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Preface

See pages P-2 to P-4 provided by Sacramento Modern.
Sacramento’s historic architecture and design contribute to its vibrancy, diversity, and sense of place. This is the backdrop upon which we share experiences, draw collective memories, and feel connected to our community. Our built environment defines our identity and sense of belonging. These places, established over the layers of time, tell our story.

It is time for us to review the chapter about Sacramento’s development during the mid-20th century—a period of unprecedented growth and expansion between 1940 and 1970—during which much of our city’s unique and distinctive character was forged. The resulting cityscape was shaped by architects, planners, designers, builders—and their clients—who, in turn, were influenced by local, regional, and national events and trends.

One such trend, Mid-Century Modernism, emerged and became the prominent design aesthetic of its time. This novel approach embraced the use of newly developed building products and technologies. Innovative, thoughtful, and optimistic designs combined with new and natural materials resulting in bright, elegant, and beautiful spaces that were well-oriented to their sites and landscapes.

The Sacramento Mid-Century Modern Historic Context Statement and Survey seeks to identify and define the different key features, characteristics, and types of Mid-Century Modern places built within city limits. Outstanding examples are highlighted in an effort to promote understanding. This study also serves to educate and inform future evaluations and identification of additional historic resources.
While this chapter of Sacramento's development may still seem recent to some, it represents a significant, distinct, and well-defined area of architecture and design. And there are compelling reasons to undertake this survey now.

After a deep recession, Sacramento is now experiencing major growth—and with that growth, comes pressure to demolish and transform older buildings. Because Mid-Century Modern resources in Sacramento have not been identified and studied to any degree, they can easily be lost before we even know about them. The Mid-Century Modern Historic Context Statement and Survey attempts to correct that. In doing so, this project contributes to our city's long-term planning, which will impact the built environment for years to come. Planning decisions made today will impact how well our city thrives tomorrow. By preserving a part of the past, we are, in essence, preparing for our future. By looking back at previous planning decisions, we can learn from our mistakes and successes.

How do buildings from the past contribute to our future? The buildings that are already here provide sustainable material and inspiration. They have a proven track record of being conduits for creative businesses. Thoughtfully reimagined buildings have a smaller carbon footprint—and therefore provide sustainable environments for economic growth. Adaptive reuse of existing buildings prevents valuable and useful materials from being sent to the landfill. Creative reuse of yesterday's buildings can also address the needs we have today, such as affordable housing and walkable neighborhoods.

Historically significant places cultivate a sense of civic pride; they hold particular meaning and bring us joy. Identifying historic places helps property owners understand and cherish what they have. And, in some instances, can provide them with economic incentives for their stewardship. Historic places enhance our quality of life and, as such, are identified in the City's General Plan as needing protection so they may continue to contribute to our City's identity.

The Sacramento Mid-Century Modern Historic Context Statement and Survey is the first of its kind, and acts as a springboard from which future efforts will follow. It has been a collaborative effort with partners from the
City of Sacramento’s Community Development Department, the California State Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento Modern, architectural historians from GEI Consultants, Inc. and Mead & Hunt, and a dedicated group of volunteers. Sacramento Modern would like to acknowledge and express our sincere thanks to everyone who contributed to this effort, including our tour homeowners, attendees, and volunteers, who helped make this happen.

Sacramento should ensure its cityscape reflects a true cross-section and walk through time, with all periods and cultures elevated and represented— for everyone to enjoy—both today, and in the future. It is our hope and intent that the Sacramento Mid-Century Modern Historic Context and Survey contributes to the effort to preserve places that tell the story of our city.

Gretchen Steinberg, President, SacMod
Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The years leading up to and following World War II, included greater global awareness, a desire to explore space, and the desire to break from traditional aesthetics, leading many architects, graphic designers, and consumers to embrace modernism. The new style was marked by the experimental forms and innovative uses of materials especially prevalent in America’s post-war downtowns, suburbs, and commercial buildings. Sacramento includes numerous properties reflecting the application of this style as the population of the city expanded due to national and statewide trends. What emerged was a distinctive style generally called Mid-Century Modern. Now is the time to celebrate this important chapter in the city’s history by identifying and documenting examples of modernism. The City of Sacramento (City) is collaborating with Sacramento Modern (SacMod) to support this effort to understand and recognize the city’s notable examples of Mid-Century Modernism.

Sacramento’s role in the history of Mid-Century Modernism was predicated upon by several factors that existed surrounding the decades prior to and following World War II. Sacramento’s location put it in the center of the state of California, near two important rivers, and in the heart of the agricultural breadbasket that is the Central Valley. While not the sole reasons for its existence, Sacramento fulfilled at least five major roles in the post-war era that included it being the location of the State Capitol (as well as providing a base of operations for city, county, and federal entities). The four additional roles of the era included the city’s function as a major agricultural processing center; a key transportation hub; the home to numerous military bases (as well as missile and defense production); and a wholesale and retail distribution center. The Sacramento region’s strengths were numerous at the time (and in many ways, remain so) and included it being the central geographic location in the state; agricultural diversity and fertility; availability of land, water, and electric power; and government employment comprising local, state, and federal civilian and military activity (which at the time provided economic stability in personal income by employing 32 percent of the total labor force). The successes of these various roles predicated extensive development as well as redevelopment in the greater Sacramento area at a scale not previously experienced (Tsargris et al. 1963:XIX).

The nexus for this document, and the larger survey and evaluation undertaking, is grounded in the efforts of SacMod founder Gretchen Steinberg. Ms. Steinberg and the preservation/education focused SacMod non-profit organization have been instrumental in the advocacy of Mid-Century Modernism in Sacramento since 2010. The enthusiasm and focus of Ms. Steinberg and SacMod on these “recent history” properties initially centered on a grassroots effort through social media and well-attended home tours that cemented their place in the preservation success story of Sacramento and beyond. Working with the City’s Preservation Director, SacMod realized that there could be benefit in a collaboration with the City to apply for a federal grant that would help identify Mid-Century Modern resources as well as develop a historic context statement that would highlight the Modernism aesthetic, and key players in the region. SacMod committed to provide the grant’s required matching funds generated from their home tour program to help raise awareness and appreciation of Sacramento’s Mid-Century Modern resources.
The City as a Certified Local Government (CLG) was successful in its application for a Historic Preservation Fund Grant through the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and with the grant’s required matching funds provided by SacMod. These preservation-focused partners embarked on a new project to complete a historic context statement and begin a survey of Mid-Century Modern properties within the city limits. This project will provide the City and SacMod with the groundwork to complete a baseline inventory, evaluation criteria, and preservation priorities of important Mid-Century Modern architecture within the city. This effort builds upon existing survey and inventories within the city, and substantial work already completed by SacMod. The project’s consultants, GEI Consultants, Inc. (GEI) and Mead & Hunt, are responsible for some key elements of the program, including this historic context statement, assisting with the completion of the reconnaissance-level survey of Mid-Century Modern properties, and the intensive evaluation of four individual properties and a residential district representing Mid-Century Modernism in Sacramento. Participants from GEI are Patricia Ambacher, Madeline Bowen, and Mark Bowen and from Mead & Hunt, Chad Moffett and Timothy Smith, who all meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for history and architectural history. Carson Anderson, Preservation Director for the City, has been the lead for the overall project and contract with the project’s consultant team. Amanda Blosser represents the OHP and serves as an advisor to the general approach of the project.

1.2 Methodology

1.2.1 Previous Modernism Work

Previous Modernism documents have been produced by several municipalities throughout the State of California. Of note are documents produced under the CLG Grant program and other programs that include, but are not limited to, the cities of Davis, Fresno, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, and Riverside. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) produced Tract Housing in California, 1945-1973: A Context for National Register Evaluation (Caltrans 2011) to assist with applying the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) evaluation criteria for tract housing built after World War II. From these previous works, much contextual understanding and thematic similarities can be gleaned as well as understanding of regional differences and specifics. For the City and the success of this project, the value of SacMod’s existing research, descriptive work through social media outlets, and informative home tour publications cannot be overstated.

1.2.2 Historic Context Statement

This historic context statement builds in part on previous works by other municipalities and supplements many discussions contained therein. It is not intended to be a complete contextual history of Modernism or the Sacramento region during the period from 1940 to 1970. For example, some aspects of the architectural history of the region could be comprehensively covered under more detailed contexts (and possibly has in some ways by other agencies) such as the Ranch House development in the United States (U.S.). Previous contextual work for the City was reviewed as was published research materials by SacMod. In addition to research completed by SacMod, supplementary research was completed at various repositories such as the City, the Center for Sacramento History, the California State Library, University Library at California State University, Sacramento, the Sacramento Bee online archive through the City of Sacramento Public Library, and the cultural resources libraries of GEI and Mead & Hunt. Professionals from both GEI and Mead & Hunt focused on the historic and architectural context and inclusive sections. SacMod provided copious amounts of research materials centered primarily on local and regional architects and architecture. Published SacMod Home Tour Guides provided useful information, as did online articles highlighted by the organization. Images and photographs were
provided by the volunteers as part of the reconnaissance level survey, the City, SacMod or the project’s consultant team unless otherwise noted. It should be noted that some of the selected photographs are not current photographs. They were included at the request of SacMod and the City to provide more clear photographs to demonstrate the architectural details of these Mid-Century Modern buildings.

1.2.3 Reconnaissance-Level Survey

As part of the larger project, the City undertook a reconnaissance-level survey of Mid-Century Modern properties within the city limits. This was to help drive the content of the historic context statement and provide a database of properties that could help the City with its General Plan preservation and planning goals. Similar to the historic context statement, this reconnaissance-level survey was not intended to be the definitive listing of Mid-Century Modern properties in Sacramento, rather a beginning point for producing some basic-level documentation that would help flag potential properties moving ahead. Given this, the focus of the survey was on representations of the clearest examples of Modernism and begin to identify those properties about which the City must be aware of relative to its California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) responsibilities over for compliance and planning. While they are within the period of study and represent Mid-Century Modern design, some resource types that fall outside those focus areas, such as the larger and most prevalent tracks of Ranch and Minimal Traditional housing completed during the study period as well as publicly owned properties, are being considered for subsequent survey and attention.

To explain the need and effort that was going to be underway, the City initiated a media outreach effort that included television, newspaper, and other electronic media press releases. These efforts dovetailed with similar information spread by SacMod using their own outlets. The outreach by SacMod and the City included a call out for potential volunteers to help conduct research, writing, and field efforts for each of the three main pieces of the project (context, reconnaissance-level survey, and intensive evaluations). Approximately 50 potential volunteers stepped forward to learn more about the program and most attended one of the two training seminars offered by the City. For the reconnaissance-level survey effort, reliance upon volunteers was paramount for completion. The City and SacMod collaborated to solicit and supply nearly 25 volunteers for the effort. The City provided training in the form of seminars that outlined the reasons for the survey, a primer on Mid-Century Modern design, a technology discussion that included smartphone setup for the assembled group, and tips for fieldwork logistics and safety protocols. As official volunteers for the City, each surveyor was provided with documentation that helped explain the survey and temporary volunteer credentials.

Selection of the survey properties was conducted in multiple phases. Preliminarily, the City looked to current GIS data that focused on assessed parcels with construction dates from 1940 to 1970, encompassing the agreed upon period representing the high period of Mid-Century Modern development in Sacramento. This initial cut of properties in the City’s GIS data system resulted in 48,000 potential parcels, many of which were not truly representative of the period of study (see Figure 1). Through desktop surveys and map research, the City narrowed the list to more focused concentrations of properties that were actually constructed during the 1940 to 1970 period and that visually represented Modernism (see Figure 2). SacMod shared their own data based on earlier research and information provided by members. Data from SacMod’s work is included in Appendix B.
Figure 1.  48,000 Parcels MCM Dates

Source: City of Sacramento, 2017

Figure 2.  2,400 Parcels MCM Prescreen

Source: City of Sacramento, 2017
The City provided spreadsheet lists and survey forms/nominations for previously documented properties within the city limits and pre-screened un-surveyed portions of the city to identify the specific streets and neighborhood-sized “hot spots” where Mid-Century Modern properties, which were the focus of this survey, were clustered (see Appendix A). Neighborhoods were screened out (using readily accessible desktop “streetview” web content) where a lack of more diverse examples of those properties were located (e.g., neighborhoods developed after 1940 comprised nearly exclusively of Ranch style and Minimal Traditional buildings that lack clusters of the relevant Mid-Century Modern properties).

There was agreement between the OHP, the City, SacMod, and the project’s consultant team that because of the enormous volume of Ranch and Minimal Traditional style buildings constructed during the Mid-Century Modern period, these more common property types would not be the focus of the survey. In cases where large groupings of types of properties illustrate historically significant neighborhood planning trends (such as the neighborhoods of Greenhaven), or represent a more noteworthy social or historical development (including subdivisions established principally for ethnic minority use like Glen Elder – that best illustrate responses to pre-1970 housing segregation practices); these were addressed in the historic context statement narrative and partially in the reconnaissance-level survey efforts.

Similarly, it was recognized that the survey should illustrate a range of building and land use types, and not simply focus on commercial and residential buildings. For instance, the survey sought to identify government offices, schools, and religious institutions and/or community/social centers that are often visual landmarks. Examples throughout the city were designed by notable architect/landscape architectural firms and this information served to inform the historic context in some part. Also, a review of the Mid-Century Modern commercial buildings already identified by SacMod and City staff revealed design types that may eventually merit documentation and evaluation (e.g., banks, medical offices, neighborhood shopping center typologies). Prescreening also identified a small number of Mid-Century Modern industrial buildings.

It was anticipated that the volunteer pool would offer a range of experience in regard to identifying appropriate properties using professionally accepted survey criteria. The prescreening identification process attempted to focus the volunteers on assigned survey focus regions of the city as well as possible significance guided by the criteria for listing on the Sacramento Register of Historic and Cultural Resources (Sacramento Register), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and the NRHP through largely through visual cues. The following possible additions were also directed to be captured if/when they could be identified by volunteers in the field:

1) Work by noteworthy Sacramento region architects and builders that embody high-end design principles. A sampling of such properties was illustrated in the SacMod information packets that included home tour booklet-referenced properties and other compiled lists of documented properties collected by SacMod.

2) Work that embodies specific Mid-Century Modern design styles and sub-forms (e.g., Formalist, Late Moderne, Split-Level, etc.).

3) Works that are more representative of Mid-Century Modern examples in their neighborhood settings. This was intended to consider certain residences located within Ranch or Minimal Traditional neighborhoods that could be distinguished somewhat apart from most of the similarly designed residences through known historic context and potentially flag them for planning purposes and future detailed evaluation. This would be a way to better ensure demographically
inclusive approach to the survey. For example, modest Mid-Century Modern infill properties in the Southside Historic District that may reflect notable ethnic historical associations might fall under this category.

It was also understood that given the expeditious approach of the reconnaissance-level survey, making detailed integrity assessments likely exceeded the level of expertise of many within the volunteer pool. Training of volunteers outlined that properties with generally good integrity retained their original massing and exterior sheathing materials, but could have non-original windows made of substitute materials (such as wood sash replaced by vinyl composite sash – provided these were placed within the original window openings/opening sizes), with allowance made for minor, not-easily noted changes to window operational characteristics. Regarding additions to the buildings, they should best be located at the rear of the building or sited and designed in such a way that they did not substantially compromise the Mid-Century Modern design character of the building when viewed from the public right-of-way.

1.2.4 **Intensive-Level Evaluations**

Finally, as part of the larger project, GEI and Mead & Hunt conducted five intensive-level evaluations (four individual properties and one district) for the ultimate desired possibility of nomination to the Sacramento Register. These five properties were chosen through discussion between SacMod and the City to represent a spread of resource types and historic themes, that clearly exemplify Mid-Century Modern architecture. Consideration was made for the resource’s ability to likely meet significance and integrity criteria for inclusion on the list. As part of this effort, SacMod compiled a comprehensive list of Mid-Century Modern properties within the city limits that were previously identified and of note or concern to that organization (see Appendix B). This list was gleaned for possible contenders for intensive evaluation. Content from the historic context statement and SacMod’s decision to conduct its own intensive evaluation on the Sacramento Zoo entry structures, helped drive the decision and the conclusion was to assess the following properties: Gunther’s Quality Ice Cream Company (Gunther’s Ice Cream) (2801 Franklin Boulevard) with a focus on the iconic neon sign; Iva Gard Shepard Garden & Arts Center (3330 McKinley Boulevard) a City-owned property; Senator Savings and Loan/Chase Bank Branch (4701 Freeport Boulevard); Gordon D. Schaber Sacramento County Courthouse (County Courthouse) (720 9th Street); and a district of Eichler residences located on South Land Park Drive, Fordham Way, and Oakridge Way.
Chapter 2. Historic Context

2.1 Historic Overview of Sacramento

2.1.1 Early History (1849-1900)

The City of Sacramento—named after the river that runs beside it—was built on four square miles of John Sutter’s New Helvetia land grant in 1849 and officially incorporated in 1850 (McGowan and Willis 1983:21, 28). Sacramento served as an important gateway to California’s gold fields during the Gold Rush years. Most of Sacramento’s early businesses during this bustling period operated near the waterfront, which was the commercial center, and businesses were housed in hastily constructed prefabricated buildings or temporary shelters such as canvas tents (Avella 2003:32). By 1854, Sacramento had grown and matured as a city and secured the title of state capitol; however, construction on a capitol building would not begin until September 1860. The Neoclassically-designed building was eventually completed in 1874 (McGowan and Willis 1983:49, 51–52). With the construction of the state capitol building, state government became a large employer in the region and soon state offices dotted the downtown area. In 1861, the Central Pacific Railroad (CPRR) formed and groundbreaking for the transcontinental railroad commenced in 1863 at Front and K streets in downtown Sacramento. The CPRR had a tremendous impact on Sacramento’s economy as people were enticed to come to the region by the cheap rail fare and promise of rich agricultural land. The railroad also enabled easier transport of materials and goods from nearby communities to markets throughout the U.S. (McGowan and Willis 1983:56, 59).

Sacramento continued to grow in the 1860s and became more culturally diverse as various ethnic groups such as Irish, German, Italian, African-American, Japanese, and Chinese immigrants came to the region seeking employment, many because of the railroad. Most of the immigrants were clustered in ethnic neighborhoods in a part of downtown Sacramento that came to be known as the West End. The West End was defined as the area from the Sacramento Riverfront eastward to the Capitol Building and from the former SPRR Railyards in the northwest section of Sacramento, south to R Street (Avella 2003:44, 55–56). As Sacramento grew and became an important political center the business district spread east and slightly south of the City Plaza (today’s Caesar Chavez Plaza). By the 1860s, most of the then new buildings tended towards the Greek Revival architectural style. By the 1870s, the picturesque Queen Anne and the Italianate architectural styles could be found in both Sacramento’s commercial and residential architecture, including the Governor’s Mansion, Crocker Mansion, and the Stanford-Lathrop Mansion (Gebhard et al. 1976:394). In 1887, the city was awarded federal funds for the construction of a new federal post office at the northeast corner of 7th and K streets (no longer extant). Two years later, the Cathedral of the Blessed Sacramento at 11th and K streets was completed (Avella 2003:69–70).

With plentiful employment opportunities, the population of Sacramento grew at a steady pace. By the 1880s, while the ethnic minorities and economically disadvantaged segments of the population remained downtown, residential homes for the more established residents ringed the outer edges of the business district. The introduction of the electric railway and trolley cars allowed for the growth of residential neighborhoods beyond the central district. This new mode of transportation proved to be reliable and safe, and quickly became a popular means of transportation for the local population. Soon Sacramento expanded beyond its city limits and several new neighborhoods and subdivisions sprang up in proximity.
to the existing or planned electric rail lines. Oak Park became the first subdivision platted in 1887, by Edwin K. Alsip and the Oak Park Association (McGowan & Willis 1983:6; Simpson 2004:7, 9). Located south of downtown Sacramento, Oak Park is bounded roughly by Stockton Boulevard, Franklin Boulevard, 14th Avenue, and Broadway. Many of the homes in Oak Park were designed in the Queen Anne architectural style, built mostly for upper-middle-class citizens (Simpson 2004:7, 17). Sacramento’s streetcar system reached Oak Park in 1904 (McGowan and Willis 1983:6).

### 2.1.2 Progress Beyond the Central Grid (1900-1920)

The turn of the 20th century ushered Sacramento into the modern world. The first automobile in Sacramento appeared in 1900 as part of a street fair, and by 1904 there were more than 20 cars registered in the city. Within six years, that number grew to 700. The use of automobiles continued to rise so that by 1914 there were more than 3,400 automobiles registered in Sacramento alone (Avella 2003: 89; McGowan & Willis 1983:75). The City also invested in public transportation and in addition to street cars, established bus lines in Sacramento and to neighboring communities such as Folsom and Stockton (Avella 2003:89). Improved transportation within the city continued the gradual expansion of development beyond the existing central district.

In 1911, Sacramento annexed additional land to the east and south of the original city limits, including Oak Park, and developed the neighborhoods of Land Park, East Sacramento, and Curtis Park. These annexations marked the first official expansion of the Sacramento’s core since it was established in 1849 (Norris 1982:74). The firm of Wright & Kimbrough, which created what is today known as the “Fabulous Forties” (located generally between 38th and 46th streets, J Street, and Folsom Boulevard in East Sacramento), as well as the 250-acre College Tract near Land Park, and Sacramento City College, also planned neighborhoods south of the city limits.

The homes in these new neighborhoods, although typically designed in more restrained styles than had been popular in years prior, would exhibit an eclectic mix of architecture within one subdivision. The Craftsman Bungalow with its modest façade and limited decoration was especially popular. Also favored were designs reflecting elements of various period revival styles ranging from the English Tudor to American Colonial Revival. As opposed to the mass-produced homes that would appear in the coming decades, the residences of the early 20th century were built individually by small scale contractors and often included a detached one-car garage reflective of the growing automobile culture.

As the residential neighborhoods grew, Sacramento’s central grid underwent a building boom. Major commercial and public buildings were constructed to beautify the city. In 1911, the City constructed a new City Hall designed by R. A. Herold in a Baroque version of the Renaissance Revival architectural style. Two years later the state government began construction on the State Library Building (today’s Library and Courts buildings) at the northeast corner of N and 9th streets and an office building across the circle from the library. Both buildings were the work of Weeks & Day and were also built in the Renaissance Revival architectural style. A new city library opened in 1918, on I Street designed by L. P. Rexford in the Italian Renaissance Revival style (Gebhard et.al. 1976:398–401).

### 2.1.3 Sacramento Buildup Between the Wars (1920-1940)

Following World War I, Sacramento undertook a second building boom. Residential buildings, including multi-family apartments, built in the Art Deco or Streamline Moderne architectural style, which made use of decorative geometric patterns and modern materials such as steel and glass, were seen with more frequency. Nearly 30 new buildings were constructed in the city during this period,
including Dean & Dean’s Memorial Auditorium in 1927 at the northwest corner of 16th and J streets, and schools like Sacramento High School (1921), and McGeorge School of Law (1924) (Avella 2003:90, 92–93). Residential development continued in the outskirts of the central grid and houses remained an eclectic mix of architecture. In the 1920s, Wright & Kimbrough had also planned for the Sutterville Heights and South Land Park neighborhoods in today’s southern part of the city, but development was delayed because of the Great Depression and then World War II (Norris 1982:84).

Like the rest of the country, the Great Depression of the 1930s had a significant impact on Sacramento’s economy. Unemployment affected the city’s two major industries: agricultural and the railroad (Brechin and Simpson 2013:186–187). Initially, the lack of jobs impacted the seasonal canning industry, which was further hurt by a winter freeze that destroyed half of the citrus trees in the Sacramento Valley in December 1932. Western Pacific Railroad workers especially suffered when they were laid off during this period (Avella 2003:97). Transient encampments could be found along both the Sacramento and American rivers, and residential development in the region practically came to a halt.

In time, federal aid brought money and jobs to Sacramento for road grading, tree removal, and the installation of street signs and traffic signals. Government funding also aided some local construction projects. The Tower Bridge was built in 1935 by the Civil Works Administration. During this same period, the Public Works Administration secured funds for the construction of C.K. McClatchy High School and the auditorium at Sacramento City College (Avella 2003:101–102). Between 1935 and 1940, the Federal Works Progress Administration provided additional relief for workers through projects to construct new buildings and structures, including rock work in William Land Park, and improvements the park’s infrastructure.

Although growth slowed during the Depression years, developers continued to buy land tracts outside the city limits and laid out plans for the construction of nearly identical homes that were built like an assembly line and ushered in the era of the subdivision. Many of these early homes were built in modest styles reflective of the economic struggles of the period. Decorative adornments were few, and the sleek horizontal lines of the Streamline Modern style became popular. In commercial construction, the International style influences could be seen, though mostly in office buildings. Bus lines gradually replaced the trolley systems and the automobile provided residents the freedom to move well beyond the city grid. As tracts of land were developed beyond the city’s central region, businesses, retail, and schools were established in the new neighborhoods.

2.1.4 Sacramento in World War II and the Post-War Boom (1940-1970)

The advent of World War II slowed residential and commercial development throughout the U.S., including Sacramento, as the nation shifted its focus to the war effort. In Sacramento, however, there was growth related to the overseas conflict, including the reactivation of two local airbases for duty. Mather Field, a World War I airbase dormant since its closing in the 1920s, was reopened in 1941, and McClellan Air Force Base (AFB), also established prior to World War II, was expanded and served as a training, repair, and refitting base for aircraft being that had been severely damaged in combat (Herbert 2013:208; McGowan and Willis 1983:85).

Large numbers of people relocated because of circumstances surrounding World War II. Some transferred to the area for jobs and others moved to seek employment. Between 1942 and 1945, approximately 340,000 African Americans relocated to California for defense-related employment. Ethnic monitors contributed significantly to the war effort.
In February 1942, President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, which required the internment of various ethnic groups to relocation camps. The order mostly targeted those of Japanese-American descent living on the West Coast. The relocation had a tremendous effect on Sacramento and the surrounding region. The Federal Bureau of Investigation froze assets at Sumitomo Bank and local businesses were forced to close. Sacramento’s Japantown, which was located between 2nd and 5th streets and L and O streets, began seeing mass evacuations in May 1942, and more than 3,000 residents were sent to assembly centers and then relocation camps throughout the western U.S. Three prominent Sacramento Japanese-American businessmen were also arrested and deemed enemy aliens. (Avella 2003:107–108). A large portion of Sacramento’s downtown population was suddenly gone, schools lost students, and the nation’s largest strawberry and grape-producing industries were devastated. Even after the war ended, the local economy would take years to recover from the abrupt removal of a vital part of the community (Wildie 2013:106–107).

Following World War II, the local economy boomed as the region adjusted to a post-war economy. Military and federal expenditures spent during World War II continued to benefit Sacramento when the war ended. McClellan AFB, Mather AFB, and the Army Signal Depot were the main employers for residents during this time, many of which were veterans who arrived from both the Pacific and European theaters. These returning military personnel sought financial support through programs such as the Serviceman’s Readjustment Act of 1944, known as the GI Bill, to qualify for mortgages and college educations. In the post-war years, state government also made changes that increased employment opportunities in Sacramento. To allow a better focus on more complex issues brought on by a growing state population, California’s legislature became full-time in 1966. This and the centralization of state agencies and departments required more workers and attracted people to the Sacramento region (Avella 2003:117).

Sacramento’s population in 1940 was 105,958 residents (U.S. Census Bureau 1940). In 1950, that number rose to 137,572 people (U.S. Census Bureau 1950:120, 5–10). As Sacramento annexed the surrounding areas that were developed, the population of the city continued to rise. Between 1955 and 1960, the population grew by nearly 22 percent (White 1968:20). The dramatic increase in the city’s populace following the war created a housing shortage. Residential development accelerated as the region struggled to meet the housing needs for thousands of returning World War II veterans. In 1945, the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce sent letters to the regional director of the National Housing Agency in Washington, D.C. apprising him of the need for additional housing, but there was a lag in housing construction because of a shortage of building materials (The Sacramento Bee 1945:4).

2.1.5 Federal Programs and Housing Discrimination

Federal programs helped jump-start the post-war economy and strongly influenced suburban housing construction, including development in Sacramento. The GI Bill provided several benefits to returning veterans, including guaranteed housing loans. The Veteran’s Administration oversaw implementation of the GI Bill’s provisions and allowed veterans to borrow the entire price of a house without a down payment or mortgage insurance. Men and women could take advantage of this benefit within two years of leaving the armed services or within two years after the war’s end. The GI Bill’s provision for mortgage loans was a boon to homeownership and reintegration into civilian life for veterans and their families (Mead & Hunt and Louis Berger Group, Inc. 2012:56).

Housing programs established during the Great Depression continued in the post-war period and helped shape suburban development patterns. The National Housing Act of 1934, administered by the Federal Housing Authority (FHA), aimed to improve economic conditions for Americans by authorizing the
FHA to insure private residential mortgages and ultimately encouraged lenders to invest in these mortgages. Since the mortgages were government-insured, lenders faced less risk of loan default by homeowners. Various amendments occurred before and after World War II, which stimulated the construction of private homes and housing developments in the post-war period (Mead & Hunt and Louis Berger Group, Inc. 2012:54–55).

The FHA’s insurance of private mortgages paved the way to homeownership for thousands of Americans, but its stringent standards also precluded thousands from realizing that same dream. Certain standards had to be met before the FHA would insure a mortgage and banks often used these same standards for non-FHA insured projects. The quality of the neighborhood was the deciding factor and was based on several considerations, which mostly hinged on geographic location: economic stability of the neighborhood; protection from adverse influences; transportation adequacy; overall appeal of the neighborhood; lack of special hazards; proximity to civic, social, and commercial centers; available utilities and conveniences; and the cost of taxes and special assessments.

Older neighborhoods near city centers were considered less desirable and economically unstable under FHA standards and were “redlined” as not meeting standards. Redlined neighborhoods were typically home to ethnic minority communities that had resided there for decades or relocated there because of discrimination in the developing suburbs. As early as the 1920s, the government refused to underwrite homes in these areas, and essentially discriminated against ethnic minority communities with a bias toward new suburban developments that met FHA standards. For example, the Wright & Kimbrough developments included covenants that prohibited African Americans and Asians from purchasing property in their tracts (Avella 2008:97). J.C. Carly, who developed Curtis Park, was the president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards (NAREB), which also encouraged racially restrictive covenants. There were restrictions on house size and color, and racial and ethnic owners/residents (Avella 2008:99). These neighborhoods became the first legally recognized racial boundaries for residency in Sacramento (Hernandez 2009:6,7–8).

Over time, this practice led to widespread divestment and arrested development in urban centers as well as segregation along racial and socio-economic lines. These national trends were furthered by the FHA’s initial encouragement of restrictive covenants in post-war suburbs to ensure appropriate land use and racial homogeneity (Pettis et al. 2012:61). Although the 1948 Supreme Court decision in Shelley vs. Kramer outlawed restrictive real estate covenants based on race, discrimination continued in the form of selecting to whom a house was sold; middle-class people of color with the means to purchase suburban homes were still denied homeownership in post-World War II suburbs.

In Sacramento, the West End, which in 1938, was defined by the federal Homeowners Loan Corporation’s (HOLC) survey results as having a high concentration of residents unsuitable for mortgage lending (Hernandez 2009:10) (see Figure 3). The HOLC identified the West End as “D Fourth Grade” meaning:

…characterized by detrimental influences [emphasis original] in a pronounced degree, undesirable population or infiltration of it [emphasis original]. Low percentage of home ownership, very poor maintenance and often vandalism prevail. Unstable incomes of the people and difficult collections are usually prevalent. The areas are broader than the so-called slum districts. Some mortgage lenders may refuse to make loans in these neighborhoods and others will lend only on a conservative basis (Marciano et al. 2017).
Figure 3. HOLC 1938 Survey Map for Sacramento

Because West End property owners were excluded from the mortgage market by real estate brokers and FHA leaders, they were left with limited financing. This, coupled with the enforcement of non-white residency covenants throughout the city, made the West End gradually become a neighborhood with mostly absentee landlords and minority, lower-income residents (Hernandez 2009:10).

In 1950, the FHA attempted to further address racial discrimination by announcing it would no longer insure mortgages on properties subject to restrictive covenants; however, the struggle for equality continued throughout the 1950s and 1960s as the civil rights movement strengthened and spread across the country (Mead & Hunt and Louis Berger Group, Inc. 2012:54–62). In Sacramento, Nathaniel Colley, the city’s first African American attorney, was a civil rights advocate. Colley, a Yale Law School graduate, opened his practice in Sacramento in 1949. He served as regional counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) during the 1950s and 1960s. For 20 years in this role he filed many anti-discrimination lawsuits pertaining to housing and education. Colley experienced housing discrimination in Sacramento and was unable to buy a lot in the city’s South Land Park neighborhood because the broker would not sell to African Americans. Colley had a white couple buy the lot for his family, and in 1955 the Colleys moved into their new house. They were met with a burning cross on their front porch. Colley filed a lawsuit against a developer who received federal funds claiming housing discrimination (Ming vs. Horgan). Colley won the case (Alim 1991:D1). In 1962, a three-month long protest against racial discrimination took place outside of South Land Park Hills, which was historically an exclusive all-white neighborhood. The protest resulted in an investigation into housing discrimination in several of Sacramento’s subdivisions by the State Attorney General (Hernandez 2009:13).

2.1.6 Urban Renewal

City centers experienced significant economic decline in the post-war period as commercial and residential development shifted to suburban areas. Once bustling urban communities and nearby older neighborhoods were increasingly perceived by city officials as congested areas of blight and the slum-like conditions requiring removal and rebuilding. A series of policies enacted at the federal, state, and local level in the years following World War II attempted to assist communities in renewing their urban centers. In 1945, the California Legislature enacted the Community Redevelopment Act to help local governments remove blighted areas of residential commercial and industrial properties through development, reconstruction, or rehabilitation. In 1951, California’s Community Redevelopment Law replaced the Community Redevelopment Act and applied to all cities and counties in California, enabling local governments to establish redevelopment agencies and implement the California’s policy toward improvement of deteriorated areas (Harris 1967:815; County of Los Angeles 2017). Nationally, the Federal Housing Act of 1949 gave local agencies the power to “redevelop” redlined neighborhoods through the acquisition of parcels via eminent domain. Bolstered by state and federal policies, local redevelopment agencies in cities across the country proceeded to coordinate the clearance of entire swaths of buildings and communities and prepare the sites for redevelopment. Two-thirds of the cost for property acquisition and clearing was paid for by the federal government; the local agency paid the remaining third. Urban redevelopment occurred across the country. A staggering 650,000 substandard homes were removed as part of urban redevelopment and only 250,000 were replaced on the same parcel with equally affordable housing (Brown 2010:41–42). These activities displaced thousands of local business owners and residents and destroyed familiar communal ties between neighbors, families, and friends.

The National Housing Act of 1954 introduced the term “urban renewal” to replace “urban redevelopment” with a focus on the restoration of decaying areas in cities. Some urban renewal efforts
focused on clearing of parcels for redevelopment and new construction. Other urban renewal projects focused on rehabilitation of existing homes, planning activities, and construction of affordable public housing and rental units. Other legislation that attempted to provide housing for lower income residents included the National Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, which enabled larger mortgages for lower-priced homes in outlying areas near military bases. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 provided financial assistance for low-income homebuyers (Mead & Hunt, Inc. and Louis Berger Group, Inc. 2012:57).

**Sacramento’s West End and Capitol Mall Redevelopment**

In the 1940s, Sacramento’s leaders were concerned about the rapidly declining downtown, particularly the West End, which in 1949 accounted for 26 percent of the city’s building fires, 45 percent of crime, and 76 percent of tuberculosis cases (see Figure 4) (Hernandez 2009:11). The West End provided affordable housing to nearly 10,000 residents, primarily single men older than 55 years (Avella 2003:127). The West End was home to most of the city’s minorities and the community provided a network of laborers for the local canneries and farms. It was also an area that had a variety of ethnic groups and where their social halls and entertainment was located (Avella 2003:127). The City asserted some authority regarding today’s Capitol Mall when it created a permanent joint Capitol Mall Committee whose purpose was guiding the future development of the Capitol Mall. Sacramento architect Herbert Goodpastor served on the committee in 1951 (*The Sacramento Bee* 1948c:4; Goodpastor 1960).

In 1950, the City established the Sacramento Redevelopment Agency (SRA) with the purpose of planning, initiating, and supervising redevelopment in Sacramento and the West End was selected as the first place for redevelopment (Norris 1982:118). City leaders hired Neutra and Alexander, the Los Angeles-based architecture firm belonging to Richard Neutra and Robert Alexander, to prepare a general plan for the urban renewal of the West End. The plan consisted of extensive slum clearance and the building of high-rise public housing along the Sacramento riverfront. But, fundamental to Neutra and Alexander’s plan was that the project be of good urban design – concise and unified. They envisioned a “cityscape” with high-rise

---

**Figure 4. Old Sacramento and the West End in Foreground, View Looking East**

Source: Center for Sacramento History, Frank Christy Collection, 1998/72/1421
apartments and office buildings, a convention hotel, and commercial enterprises. Retaining the street pattern Neutra and Alexander recommended superblocks and a separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic for safety reasons (Tsuruda and Read 1978; Chou 2014:8–19). Various studies identified 233 blocks that needed transformation (see Figures 5-6) (Avella 2003:127). The plan, however, was met with resistance by business owners because of the public housing aspect (Chou 2014:8-19). In response, the SRA placed a caveat on the plan that relocation only applied to families who lived in the area for at least one year. This dramatically reduced the number of people, particularly single men, who would require relocation.

The SRA hired Sasaki, Walker, Lackey Associates, a landscape, planning and architectural firm, to recommend the development direction and designs for potential sites along today’s Capitol Mall. The firm recommended that the focus of Capitol Mall should be the State Capitol Building with symmetrical arrangement of buildings (Tsuruda and Read 1978). SRA’s resulting 1954 Capitol Mall Redevelopment Project focused on clearing 75 blocks in downtown (Chou 2014:8-18; SRA 1962:4). As part of redevelopment, the SRA encouraged the construction of government office buildings on nearby Capitol Mall because it helped bail out property owners who were faced with falling property values (Norris 1982:116–117). This new plan centered on the area between the West End and the State Capitol building, with plans to transform Capitol Avenue, originally M Street, into a spacious mall blanketed by architecturally pleasing buildings (SRA 1962:7). The landscape design, including the sidewalks, trees, street lights, and grassy median were planned in 1962 and finished in 1965 (PAR 2014:1). J.W. Wilson, a design engineer from the Division of Highways, and Donald Van Riper, a landscape architect, designed Capitol Mall with a symmetrical plan having 8-foot-wide sidewalks with an 8-foot-wide landscaped strip of Linden trees on each side of the mall, and a center median 52 feet wide covered in grass (PAR 2014:16).

SRA divided redevelopment into three phases (see Figure 7). Phase I of the project and focused on nine blocks for nine buildings. The first building completed was in 1959, the Federal Court and Office Building, designed by Harry J. Devine, Herbert E. Goodpastor, Raymond Francheshi, Dreyfuss & Blackford, and Rickey & Brooks. Phase I also saw the construction of Capitol Towers Apartments (Capitol Towers). This major residential complex was estimated to accommodate almost 5,000 people who would have easy, walkable access to the planned commercial development. Capitol Towers was a collaborative effort designed by Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons (WBE), DeMars & Reay, Edward Larrabee Barnes, Dreyfuss & Blackford, and Lawrence Halprin to name a few (SRA 1962:4; Tsuruda and Read 1978; Chou 2014:8-23). Commercial buildings completed in this phase included 520 Capitol Mall. Known at the time as the IBM Building because IBM was the building’s largest tenant, it was designed by Dreyfuss & Blackford. Phase I ended in 1962 and Phase II began. Phase II was completed in 1965 and involved approximately $65 million of private, public, and quasi-public funds invested in 9.5 blocks. This phase featured a commercial complex designed by Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill focusing on K Street between 2nd and 4th streets. The plan was to create a pedestrian mall with the Macy’s Department Store as the anchor store. Much of Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill’s concept was not developed as originally designed (SRA 1962:4; JRP 2013:23). The third and final phase began in 1965 and ended in 1969. This was the largest of the projects and covered 51 blocks. Work in this phase covered Old Sacramento, the new Chinatown mall, and a large state office complex, among other buildings (SRA 1962:4). Throughout the 1970s and into the late-20th century, several government buildings continued to be constructed on Capitol Mall and the downtown area.
Figure 5. Demolition of Sacramento’s West End by Redevelopment, December 1962

Source: SacMod Ephemera Collection/Mike Brown Vintage Slide Donation, 2017

Figure 6. Demolition of Sacramento’s West End, July 1963

Source: SacMod Ephemera Collection/Mike Brown Vintage Slide Donation, 2017
Sacramento’s Chinatown Mall

Sacramento’s original Chinatown was established in 1850 and covered the area between 2nd and 6th streets on I Street (Choy 2007:127). The neighborhood remained largely unchanged until the early 1900s when older buildings were replaced with newer ones. After World War II, it was evident that Chinatown, considered part of the West End, was becoming part of the Sacramento’s “skid row.”

In 1960, Jack Chew presented a tentative plan for a five-block, $15 million development project to the SRA for a “New Chinatown.” The project could not immediately move forward because the SRA was still trying to find investors who would restore the old commercial center on K Street. Chew’s proposed project was also complicated because of ongoing challenges presented by the planned construction of Interstate 5 nearby. The location of the new freeway had to be resolved before the “New Chinatown” project could move forward (Dempster 1971:8).
Four years later in 1964, the SRA received federal money to build a new Chinatown; however, the plans fell short because it was too ambitious, expensive, and did not have the support of the local Chinese community (Dempster 1971:8). This, coupled with Proposition 14, which opened the door to discrimination as it gave property owners and landlords the right to sell and rent property to whomever they pleased, placed a freeze on redevelopment funding. It was not until 1967 when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the proposition was unconstitutional that redevelopment financing was available again in California. By then, many West End residents were being displaced and it became critical for the Chinese community to build its new Chinatown to maintain the cohesion among the community (Dempster 1971:8). The Confucius Temple at 404 I Street, constructed between 1952 and 1961, was considered by the Chinese community to be the anchor of the new Chinatown (see Figure 8) (Dempster 1971:8). The temple, a steel-frame, three story building designed by Eva Fong Low, Lun Chan, and Lyman Lee, was a project by the Chinese Benevolent Society and the architects wished for the building to architecturally express the “best of Oriental culture” (The Sacramento Bee 1959c:n.p.).

Local architect Henry Yee was one of the loudest protestors of the original Chinatown plan by the firm Chan-Radner because it was too ambitious and expensive. Yee designed his own two-block plan and presented it to the SRA. At the same time, the head of the SRA, Robert Roche, was meeting with Chinese-American community leaders to persuade them that the unusual terrain would be a unique touch for the landscaping and design of the new Chinatown because as old buildings were being demolished the original level of Sacramento’s streets, 8 feet lower than the surrounding existing streets, emerged (Dempster 1971:8).

When the project went out to bid in 1967, there were nine sites available, but 14 proposals were submitted. The local Chinese-American family associations and property owners were given priority. By 1969, construction on the new Chinatown began (Dempster 1971:8). The first building to break ground
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**Figure 8. Sacramento's Chinatown**

333-429 J Street
Architects: 333 J: Wong Center - McGuire, Eatough & Fong, 1972
401 J: Soo Yuen Benevolent Association - Sooky Lee, 1970
419 J: Hong Kong Lum Restaurant - Sooky Lee, 1970
429 J: Hong Kong Bank - Hertzka & Knowles, 1970
Source: SacMod, 2017
and be built is today known as the Soo Yuen Benevolent Association. Built in 1970, it was designed by Sooky Lee and features wide roof overhangs, ceramic tile, animals at each roof corner, intricate painted designs, and sculptures of solid brass dragons (The Sacramento Bee 1971:11). Lee also designed the Hong Kung Lum Restaurant at 419 J Street. Architect Henry Yee designed the Ong Ko Met at 427 J Street and 429 J Street, and Hong Kong Bank was the work of Hertzka & Knowles (SacMod 2017:3). Construction in Chinatown continued into 1972. Landscape design was by the Davis, California, firm of Baronian & Danielson (The Sacramento Bee 1967d:B1).

2.1.7 Transportation and Suburbanization

The popularity of the automobile and expanded transportation infrastructure during the post-war period resulted in a physical transformation of cities throughout California and the nation. The prosperous post-World War II economy created a high demand for automobiles and a boom in the automobile manufacturing industry. The number of cars owned by Americans doubled between 1945 and 1955 and approximately 50 million cars traveled the country’s roads and highways by 1960 (City of San Diego 2007:41). This increase in automobile use rendered highways and freeways constructed in earlier decades inadequate due to the volume of traffic and the rapid suburbanization occurring throughout the nation. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 authorized the designation of an Interstate Highway System with the intention of connecting major metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers across the country. The Interstate Highway System, expected to span some 40,000 miles, would also serve a role in military defense; however, the Act had insufficient funding and its drafters had not anticipated the dramatic suburban growth and widespread automobile ownership that occurred in the years immediately following World War II. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 authorized the first funding for the new Interstate Highway System, allocating a total of $50 million dollars for fiscal years 1954 and 1955. This was combined with federal funding, gasoline taxes, road use taxes, and state budgets (Mead & Hunt and Louis Berger Group, Inc. 2012:41).

Sacramento functioned as a community reliant upon local surface streets for automobile use for the years prior to World War II. The years following the war saw an increase in automobile production that strained local major arterials. From 1945 to 1962 the number of private automobiles in the U.S. increased from 25.7 million to 65.7 million (Hoyt 1963:295). Sacramento and regional commercial corridors included some notable ingress, egress, and internal circulation streets such as Stockton Boulevard, Franklin Boulevard, Freeport Boulevard, Broadway, Del Paso Boulevard, Fair Oaks Boulevard, and Capitol Avenue (Capitol Mall).

Planning for a freeway system in the Sacramento area began in 1947 only a couple years following the conclusion of World War II. At that time, the California Division of Highways (predecessor to modern-day Caltrans) worked with the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads to outline a plan for a network of modern roads. Presented in 1949 and formally adopted in 1950, the plan resulted in the Elvas Freeway, which later became State Route 51, Business 80 (Business Loop 80), and the Capital City Freeway, constructed between 1950 and 1955. It was the first freeway built north of Sacramento’s central grid streets, as part of the incremental development of the city and region’s freeway system. Three years following the adoption of the Elvas Freeway, the agencies adopted the construction of the South Sacramento Freeway (U.S. 50/99) to the south, which was opened in 1961 (Hart 1963:558–559).

The city core became somewhat unique in that at the time it had no freeways either through the city or bypassing it, rather relying upon surface streets to connect freeways that entered to the north: Highway 40 and Highway 99E (Elvas Freeway), south: 99S (South Sacramento Freeway), and west Highway 40/99W (West Sacramento Freeway). This configuration resulted from the city’s location between two
major rivers. By 1954, officials began the process of laying out an east/west freeway that would take many years to realize completion because of public pressure and neighborhood planning needs. That same year the Highway Commission adopted a north/south freeway along 29th and 30th streets to connect the Elvas Freeway to the South Sacramento Freeway. Along the west edge of the city, Highway 5 was planned alongside concerns for the preservation of historic buildings in Old Sacramento. Added to the challenge for the city was the exponential population growth of Sacramento since 1947 that negated city transportation needs data and required reconsideration for much expanded post-World War II automobile usage (Hart 1963:560–569). The routing of all freeways in the city that took into consideration some preservation and neighborhood concerns was adopted by the early 1960s.

By the early 1960s, the city had a population of approximately 246,000 people. Seventy-five percent of the state government employees arrived at work via automobile and approximately 630,000 people entered or left Sacramento’s downtown each day. Sacramento’s residents followed the same model of many throughout the country by increasingly using the automobile as their primary mode of transportation. The proliferation of the automobile filled the ever-increasing miles of highway that leapt nationally from 204,000 miles of paved road in 1910, to 2,600,000 miles in 1962 (Hoyt 1963:295).

By the late-1960s and early-1970s, Interstates 5 and 80 were completed (see Figure 9). The new roads alleviated traffic congestion in and out of the city and rerouted vehicular traffic that had once traversed Sacramento’s downtown using surface streets to periphery elevated freeways. With the completion of the freeway system, which encircled Sacramento’s central city, former engineering landmarks such as the Tower Bridge no longer functioned as the main western entrance to the city. Such was the case for new freeways nationally, reduced traffic being coursed through the city center began to negatively impact commercial enterprises in the downtown that relied on the steady stream of traffic the surface streets provided. The new elevated freeways made it possible for residents to live, shop, and recreate further out in the suburbs and commute to their jobs in the city (Hoyt 1963:295–296). The Sacramento region also became desirable as it was at the crossroads of some of the key freeways of northern California. These freeways allowed less restrained travel between key work places in the area such as government, food processing, and defense centers, and housing and shopping in desired areas of the early 1960s such as South Land Park, River Park, the Northeast area (Arden, Town & Country, San Juan), Freeport Boulevard area, and the South Area (Tsargris et al. 1963:XXII).

Suburbanization and expanded transportation infrastructure also meant that drivers began traveling longer distances making speed and efficiency of getting around cities an important consideration. By 1953, there were more than 100,000 automobiles in Sacramento. The city had one car for every 1.6 residents (n.a. 1953:5–6). By the 1960s, the massive influx of returning war veterans had subsided and the development trend shifted to purchasing large tracts of land where subdivisions could be built at a much larger scale than

---

**Figure 9. View of Interstate 5 Looking North 1970**

Source: Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento Bee Collection 1983/001/SBPM Freeway 2nd-3rd Street
what occurred in earlier years (Avella 2008:104–105). For residential development, the one-story style of the Minimal Traditional gained prominence because their simple form could be quickly produced for the growing subdivisions throughout the city. The residences featured small, compact gable or hip roofs with stud construction like those built before the war. By 1953, the immediate demand for housing was over and Minimal Traditional homes fell out of favor as people traded up for larger homes and could simply afford larger residences because of the booming post-war economy. Ranch houses became popular and featured more square footage, large picture windows, and wide overhanging eaves (Caltrans 2011:67–71, 76). The homes developed in these post-war neighborhoods were built more for comfort and affordability than style. Materials for residential construction were typically prefabricated plywood, stucco, or concrete block. Between 1945 and 1954, more than 13 million homes were constructed across the nation (see Figure 10). These new homes were primarily located in newly developed suburban communities; only 19.4 percent of new housing was constructed in central cities (Mead & Hunt and Louis Berger Group, Inc. 2012:49–50).

**Figure 10. Number of Parcels Containing Buildings Built Between 1940 and 1970**

New construction in the bustling suburbs also included churches, schools, libraries, and recreational centers and often reflected modernistic stylistic influences. These suburban commercial centers drew business away from the city’s central business district. Banks located in city centers opened conveniently located branch banks in suburban areas to serve the growing suburban population. Open land in outlying areas enabled businesses to relocate, expand, and provide plenty of parking for employees and customers. For these reasons office buildings, corporate complexes, and industrial parks were constructed in post-war suburbs and were often constructed in Corporate Modern or Mid-Century Modern styles (City of San Diego 2007:46).

The establishment of the Sacramento Army Depot at Fruitridge and Power Inn roads and the Campbell South Plant at 47th Avenue and Franklin Boulevard helped spur the development of neighborhoods in post-war Sacramento. Most of the new subdivisions within city limits were to the south. The first post-
World War II neighborhoods were in the Fruitridge, Colonial Heights, Sutterville, and South Land Park areas (Norris 1982:84). Sacramento annexed Colonial Heights in 1948, despite the objections of residents who were concerned about increased taxes (Sacramento Archives Museum Collection Center 2008:45). Neighborhoods such as Hollywood Park, Sutterville Heights, and Freeport Village were advertised for working-class families (Avella 2008:104). By 1955, Sacramento annexed 27 districts and increased the city’s limits by almost 10 square miles (see Figure11) (Norris 1982:84).

In December 1964, the city merged with North Sacramento through a hotly debated and close public vote. After the merger, the boundaries of the northern portion of Sacramento were roughly marked by the American River to the south, the Natomas East Drainage Canal on the west, Main Avenue on the north, and the Sacramento Northern Railroad on the east on to Lampasas Avenue (Ehrenreich-Risner 2010:26). In 1968, the California State Fair moved into the new 350-acre California Exposition (Cal Expo), on the north bank of the American River, and throughout the 1970s and 1980s, improvements were made to the area’s infrastructure and roads (Page & Turnbull 2013, 6.3-16).

2.1.8 Commercial Development

Mid-Century Modern commercial architecture in Sacramento is generally expressed throughout the city limits. The style is represented through various aspects of commercial enterprises such as shopping centers, anchor department stores, smaller independent stores, financial institutions, restaurants, motels/hotels, and gas stations. Prior to World War II, much of the commercial activity of the city occurred within what is known as the Sacramento central business district of downtown/midtown. Post-war revitalization pushed the limits of residential and supporting commercial construction out of downtown in almost all directions.

The construction of commercial architecture during this period follows much of the same patterns as residential development to both entice continued development of certain areas by advertising proximity to desired services and retail outlets as well as supply those residents who had already moved in. Except for some infill construction and a larger redevelopment push for the West End in the 1960s, the clear majority of commercial development for Sacramento during this period was within the rapidly growing suburban areas outside the downtown/midtown neighborhoods. Commercial development during the post-war period took place in neighborhoods located to the south, east, and northeast of the city’s core where cheap land was available for new construction and space to accommodate the preferred mode of post-war transportation: the automobile. Military base construction and operation (primarily McClellan AFB) drove the expansion of residential and commercial development to the northeast during and after World War II in the Del Paso Heights and North Highlands areas (Cope 1965:35; Tsargris et al. 1963:9, Morgan 1960:16).

As was common nationally, all manner of commercial needs followed in the expansion of residential neighborhoods during this time. Employment possibilities away from the central city area, including McClellan AFB, Mather AFB, and Aerojet General (Aerojet), meant that taking advantage of residential and commercial opportunities between these areas made sense to commercial developers (Cope 1965:42). Commercial development areas to the south were located along primary transportation corridors such as Riverside, Freeport, Franklin, and Stockton boulevards that led to food processing jobs in the south and southeast areas.

It should be noted that these commercial enterprises were reacting to increased competition by using new advertising techniques and often implemented use of neon signage and lighting for building decoration to lure potential customers during the evening hours. Supermarkets began using the term
Figure 11. Annexation Map 1849-2013

Source: City of Sacramento, 2013a
“owl hours” to advertise late-night shopping options and the wider use of glass exposing lighted interiors helped make this point. Hotels (apart from older open-plan motels) became dependent upon their signs and decorative exteriors representing the quality of the experience that awaited potential customers since the establishment’s insurance of privacy and quiet generally kept non-customers outside (Liebs 1995:187). Financial institutions appear to largely consist of an exception to neon lighting use as they typically held to daytime business hours and presented a greater feeling of formality and security.

**Shopping Centers, Department Stores, Neighborhood Stores**

In addition to the downtown Sacramento business district, by 1965, the Sacramento metropolitan area featured 12 neighborhood shopping centers, five community shopping centers, and five regional shopping centers. This metropolitan area extended beyond Sacramento’s boundary and thus the numbers within the city limits are fewer. For example, Arden Fair (Regional) Shopping Center, constructed in March 1957, (annexed to Sacramento in 1962), is the only regional shopping center from the period within the current city limits. Following World War II, city residents frequented shopping centers currently outside (and primarily northeast of) the limits including: Town and Country Shopping Center (1945), Country Club Center (1952), Country Club Plaza (1958), and Taylor’s Shopping Center (1960). Residents employed by outer-lying Aerojet were served by Mills, Mills Park, and Cordova Village Shopping Centers in the current City of Rancho Cordova area. Southward of Sacramento’s downtown area there existed Southgate and Southgate Plaza Shopping Centers (1960), also outside the city limits, but seeking to serve more regional customers within the city (Cope 1965:46–47).

While regional shopping centers attracted larger retailers, it was the neighborhood and community shopping centers that presented the greatest customer draw away from the downtown/midtown central business district as they featured newer and larger supermarkets. In fact, the lure of new and more inclusive supermarkets reflected a national trend in which 10,000 supermarkets existed nationwide in 1946, and by 1953, the industry witnessed another 7,000 constructed. These new stores of the early 1950s often incorporated a functional Modernist aesthetic and featured a more eye-catching front with a large horizontal window extending across an entire facade of the

![Figure 12. Sutterville Shopping Center Advertisement](image)

*Architect: Karel Kooper and Curtis C. Maybeck, 1955
Source: The Sacramento Bee, 1955d*
building to put on display the activities and products held inside as their draw. Competition became so aggressive in the late-1950s and early-1960s that supermarkets and stores implemented more visually captivating exterior architectural details to differentiate their largely standardized (interior) stores from competitors (Liebs 1995:130–131).

In 1956, the first major store, Sears, moved from downtown Sacramento to the suburbs. This event is considered the beginning of the shift from growth in downtown as the primary shopping destination to the outer-lying suburban areas. Between 1958 and 1965, the number of shopping goods stores (general merchandise, apparel, accessories, furniture, and appliances) dropped from 342 stores to 290 (Cope 1965:45–47).

The commercial growth in the expanding suburbs of Sacramento focused on independent stores lining major thoroughfares connecting to (or passing through) residential neighborhoods, and often smaller collections of stores were commonly anchored by large supermarkets. Examples of this are the Fruittidge Manor Shopping Center, constructed in 1948, that held one of the many Inks Brothers Supermarkets; Tallac Village, constructed in 1951, featuring a Raley’s supermarket; Sutterville Shopping Center, constructed in 1955, with a Cardinal-Inks Market (see Figure 12); and South Land Park Hills Shopping Center, constructed in two phases between 1960 and 1968 with initially a Safeway and later a Jumbo Market.

Development patterns for shopping centers and stores varied depending upon the availability of suitable and inexpensive properties as well as ease of access and parking. Freeport Boulevard extended the development of shopping services generally along its entire corridor like that of Franklin Boulevard and Stockton Boulevard to the east. Freeport Boulevard and other main streets benefited from smaller neighborhood shopping centers having limited capacity for growth at a time when neighborhoods were expanding exponentially in the 1950s. Somewhat unique is Riverside Boulevard, which city officials sought to limit commercial store development to increments of one mile spacing as part of a new planning strategy. This innovative thinking reflected the desires of new homeowners wishing to avoid overexpansion of commercial development in their newly adopted suburbs (Morgan 1960:2, 52).

While so many of the stores were being constructed or moving to the suburbs, the SRA sought to bring new commercial interest to the West End of downtown starting in 1956, and succeeded in enticing Macy’s to construct a new store by 1963. The City thought that a large retailer like Macy’s committing to the downtown area would encourage additional commercial development to replace those variety stores that served the lower income groups that had historically been in the area; however, retail sales did not increase (nor did demand for additional retail space) as expected, and additional considerations for creating interest in downtown centered on creation of a “commercial superblock,” pedestrian mall, public transportation, and consolidated parking areas (Cope 1965:53–56). Much of this vision was eventually realized with the formation of a pedestrian mall along K Street and the design and construction of the Downtown Plaza Mall by Victor Gruen Associates between 1967 and 1971 (Page & Turnbull 2013:105–106).

**Banking**

The banking industry settled early in Sacramento about the time of the Gold Rush. Darius Ogden Mills, later to become the first president of The Bank of California, founded the D. O. Mills Bank in Sacramento in 1859 (Hart 1978:274).
Between 1955 and 1963 the numbers of lending institutions in the Sacramento metropolitan area expanded notably. Supported by post-World War II financing and development, commercial banks grew by 167 percent and savings and loans grew by 60 percent. By the early-1960s, principal banking institutions in the Sacramento metropolitan area included eight distinct commercial bank brands and their various branches, and eight savings and loan associations and their associated branches (Tsargris et al. 1963:XXI-XXII).

Growth and expansion for banking occurred in the downtown area as well as within the growing suburban areas (see Figure 13). The Capitol Mall Project was a 15-block portion of Redevelopment Area Phase 1 that was commenced in February 1954 and within this project, the Capitol Mall development included (alongside the Federal Building and the former IBM Building) two main branches of successful banks of the time: Wells Fargo and Crocker National Bank (Page & Turnbull 2013:105–106). Bank branches constructed during the 1950s-1970s could be found within just about all the suburban neighborhoods with a notable number along Broadway, Freeport, and Folsom boulevards, and Arden Way among others.

**Restaurants**

The cosmopolitan makeup of settlers and people taking advantage of the Gold Rush meant that Sacramento shared in an early diversification of restaurants in the mid-1800s and continued that tradition over the next 100 years. Eating out remained somewhat of a special occasion for most households up to the 1950s when the restaurant experience began to change resulting from the increased car-culture and household wealth. Like shopping stores and other commercial enterprises of the era, restaurateurs held a desire to present a more current façade and use eye-catching architecture as a form of advertisement (Liebs 1995: 210-211).

Along with other commercial enterprises, during the post-World War II era, the potential for reasonable success from restaurant establishments along heavily traveled thoroughfares within the city prompted many new developments. While not as well-known as drive-ins of larger cities in Northern and Southern California, Sacramento featured several new eating establishments along some of its main boulevards.

Broadway Boulevard participated in construction projects of the time including in 1961, when Al Nahas opened a restaurant on the site of what had been one of many car lots along the boulevard. Nahas opened...
Al & Bud’s Platter in a building designed by architect Sooky Lee and constructed by John Otto (and currently houses the Pancake Circus) (see Figures 14 and 15). Freeport Boulevard also featured some of the earliest Mid-Century Modern construction projects such as the Zombie Hut (no longer extant)

**Figure 14. Al & Bud’s Platter**

![Al & Bud’s Platter](image)

2101 Broadway
Architect: Sooky Lee, 1961
Source: Center for Sacramento History, Sacramento Bee Collection, ’Sheely Nahas Restaurant’ Harry Wood Photographer, 2-10-1961

**Figure 15. Pancake Circus (formerly Al & Bud’s Platter)**

![Pancake Circus](image)

2101 Broadway
Architect: Sooky Lee, 1961
Source: GEI Consultants, Inc., 2016
(see Figure 16), which opened in 1945 and witnessed several remodels by various Sacramento architects including Starks, Jozens & Nacht, Wallace J. Alexander, and Sooky Lee (SacMod 2013:36-37). Busy Franklin Boulevard also included eating establishments that showed more specialization of products such as ice-cream with Gunther’s Ice Cream building at their current location in 1949.

**Figure 16. Zombie Hut Newspaper Advertisement**

Source: *The Sacramento Bee*, 1968c

**Motel/Hotels**

In general, the motel industry saw an incredible amount of growth following World War II. In 1948, more than 25,000 motels were spread across the U.S. By 1954, that number increased to more than 29,000 nationwide (Jakle et al. 1996:20). Several factors contributed to the rise of motels in America. During the 1950s, with the ongoing popularity of the automobile, more Americans were moving to the suburbs and purchasing cars. Leisure travel was more commonplace and much of this travel was done by automobile aided by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956. Motels were also seen as a wise real estate investment as new motels appreciated quickly. Financially, the 1954 tax code allowed equity to be sheltered through accelerated depreciation early in the ownership of the motel. But, after about 10 years, amortization payments became greater than depreciation allowances, the owners would sell and take their long-term capital gain. This encouraged new construction and the remodeling of older motels under new ownership (Jakle et al. 1996:45, 47). In 1958 alone it was estimated that the motel industry generated two billion dollars (*Architectural Record* 1960:25). By 1964, there were an estimated 61,000 motels in the U.S. (Jakle et al. 1996:20). By the 1970s there was a slight decline with only 52,000 motels operating in the nation. The name ‘motel’ derived from motor-hotel (car focused) while the word hotel came from highway hotel (location focused). By the 1950s, the names became almost synonymous nationally since automobiles were used to access all and locations may or may not be in proximity to a highway (Liebs 1995:184–188).

It was in post-World War II Sacramento where the Mid-Century Modern aesthetic gained some popularity for hotel designs. The demand for commercial enterprises was high after the war and numerous returning war veterans entered architectural school and began practices. Hotels in the Sacramento area were located along the busiest thoroughfares to attract travelers visiting the city or passing through from places like the San Francisco Bay Area to Lake Tahoe. Examples of motel/hotel projects include the former Mansion Inn Hotel (Clarion Hotel more recently) on 16th Street (formerly...
Highway 160) in Midtown designed by Albert Dreyfuss and Leonard Blackford (1958) and the former El Mirador Hotel (now Park Place Senior Residence) (see Figure 17) constructed in 1957 on N Street across from the Capitol building, built by Fred Kaiser with structural engineering assistance of Gordon H. Klippel (see Figure 17) (SacMod 2014).

Figure 17. Former El Mirador Hotel Vintage Brochure

Source: SacMod Ephemera Collection, date unknown

2.1.9 Sacramento’s Mid-Century Neighborhoods

Development of Sacramento’s Mid-Century Modern neighborhoods resulted from numerous factors that included, among others: increased need for new residential stock to house a growing, civic, military/defense, and food-processing based workforce; availability of inexpensive land; and access to major roadway corridors. Many of these neighborhoods were platted and built out while the property was still unincorporated, before being annexed into the city. Focus in some of these areas was also on having a more “rural” non-urban “sub-urban” type of setting, including some very large lots. The neighborhoods highlighted in this section is not a full accounting of all neighborhoods, but rather a selection of neighborhoods that represent areas of the city or more unique types of development for the 1940 to 1970 period. Figure 18 shows a map of Sacramento’s neighborhoods.
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Figure 18. Sacramento’s Neighborhoods

Source: City of Sacramento, 2013b
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**Campus Commons**

The area that is today Campus Commons was historically the Horst and Haas hop ranches and featured very flat land. The 681 acres was annexed by Sacramento in 1965 and became Sacramento’s second planned unit development, also known as cluster planning (see Figure 19) (Hurst 1965a:D1; City Planning Commission 1968; Caltrans 2011:49). Towards the end of the 1950s, cluster planning was a new method for subdivision and tract design and it gained popularity in the 1960s. The principle was that cities set aside a portion of a tract as parkland or undeveloped green space and group the housing more densely, in clusters with each unit having less of their own private yard area. The local government would approve these communities and allow the developer to construct the maximum number of units allowed under the zoning regulations based on the size of the tract (Caltrans 2011:49). The planned unit development concept allowed for flexibility in land use and design that was previously restricted by Sacramento’s permitting and zoning processes. The process began with the pre-planning stage when the developer incorporated the existing policies and regulations into the design that brought about a balanced neighborhood design (City Planning Commission 1968).

**Figure 19. Campus Commons Rendering**

Source: The Sacramento Bee, 1965
Horst Ranch Venture unveiled its plan for Campus Commons in September 1965 and targeted it at adults, young families, and California State University, Sacramento students (Hurst 1965a:D1). A key element of Campus Commons’ design was the contoured streets and its landscape design that included large open common spaces and screening from the parking areas. Sculpturing the land was the work of Callister & Payne, an architectural firm from Marin County, and engineered by a local firm, Spink Engineering Company. The streets in Campus Commons were designed to be approximately 4 feet below the existing ground level. The removed dirt was then used to create berms that lined the street putting the residences several feet below street level. Garages and driveways were designed to be to the rear of the residences and hidden by the terrain and landscaping (Hurst 1965b:D14). Landscape design was by Kenneth R. Anderson and provided a semi-rural look and feel in Campus Commons (Freshwater 1966:E5). Initial plantings included more than 10,000 annuals, shrubs, and trees (The Sacramento Bee 1966b:E12).

The City Planning Commission tentatively approved the first subdivision that was for 28 acres for 108 townhouses, the first such residences to be built in Sacramento, and seven acres for a swimming and tennis club, and the remaining for office buildings (The Sacramento Bee 1965a:C2). The townhouses were designed to be either single or two-story and the plans had two, three, or four bedrooms with a formal dining room and den, and either two or 2 ½ baths. The units had a variety of color schemes and all were equipped with air conditioners and underground utilities (The Sacramento Bee 1966a). Prices ranged from $28,500 to $35,000 (Freshwater 1966:E5). Architecturally, the townhouses reflected the Contemporary style (see Figure 20).

Another key component of the development was the construction of a pedestrian bridge that crossed the American River and led to California State University, Sacramento. The bridge opened in 1967 and was dedicated as the Guy West Bridge. Ted D’Amico of the Spink Company designed the bridge (Sac State Magazine 2005).
**Gardenland**

The Gardenland neighborhood is located within Reclamation District (RD) 1000 and is directly northeast of the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal and levee. The main thoroughfares are West El Camino Boulevard and Northgate Boulevard. Consisting of a mix of housing types, including Minimal Traditional, Ranch, and some examples of Mid-Century Modern commercial like the hyperbolic paraboloid gas station at Northgate Boulevard and Harding Avenue (see Figure 21), the neighborhood was developed initially in the 1920s and then later in the 1950s. As the earliest developed community within RD 1000, it has subsequently been overshadowed by more extensive newer development in South Natomas and North Sacramento.

**Figure 21. Former Orbit Stations, Inc.**

The town of North Sacramento and the County of Sacramento approved the subdivision of Gardenland in 1926 some 13 years after the formation of surrounding RD 1000. The original subdivision map boundaries included Wilson Avenue to the north, Columbus Avenue and the RD 1000 levee to the south, Lower Marysville Road (later renamed Northgate Boulevard) to the west, and the RD 1000 Levee to the east. From this 1920s-initial development of Gardenland began a transformation from supporting rural nearby agriculture to more urban uses. Construction of residences and limited commercial properties took place largely between 1920 and 1950 though at one point the Depression of the 1930s slowed development in the area to a standstill. Interest in development was also subdued given that public improvements such as sidewalks, lighting, and other amenities were not provided because of lack of funding. Subsequently unemployed migrants began settling in the area and homeless camps sprang up nearby leaving the community without the means to deal with these challenges (Breton 1993:A1; City of Sacramento 2003:4).

In the 1950s, Northgate Boulevard, which bisects the adjacent Northgate and Gardenland neighborhoods, became the transportation route for personnel and supplies to nearby McClellan AFB giving Gardenland a steady stream of local traffic. Supplies were often shipped by boat up the Sacramento River to dock off the Garden Highway specified for Air Force use and then transported via truck to McClellan AFB. To accommodate the traffic, local officials widened Northgate Boulevard which resulted in the current configuration of the commercial corridor. By the 1960s, Sacramento...
annexed the Gardenland neighborhood (Breton 1993:A1; City of Sacramento 2003:4; Historic Environment Consultants 1993:9).

**Golf Course Terrace**

In 1953, the City Council approved plans to name a new subdivision Bing Maloney Golf Course Terrace, which became the Golf Course Terrace neighborhood that contained several different subdivisions built during the mid-20th century (*The Sacramento Bee* 1953d:21). The neighborhood is bordered by Fruitridge Road to the north, 24th Street to the east, Florin Road to the south, and Executive Airport and Freeport Boulevard to the west (see Figure 22) (*The Sacramento Bee* 1954a:6).

Michael & Neher Development was one of the first developers in the Golf Course Terrace, developing Golf Course Terrace No. 1 subdivision. Michael & Neher advertised that the houses would be custom built with three bedrooms, two baths, 29-foot beam ceilings in the living room, birch or mahogany cabinets in large kitchens, and two-car garages and some plans would have two fireplaces (*The Sacramento Bee* 1954a:6; *The Sacramento Bee* 1954b:34). It was one of 120 new subdivisions filed with the Sacramento County Recorder in 1954 (*The Sacramento Bee* 1954e:5).

In 1954, Moss & Moss Realty Company announced the development of Golf Course Village a subdivision within Golf Course Terrace area (see Figure 23). Golf Course Village contained 640 units that were contemporary Ranch style homes built
with three or four bedrooms and two baths. Stylistic features included fireplaces, exposed beam ceilings, breakfast bars, and aluminum windows all constructed by Boswell-Alliance Construction Company (*The Sacramento Bee* 1954g:F16; *The Sacramento Bee* 1954d:24).

In 1955, the Associated Home Builders of Sacramento planned its second Parade of Homes to be in Golf Course Terrace. Twenty-five builders were invited to build model homes that were showcased (Associated Home Builders of Sacramento 1955:1). Under the leadership of E. L. Schutt, paving and sewer lines were completed in May 1955 and the show was open between September 17 and October 2 and was expected to attract more than 300,000 people. The first six builders broke ground in early June (*The Sacramento Bee* 1955a:F22, *The Sacramento Bee* 1955b:F16). The entrance to the Parade of Homes was marked by a large archway at the corner of Hogan Drive and 56th Avenue. The homes were designed in the Ranch style, but were customized and included sub-types of Storybook, Colonial, and Caribbean (GCTENA 2016).

**Glen Elder**

The Glen Elder neighborhood is in the southeastern section of Sacramento and was developed in 1954 by Alcan Pacific Corporation. It was annexed by Sacramento in 1956. The residences were built on ¼ acre lots and the average cost of a property was $8,500 (White 1968:28–29). It was to be an interracial neighborhood, advertised to be the first and only to be developed in Sacramento during this period, but it became a predominately African American neighborhood as residents of the West End were displaced by redevelopment and restrictive covenants in other neighborhoods made it nearly impossible to buy a house elsewhere (White 1968:29). The neighborhood has nearly 460 residences and by 1968 there were close to 2,000 residents living in Glen Elder. During this period, there were also no commercial centers, churches, entertainment venues, or libraries, but there were two elementary schools (White 1968:27). Architecturally, the residences were originally clad in stucco, but by the late-1960s many had alterations that included replacement wood siding, asbestos shingles or brick. The residences, typically built in a Minimal Traditional style, had garages and carports, but in subsequent years many garages and carports were converted into living space (White 1968:28).
Greenhaven

An area approximately five miles south of downtown Sacramento, is known as the “Pocket” because the Sacramento River forms a pocket shape as it bends on the north, west, and south. In 1959, Sacramento annexed the Pocket area (Gregory 2001:7).

The first planning for the Pocket/Greenhaven area was completed by Lincoln and Parker Development Company (today known as Parker Development Company), a San Francisco East Bay development company owned by Harold Parker and Kermit Lincoln (Gregory 2001:8). In 1958, the firm purchased 700 acres in the Pocket that was part of the Zacharias and King ranches. Parker and Lincoln named their plan Greenhaven 70 as a look towards the upcoming decade. Greenhaven is Sacramento’s first example of cluster planning. Parker and Lincoln’s original plan included greenbelts with schools located on them, pedestrian overpasses and underpasses, no television antennas, a shopping center, two churches, a social-cultural center with a library and a theater, gas stations, a firehouse, and underground utilities. They envisioned a planned community, but affordable, with prices ranging from $17,000 to $25,000 (see Figure 25) (The Sacramento Bee 1995:N3A; Gregory 2001:8; Armstrong 2012). The firm promoted the proposed community in the local newspapers with advertisements that read: “Take a Look at the Future!” The first development, Greenhaven 1, was located on newly laid out streets east of Riverside Boulevard, on the north side of Seymour Park (see Figure 26) and was surrounded by farmland (The Sacramento Bee 1995:N3A). Construction of Greenhaven 1 began in 1961 and consisted primarily of Ranch style single-family residences built by a handful of builders. The streets

Figure 25. Greenhaven Residence

85 Sarlit Circle
Builder/Architect: Streng Bros./Carter Sparks, 1963
Source: City of Sacramento, 2017

Figure 26. Seymour Park

845 Florin Road
Source: City of Sacramento, 2017
were mostly a series of loop-shaped streets separated by the greenbelt. Greenhaven won a National Association of Home Builders award in 1963 for its planning (Gregory 1998:36; Caltrans 2011:50).

**Hollywood Park**

The Hollywood Park neighborhood is roughly bounded by Sutterville Road to the north, Freeport Boulevard to the west, 24th Street to the east, and Fruitridge Road to the south. The neighborhood is predominantly middle class and while the housing is characterized primarily by the Minimal Traditional residence style; the neighborhood is also home to some of the most representative examples of Mid-Century Modern commercial architecture within its western edge along the Freeport Boulevard corridor (see Figure 27). The neighborhood has its roots in the years just prior to World War II. At that time, builders Parsons and Jacobs constructed a collection of houses reflecting smaller, but familiar early-20th century designs (including restrained Streamline Moderne and Tudor) along two streets off Freeport Boulevard south of Sutterville Road. The start of World War II in 1941 essentially halted construction on the new homes, but by 1948 larger-scale construction of houses took place. Sierra Builders, owned by John Fernandez, laid out the neighborhood primarily represented by the newer Minimal Traditional design style that was being used throughout the state for increasingly larger housing developments because the simplistic design allowed for speedier construction. Named “Hollywood Park View,” Fernandez’ development was joined by other planned neighborhoods in the area and was largely completed by the early 1960s (Holt 2016). Fernandez named his construction company after his cabin in the Sierra Nevada mountains and his company was responsible for numerous housing and commercial projects throughout the Sacramento region, including Tahoe Park (Armstrong 2011). Hollywood Park features three schools in the heart of the neighborhood and commercial/light-industrial from the mid-century period along each of its bordering streets. Similarly characterized neighborhoods include Mangan Park directly to the south and Brentwood to the southeast.

**Richardson Village**

When it was originally planned in the fall of 1948, Richardson Village was part of the City of North Sacramento. Joseph Spink, the engineer, proposed 350 houses for the first tract (The Sacramento Bee 1948d:6). Two years later the first 25 houses were permitted to the Netherby Construction Company from Oakland. The houses would be either three or two bedrooms, sell between $5,500 and $5,900 and the houses were of wood frame construction and clad in stucco. The first tract was the largest in the City of North Sacramento to date (The Sacramento Bee 1950c:21). Randy Wagaman, a local real estate agent with offices on Fulton Avenue, promoted the sales of Richardson Village in its early development. Netherby planned for 900 houses, a shopping center with 12 stores and a parking lot large enough for

---

**Figure 27. Hollywood Hardware Neon Sign**

5303 Freeport Boulevard
Builder: H.H. Hendren
Neon: Eplo Sign Company (Electrical Products Corporation)
Source: SacMod, 2010
200 cars. The shopping center was set to include a market, drug store, liquor store, dry cleaners, and a beauty shop. Netherby also acquired land for a park and a fire station *(The Sacramento Bee* 1952e:12). By the summer of 1952, the Las Palmas Junior High School (today known as Martin Luther King, Jr. Technology Academy) was under construction with a planned opening in the spring of 1953. It was built to accommodate more than 800 students in 18 classrooms. The school also featured an auditorium, music room, multiuse room, three shops, and a library *(The Sacramento Bee* 1952d:C8). Leonard Starks was hired to design the high school in Richardson Village (see Figures 28-29) *(The Sacramento Bee* 1953a:F28). Richardson Village became part of Sacramento in 1964 when the City of North Sacramento was annexed.

**Figure 28. Rendering of las Palmas Senior High School**

Source: SacMod, date unknown

**Figure 29. Martin Luther King, Jr. Technology Academy**

3051 Fairfield Street
Architect: Leonard F. Starks, AIA, 1956
Source: SacMod, 2017d
River Park

River Park is an area northeast of the East Sacramento neighborhood and was annexed into the city in 1946 (see Figure 30). At that time, the annexation was the first to the city since 1911; a span of 35 years. Spilman-Callister Company were the owners of the property as well as responsible for the subdivision that started in the same year as the annexation. Envisioned by Spilman-Callister, the project was designed by experienced civic planners (River Park Neighborhood Association 2017). River Park Development offered 250 lots for sale in 1950. River Park was advertised as having the advantage of being in the city limits, close to California State University, Sacramento, and for having an elementary school (The Sacramento Bee 1950a:13).

South Land Park

The South Land Park area is generally bounded by Sutterville Road, Freeport Boulevard, Florin Avenue, and Interstate 5. The area of South Land Park and its older neighbor Sutterville Heights (now part of South Land Park) were considered two of Sacramento’s residential showpieces in the 1950s. A third area, Freeport Manor demarked by Freeport Boulevard, Park Village Street, and 35th Avenue, is further to the south and was considered somewhat similar in character. The South Land Park neighborhood is known for its rolling hills, mature native oak trees, and curving streets, often with no sidewalks. These hills held truck gardens and small farms that dotted the landscape prior to serious development of the area (Hooper 1955:17).

The area traces its history from the Mead family who moved to the Sutterville area in 1904, and are generally considered pioneer builders of the area. Frank Mead, Sr. built the first homes in Sutterville Heights as early as 1909, but it was not until 1929, just prior to the Great Depression of the 1930s, that the first real building of modern homes began, also by Mead (Hooper 1955:17).

Following the economic downturn, in 1940 builders and real estate developers began larger-scale developments in the South Land Park area. That year Frank Williams began the 15-acre Park Ridge Tract near Del Rio Road. Other developers were also considering starting projects within the neighborhood, but World War II pushed eventual development out five years. By 1946, the war concluded and development continued aggressively. The first builders of this period were L.F. Noonan and Moss & Lucas (later named Moss & Moss) who advertised their new properties in April 1946. The
Noonan development was on the old Heilbron Ranch. Since that early development of the 1940s, hundreds of houses were built and Freeport Boulevard became a busy shopping district (Hooper 1955:17).

Other builders of projects in the area during the 1950s included: Blomberg Builders; Streng Brothers; Eichler Homes; H.J. Harlow Jr.; Jacobson Construction Company; Lawrence Construction Company; Nevis Brothers; Ruben Weber; John Fernandez Sierra Builders; and E. A. Corum and George Reed who developed Freeport Manor to the south. Walter E. Trainer, Jr. handled many of the sales within Freeport Manor for Reed (Hooper 1955:17). South Land Park Hills was one of 120 new subdivision filed with the Sacramento County Recorder in 1954 (see Figure 31) (The Sacramento Bee 1954e:5).

Figure 31. Mead Residence

Original designed in 1960 by Koblik & Fisher (constructed by Erickson Construction Company). This initial phase of the center began with the current post office wing (initially a Safeway Market adjoined by numerous other shops), and was followed by the Jumbo Market which took over the Safeway lease while a new building to house the grocer, designed by Sooky Lee, was constructed in the shopping center by 1968 (The Sacramento Union 1960:22b; The Sacramento Bee 1967a:E3; The Sacramento Bee 1968b:C3).

In 1955, the resident population of the South Land Park area reached 9,000 persons. It was expected to reach 16,000 by 1960. To accommodate this population, schools were planned and nearby recreational facilities led to high desirability of the area. Land Park, two golf courses, Sacramento City College, and the river offered recreational possibilities. Residents took further measures and formed Park Terrace Swimming and Tennis Club, designed by Rickey & Brooks, and signed up 300 families living in the area following its opening in August 1954.
The South Land Park area was desirable also as it was approximately 28 feet higher than the area at 10th and K Streets, so flooding was a lesser concern. Growth was kept orderly in no small part by the attentiveness of the Sutterville Civic Improvement Association formed in 1954 (Hooper 1955: 17).

Today’s South Land Park neighborhood is comprised of several different subdivisions containing an abundance of architect-designed residences. The area was largely developed by Moss & Moss who established such tracts as South Land Park Terrace’s Unit No. 4, which consisted of 40 lots. The subdivision had large lots, rolling hills, trees, and good drainage (The Sacramento Bee 1951:12). By 1952, 100 of the lots in South Land Park Terrace were sold (The Sacramento Bee 1952:20).

**Swanston Estates**

Swanston Estates is in the northeastern part of Sacramento and is bordered by Interstate 80 to its north and west, Ethan Way to the east, and Arden Way to the south. Swanston Estates was one of 120 new subdivisions filed with the Sacramento County Recorder in 1954 (The Sacramento Bee 1954e:5). The land was originally owned by the Swanston family who sold it to Heraty & Gannon in 1954 at a cost of $3,632 an acre, making it one of Sacramento’s largest real estate transactions of the 1950s. The 234 acres were designed for 1,000 lots for residences (see Figure 32), a hotel or motel, and a shopping center (The Sacramento Bee 1954f:1). Architecturally, the houses reflected the Ranch Modern style with the option of four models: The Surrey and the Castlewood having three bedrooms; the Dartmoor with three bedrooms and a nursery; and the Yorkshire with four bedrooms. The houses were advertised as featuring split shingle roofs, parquet hardwood floors, mahogany wood cabinets, hardwood paneling, ceiling to floor glass walls, and planned patios. The residences were priced between $9,950 to $14,500 (The Sacramento Bee 1954c:37).

When constructed, the neighborhood was outside Sacramento city limits. Residents, however, wanted to be part of the city and in 1963 they formed the Swanston-Ben Ali Haggin Annexation Committee. This committee included residents from the Swanston Estates neighborhood, and two neighborhoods to the north, Ben Ali and Hagginwood (The Sacramento Bee 1963b:B2). The committee was successful and voters approved the annexation making it the largest area in size to be annexed by the City (The Sacramento Bee 1963:1b).
**Tallac Village**

Tallac Village is situated between 21st Avenue to the north, Fruitridge Road to the south, 65th Street Expressway on the east, and Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard to the west. The neighborhood was designed for approximately 1,000 lots (*The Sacramento Bee* 1949:15). In 1948, the city building inspector issued Manuel Jacinto, a local contractor, permits for the construction of 30 residences in Tallac Village. The cost for the homes ranged between $4,275 and $5,000 (*The Sacramento Bee* 1948b:27). The houses in Units No. 1 and 2 were of wood frame construction and totaled approximately 335 houses. But, in 1949, with the construction of Unit No. 3, which contained 123 lots, Jacinto began constructing the houses using basalite blocks (see Figure 33). These homes featured steel sash windows and steel and aluminum door frames. By 1950, Jacinto was constructing all the residences in Tallac Village, including Units No. 4 and No. 5 in basalite blocks (*The Sacramento Bee* 1949:15; *The Sacramento Bee* 1950b:7; *The Sacramento Bee* 1950d:12).

![Figure 33. Patton Residence](5101 Valletta Way 5101 Valletta Way  Builder: Jacinto Homes, 1950/1951 Source: SacMod, 2017)
Chapter 3. Architectural Context

3.1 Origins of Modernism

Modernism emerged in the early- to mid-20th century as an architectural and aesthetic philosophy that focused on functionality, abstraction, and rejection of ornamentation. Architects experimented with new design ideas, new materials, and new applications for existing materials in ways that intentionally diverged from past styles and forms. These efforts ultimately led to the development of a new architectural language that reflected the innovation and promise of a modern age.

Major contributing factors to the development of modernism included developments around the world related to war, social and political unrest, economic instability, industrial developments and the exchange of new architectural ideas between European and American architects through journals and various expositions. The onset of World War I galvanized industrial expansion throughout Europe and the U.S., which led to innovations in mass production methods that made possible the manufacture of materials like large sheets of glass, steel, and concrete. In the war’s aftermath, Europe remained unstable. Political divisions infused with emerging nationalist and socialist ideologies took hold with various dictators vying for power across the European continent. Moreover, general distrust for established political institutions and cultural norms created a climate of social unrest. Rebuilding war-torn European cities with limited financial resources exacerbated the need for cost-effective building methods in urban centers where urban planning concerns produced a highlighted focus on cleanliness and improving living conditions. To meet this need architects began experimenting to find cost-effective designs that used mass-produced goods. The result was cutting edge building designs that incorporated industrialized materials in new and innovative ways (Davies 1998:943–958).

One of the engines of new architectural design after World War I was the Bauhaus School of Art and Architecture (Bauhaus) in Weimar, Germany. German architect Walter Gropius founded the Bauhaus in 1919 to “end the isolation of the arts one from another” and to cooperatively train artisans with the goal of creating a “visionary and utopian craft guild that would combine beauty and usefulness” (Khan 2001:21). The Bauhaus was instrumental in cultivating the talents of early modernist architects in Europe. Other notable contemporaries of the Bauhaus included Swiss-French architect Le Corbusier, whose designs relied on pure geometric shapes and a rational order of space to transform the home into an efficient and rational machine for living. Le Corbusier’s designs conveyed a fundamentally new aesthetic using reinforced concrete, flat-roof buildings, open plans, horizontal bands of windows, and a building composition without a defined facade. German architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (Mies) was also innovative in his emphasis on open space and honest use of new materials and techniques such as vertical panels of glass, suspended floors, and exposed steel structural elements (Khan 2001:27–28; NTHP 2017).

European modernists collectively created buildings that were minimalist, functional, and lacked ornamentation. These types of buildings were built with mass-produced construction materials and were in theory cost-effective. The visual rationality, honesty, and transparency conveyed by their designs and use of materials represented an important artistic response to the political and economic instability of the time. Lacking visual reference to historic periods, regions, or countries, the designs of European
modernists reflected a truly modern and international style of architecture for the modern era (Lamprecht and Paul 2008:E4; NTHP 2017).

3.2 Emergence of Modernism in California and the United States, 1900-1940

Architects Louis Sullivan and Frank Lloyd Wright began experimenting with new ideas about design and space in the closing years of the 19th century and early decades of the 20th century. Their works contrasted with the fanciful architecture of the preceding Victorian Era by emphasizing function over ornamentation, the interplay between architecture and the environment, and the honest expression of structural design – which coincided with the modernist movement simultaneously emerging in Europe (Brown 2010:70–71).

In the first decades of the 20th century Southern California’s dramatic natural landscapes and expanding cityscapes served as creative inspiration for architects wishing to experiment with new designs that could make life more efficient and enjoyable in a nearly perfect climate. San Diego Architect Irving Gill experimented with concrete and designed buildings with pure forms and lack of ornamentation. He is credited with pushing the technical and artistic boundaries of architecture during the early 20th century and creating a new architectural vocabulary that paved the way for modernism and the International style in the U.S. By the 1920s, Frank Lloyd Wright began building his concrete block houses in Los Angeles that reflected a combination of the natural motifs and modern technology, hallmarks of Frank Lloyd Wright designs (Irving J. Gill Foundation 2016; Hess 2016).

Austrian architects Richard Neutra and Rudolph Schindler immigrated to the U.S. in the early 20th century and worked briefly for Frank Lloyd Wright before relocating to Southern California. Both men played an important role in the development of Modernism in the U.S., and especially California. Schindler’s first design in California was the 1922 Schindler-Chace House in West Hollywood that featured concrete floors and prefabricated concrete slab walls placed in a repetitive and interlocking pattern reminiscent of a factory production line. Neutra’s 1927 Lovell House in Los Angeles featured a steel structure with exterior bands of glass and concrete that expressed the volume within. Both buildings were innovative in their use of materials, rejection of historic precedent, and lack of ornamentation. Schindler and Neutra were very influential on the development of modernism in Southern California and represent the ongoing dialogue that occurred between European and American modernist architects in the first decades of the 20th century (Khan 2001:104–107, 231–232).

In 1922, an entry in a design contest for the Chicago Tribune Building included a unique design by Finnish architect Eliel Saarinen. His Art Deco design was not chosen, but was widely publicized and many of its design principles adopted by architects across the nation. Art Deco buildings had sharp edges and stylized decorative geometric motifs applied to the façade. The 1925 Internationale des Arts Decoratifs et Industriels Moderne exposition in Paris featured design pavilions by French, Dutch, Danish, Austrian, and others that furthered the popularity of the Art Deco style; thousands of Americans attended the exposition. The Art Deco style intentionally broke from past architectural traditions, but did not reflect the minimalist functionality of the Bauhaus movement (Gapp 1978:18–20; PHMC 2017).

In 1932, architect Philip Johnson and architectural historian Henry Russell-Hitchcock co-authored a publication and curated an exhibit entitled The International Style: Architecture Since 1922 at New York’s Museum of Modern Art. The 1932 exhibit is credited with formally introducing the International style developed by European modernists to the American public. The exhibit included works by
Plans for the exhibition initially included Frank Lloyd Wright, but he withdrew from the event just one month prior to its opening. Wright’s vision of Modernism and that of the European modernists were similar in their freedom from historical precedent, use of new materials, and innovative ideas about space that emphasized free-flowing planes rather than enclosed boxes; however, Wright preferred craftsmanship using natural materials and traditional methods; his designs conveyed a connection between architecture and nature whereas European modernism fully embraced the machine age with standardized designs that were universally applicable, devoid of links to nature, and abstract (Levine 1986:4–5; Brown 2010:71). For this reason, Wright differed philosophically with the European modernists and did not participate in the exhibition. Nevertheless, the 1932 exhibition was pivotal to the introduction of European modernism to the U.S., which laid the groundwork for other architectural innovations that occurred in subsequent decades.

By the mid-1930s a combination of Art Deco and International styles of architecture emerged a new style. The Streamline Moderne style, also known as Art Moderne, expressed through architecture the industrial and aerodynamic forms of the Machine Age. Streamline Moderne buildings featured sleek, horizontal lines, rounded corners, and curved design elements found on automobiles, airplanes, and ocean liners of the period. By the early 1940s a more boxy and angular version of the style had developed known as Late Moderne. This style had similar massing, but no curved elements. It also had bands of windows with protruding surrounds and minimal canopies over entryways (CAJA 2009:12–14; Brown 2010:157).

The ascendency of the Nazi party to power in Germany in January 1933 had a significant impact on the development of Modernism worldwide. The Nazis closed the Bauhaus shortly after taking power forcing visionary European modernist architects like Gropius and Mies to flee Germany. These architects eventually immigrated to the U.S. In 1937, Gropius carried on the Bauhaus ideals during his tenure as a professor and Director of Harvard’s Graduate School of Design. Gropius also established The Architects Collaborative, which was instrumental in the design and construction of numerous modernist buildings around the world (Khan 2001:98, 229). Czech-born professor and architectural historian Sigfried Giedion taught at Harvard during Gropius’ tenure and in 1938-1939 delivered a series of lectures that culminated in his influential book on modern architecture entitled Space, Time, and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition. Giedion went on to teach at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Dictionary of Art Historians 2017). Mies began teaching at the Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT) and his first major American project was the campus plan and buildings for IIT in 1939. Mies promoted a “less is more” approach and was very influential in the design of American skyscrapers that featured concrete or steel structural skeletons with glass curtain walls (Brown 2010:76; Allaback 2003:5–6; Khan 2001:230).

During the late-1930s, a regional California iteration of Modernism developed in the San Francisco Bay Area that came to be known as Bay Region Modernism or Second Bay Tradition. The First Bay Tradition had spanned the 1880s and 1920s and was a reaction against the formality and ornamentation associated with Classical, Beaux-Arts, and Victorian architecture; The First Bay Tradition valued craftsmanship, local materials, including redwood and other wood type shingles, and a sensitivity to surroundings and was associated with the Arts and Crafts style.

The Second Bay Tradition combined the rustic nature of First Bay Tradition architecture with the machine aesthetic of European Modernism to form a new aesthetic with low-pitched rooflines, deep overhanging eaves, exterior wood cladding, and large expansive glass windows. William Wurster was
instrumental in bringing about the Second Bay Tradition. A native of Stockton, Wurster earned a degree in architecture from University of California Berkeley (UCB) in 1919 and briefly worked for firms in Sacramento before establishing his own firm in 1924. Wurster eventually formed the firm WBE in 1945; the company designed a variety of residential, educational, and institutional buildings throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. He became Dean of Architecture at UCB in 1950 and founded the school’s College of Environmental Design (CED) in 1959, a radical concept at the time that combined the departments of architecture, landscape architecture, city and regional planning, and design (UCB Environmental Design Archives 2017). Some of Wurster’s notable works included the Grover House and Harley-Stevens House in San Francisco, both of which have simplistic designs with clean lines, wide overhanging eaves, and lack of ornamentation. Behind Wurster’s designs was an indoor-outdoor approach that required interaction with the landscape to reach the interior. Gardner Daily was another prominent Second Bay Tradition architect. His notable modernist designs often combined the volume of the International style with the curvilinear features of the Streamline Moderne style. Like Wurster, his designs fused the indoors and outdoors; he used sliding glass doors and screen doors to achieve this in addition to tall, vertically oriented windows. Second Bay Modernism continued into the mid-1960s.

Students of the UCB School of Architecture and later CED had an indelible impact on the modernist movement within Sacramento; notable Sacramento modernist architects that attended the school include the likes of Herbert Goodpastor, Leonard Blackford, Raymond Franceschi, Carter Sparks, and Sooky Lee (Brown 2010:79, 104–107). The blurred line between exterior and interior space espoused in Modernist architecture resulted in fruitful collaborations between architects and innovative landscape architects like California native Thomas Church, who studied garden design at UCB, graduated from Harvard’s Graduate School of Design, and wrote two important books on modern residential garden design entitled Gardens Are for People and Your Private World. Two of his contemporaries, Lawrence Halprin, who worked on the Capitol Towers project in Sacramento, and Garrett Eckbo, author of Landscape for Living, are also notable landscape architects that collaborated with Second Bay Tradition architects (Cultural Landscape Foundation 2017a).

The involvement of the U.S. in World War II in 1941 caused a significant shift in terms of people and the allocation of construction materials that interrupted the development of Modernism. Many feared that a Japanese attack on the U.S. mainland was eminent and California’s location on the West Coast made it a prime target. Defense-related industries flourished and most supplies went toward the war effort. California ultimately produced 17 percent of all war supplies made in the U. S. for the war effort and received nearly 12 percent of all U.S. government contracts during the war (Caltrans 2011:29). To meet the need for defense-related buildings and homes the Stran-Steel Company developed a prefabricated metal building known as a Quonset hut for the Navy during World War II. Quonset huts were constructed primarily for utilitarian purposes and to address housing and material shortages for defense-related needs (Historitecture, LLC 2003:9–10). Wartime material rations and a temporary moratorium on domestic housing construction significantly limited further development of Modernism during World War II (PAST Consultants 2009:22; USDHUD 2017; Brown 2010:91).

3.3 Modernism in the Post-World War II Era, 1945-1970

Although World War II interrupted the ongoing development of Modernism that had occurred during the 1920s and 1930s, it ultimately fostered a lot of pent-up creativity that resulted in a post-war explosion of architectural experimentation and new interpretations of modernistic design. In anticipation of the post-war housing boom an experimental program, known as the Case Study House Program, was established in 1945 in Southern California. John Entenza, editor and publisher of Los Angeles Journal Arts &
Architecture conceived of the program to develop and promote the construction of Modern residences that were affordable and offered a modern solution for the oncoming housing demand. The program included works by well-known modernist architects like Richard Neutra, Pierre Koenig and Charles Eames. Thirty-five homes were designed under the program, but only 25 were ultimately constructed between 1945 and 1965. The majority were built in Southern California in metropolitan Los Angeles and San Diego. Thousands of people toured the prototype residences and the program received widespread publicity that helped spread the popularity of modernist architecture throughout California and the country (Brown 2010:78–79, 91; USDHUD 2017; Moruzzi 2013:E1–E9, G34).

Modernist architecture underwent several important transformations in the years immediately following World War II as the nation experienced unprecedented suburban growth due to government programs and various economic and cultural trends. Large numbers of servicemen and women returned to civilian life after the war and the influx of people back into the economy combined with a post-war baby boom created a high demand for housing throughout the nation. This affected modern architecture nationally, regionally, and in Sacramento.

Architects and developers capitalized on the demand for larger homes and began constructing architect-designed tract housing and custom-built Ranch Modern and Contemporary style homes, both of which featured open floorplans, more square footage, and sprawling parcels in newly developed suburban neighborhoods. These homes reflected architectural details of Mid-Century Modernism, including flat or shallow-pitched gable roofs, wide overhanging eaves, and a variety of materials incorporated into the design. Many featured post-and-beam construction; structural systems with large timber posts and beams that were typically widely spaced and filled in with glass or non-structural wall panels. This type of construction required a high level of precision since the structural components were typically left exposed. Bay Area developer Joseph Eichler was a well-known and important builder of Mid-Century Modern homes in California. Eichler established the Sunnyvale Building Company in 1947 and built some early tract housing developments that utilized stud construction. Later, he formed the company Eichler Homes and hired architectural firms to design the homes that reflected the Mid-Century Modern style with shallow-pitched or flat roofs and post-and-beam construction (Caltrans 2011:80–83).

### 3.4 General Characteristics of Modernism and Styles

Modernist buildings in the U. S. incorporated a broad range of new building materials and reflected the values of functionality, simplicity, and efficiency in their designs. General features of Modernism that carried through the various stylistic offshoots that developed throughout the 1940, 1950s, and 1960s included the following:

- **Form** – overall geometric massing and simple, clean lines; emphasis on horizontality, though not with unrelieved flat planes; in multi-story structures, interior floors are often demarcated on the exterior with an inset first floor and cantilevered planes to indicate upper floors.
- **Structure** – exposed structural system typically using concrete, steel, or wood materials, and some concrete block or masonry for smaller structures.
- **Roof** – flat or low-pitches, often with deep overhangs/eaves emphasizing horizontality; some with large sweeping or folded forms.
- **Exterior and interior walls** – contrasting materials and textures or smooth, blank walls typically filling entire structural “bays”; exterior walls and openings in offset planes along horizontal lines; use of exterior screens or grills that shelter window and door openings, usually in concrete or metal.
- Windows – custom windows (ribbon, picture, corner); large expanses of glass arranged in horizontal groupings of vertically oriented sashes, with glazing often filling entire structural bays; windows may be located in clerestory, between solid walls and eaves.
- Integrated site planning and landscapes designs – sliding glass doors, integrated indoor and outdoor private living spaces, courtyards with screens, walls, berms, or plantings that provide demarcation between private and public outdoor spaces; plantings generally have a horizontal orientation relative to sun angles and topography.

As architects applied and experimented with new materials and technologies, applying the values of functionality and simplicity, many distinct styles developed into what we know as Modernism. Following is a discussion of each of these distinct styles that comprised Modernism in the U. S. between 1940 and 1970.

### 3.4.1 Late Moderne

Buildings designed in the Late Moderne style evolved out of the Streamline Moderne style that emerged in the 1930s. Streamline Moderne reflected a clean, efficient, and economical approach to building design that signified a break from the ornamented Art Deco designs of the 1920s and embraced the machine-age aesthetic associated with speed and movement. Streamline Moderne-style buildings generally featured flat roofs, overall horizontal emphasis, smooth wall surfaces, curved corners, steel-frame corner windows, glass block, and pipe railings along staircases and balconies. Although residential construction slowed considerably during World War II buildings constructed immediately following the war still reflected elements of the Streamline Moderne and are referred to as Late Moderne. Late Moderne-style buildings have modest, stripped down features of the Streamline Moderne style and reflect the influence of the International style that was developing around the same period. Late Moderne-style buildings were built primarily between 1945 and the mid-1960s (CAJA 2009:13–14; Brown 2010:113). Example includes Executive Airport (see Figure 34).

Typical features of the Late Moderne style include:

- Flat rooflines
- Angular and box-like massing with horizontal emphasis
- Smooth exterior walls (concrete or stucco)
- Canopies over entryways
- Fenestration consisting of punched windows or horizontal bands of steel-frame windows, often wrapping around corners
- Windows with projecting surrounds
- Muted curved details

### 3.4.2 International Style

The International style originated with the Bauhaus established in Germany after World War I. Bauhaus architects valued minimalist, functional, unadorned designs and used space and new construction materials like concrete, steel, and glass in innovative ways. A brand-new aesthetic emerged that rejected historical precedence in terms of architectural style that was not tied to a single country – it was a truly international style. The Bauhaus movement spread across Europe and was first introduced to the American public in 1932 in an exhibit held at New York’s Metropolitan Museum of Art entitled *The International Style: Architecture Since 1922.* Influential Bauhaus architects such as Walter Gropius and Mies fled to the U. S. in the late 1930s to escape the political and social turmoil of Nazi Germany. They obtained prestigious positions in architecture schools at Harvard Chicago’s IIT, respectively, furthering the innovative designs established by the Bauhaus school. The International style was highly influential to the modernist movement in the U.S. and provided a basis for reaction as new modernist styles developed during the 1950s and 1960s.

Example of International Style includes the Federal Courthouse building (650 Capitol Mall) and property at 2319 K St (see Figure 35).

Typical features of the International style include:

- Flat rooflines
- Rectangular, block-like massing with square corners
- Often utilizing asymmetrical facades that collectively convey balance
- Horizontal bands of flush windows, or full-bay glazing or glass curtain walls; floor-to-ceiling openings, including doorways
- Minimalist and lacks ornamentation
- Structural system (concrete or steel) that expresses form and function

![Figure 35. International Style](image-url)
3.4.3 Googie/Exaggerated Modern

The Googie/Exaggerated Modern style developed during a time of technological innovation, space travel, and the post-World War II cultural obsession with the automobile. In 1949, a small coffee shop opened on Sunset Boulevard in Los Angeles named “Googie’s.” Designed by modernist architect John Lautner, the building was striking for its dramatic multi-plane roofline that reached out to passersbys, sharp angles, tilted walls of glass and concrete tethered to landscaped planters, and an overall exuberant aesthetic that was optimistic and futuristic. In 1957, the Soviet Union launched Sputnik 1 into orbit and the U.S. launched Explorer 1 in 1958. By the early 1960s space travel was a reality with the out-of-this-world space flights of Alan Shepard and John Glenn in 1961 and 1962, respectively. The American public became fascinated with space travel and science, which was reflected in the futuristic design of consumer goods, automobiles, and buildings. New coffee shops, restaurants, shopping centers, theaters, motels, and gas stations increasingly incorporated colorful and cutting-edge designs with angular features, flying saucer shapes, distinctive rooflines that defied gravity, and flashing neon signs with atomic and starburst motifs to attract clientele and appeal to their current sensibilities. Unlike the International style, Googie reflected an inclusive rather than minimalist approach to design and materials; Googie architects were not limited by the steel, concrete, and glass materials of the International style but incorporated any building material they could find such as asbestos, cement, stone, glass block, ceramic tile, porcelain enamel, plastics, and plywood. Googie was a relatively short-lived phenomenon and fell out of favor by the late-1960s (Hess 2004:68–69; City of San Diego 2007:61; PAST Consultants 2009:83; CAJA 2009:18). Examples of the Googie/Exaggerated Modern Style in Sacramento include the former Mac Farlane’s Candies (4900 Freeport Boulevard) (see Figures 36-37), and the former Jumbo Market (5820 South Land Park Drive).

**Figure 36. Former Mac Farlane’s Candies (Exterior)**

4900 Freeport Boulevard
Architect/Designer: Jock McKay (architect); Walter Landor & Associates (industrial designers), 1964
Source: SacMod, 2017
Typical features of the Googie style include:

- Exaggerated rooflines, including folded, curvilinear, butterfly, swooping, boomerang, or hyperbolic shapes
- Irregular rectangular massing with abstract, angular, and curved portions
- Asymmetrical facades that convey movement
- Flush-mounted expanses of steel- or aluminum-frame glass
- Variety of building materials, including concrete, steel, glass, asbestos, cement, stone, glass block, plastics, plywood ceramic tile, and porcelain enamel
- Colorful accents screen block, shadow blocks, and space-age and scientific motifs like starbursts and atoms
- Prominent commercial signage integrated with building design are freestanding

### 3.4.4 Mid-Century Modern

Mid-Century Modern is a broad term that refers to an expressive iteration of Modernism that emerged in the decades following World War II. The style evoked less sterility than the International Style with solid wall surfaces and a variety of natural and manufactured materials. Mid-Century Modern style was applied to a wide variety of properties, including residences, churches, schools, banks, institutional buildings, recreational buildings, commercial and office buildings, and others. Common elements among Mid-Century Modern buildings included cantilevered roofs, flat or shed roof forms, deep overhanging eaves, canted and large expansive windows, and a variety of incorporated materials,
including wood, stone, brick, stucco, plastic, metal, and concrete. This section highlights a few of the different applications of Mid-Century Modern style that were based primarily on the function of the building.

**Ranch Modern**

The post-World War II economy and demand for larger homes led to the design and construction of more elaborate architect-designed Ranch homes that reflected Modernistic influences. Ranch homes built as part of a tract development were of a much smaller scale than Ranch Modern residences. Ranch Modern homes had deeper setbacks on larger lots, living spaces and kitchens with additional square footage, and larger garages. Ranch Modern residences also lacked the stylistic details that referenced the past, such as shutters, dove cotes, and exterior materials and simulated barn exteriors. These homes often have similar features as Post-and-beam homes discussed below (see Figure 38).

Ranch Modern Features:

- Horizontal massing
- One-story, sprawling L-shaped or U-shaped plan
- Prominent low-pitched hip or gable roof with wide overhanging eaves
- Combination of exterior walls materials, including vertical wood siding, brick, stone
- Fenestration consists of picture windows, elevated sliding windows, and banks of casement windows
- Massive stone or brick chimneys

**Contemporary**

The Contemporary style was used for residential and commercial buildings in the post-war era. Contemporary buildings were characterized by minimal architectural detail and integration of the building into the surrounding landscape. Integration with natural surroundings was typically achieved with pronounced flat or low-pitch rooflines, expanses of windows to integrate interior and exterior spaces, and split-level design with basement-level garages or carports (see Figure 39).
Contemporary features:

- Angular and boxy massing with low profile
- Flat or low-pitched roof with pronounced roofline
- Large expanses of glass, with tops of openings aligned at plate line
- Non-traditional exterior materials
- Stacked bond brick or concrete
- Emphasis on horizontality
- Integration with surrounding landscape
- Often reflect modified Ranch or Split-level with garage or carport on lower level

**Post-and-Beam**

Post-and-beam “style” is based upon a structural system, used in Sacramento for some smaller-scaled commercial structures, but primary for residences during the late 1950s through the early 1960s. Post-and-beam construction consisted of a system of vertical columns/posts and horizontal beams, which created open areas in which solid walls (partial or full-height) or expansive glass walls could be placed (see Figure 40).

The structural system for post-and-beam construction consisted of solid, load-bearing walls, columns, and beams. This type of structural system enabled the use of open space and expansive glass windows, elements which are both reminiscent of the International style. Some post-World War II components for post-and-beam homes were prefabricated and shipped to the site for construction; they could be assembled in several combinations and quickly making them especially popular for residential housing tracts. Mid-Century Modern design embraced indoor-outdoor living so while elements like front façade walls, planters, concrete screens were used to keep out views from the street into the house, indoor atriums, and roof cutouts were often used to bring outdoors into interior spaces.
Post-and-Beam features:

- Horizontal angular massing with low profile
- Low-pitched roof with exposed beams and wide overhanging eaves (can be flat, hipped, gabled, or shed roof)
- Lack of applied ornamentation
- Exposed structural elements, such as porch supports and beams
- Open carport or garage oriented toward the street, integrated into the building
- Combination of exterior walls materials, including vertical wood siding, stucco, brick, stone, concrete block
- Flush mounted, metal frame windows (some feature full height clerestory windows)

**Commercial Modern**

Mid-Century Modern commercial buildings adopted elements of the glass and steel-frame International style buildings promoted by early modernist architects like Mies and were much more “stripped down” versions of Mid-Century Modern residential architecture. They typically feature wide expanses of steel-frame windows anchored by concrete or brick. Their overall aesthetic is typically sparse to highlight the clean lines of the steel and glass structure. Decorative elements most often take the form of stylized lettering with the business name or a large-free standing commercial sign.

Examples of the Commercial Modern Style in Sacramento include the former offices of Dreyfuss & Blackford (2729 I Street)

Commercial Modern features:

- Flat roofs
- Metal awnings
- Vertical exterior details (sometimes as base for signage)
- Exposed structural elements
- Expansive window walls set within flush-mounted steel or aluminum frames
- Commercial signage (attached or free-standing)
- Use of modern exterior materials, including Roman brick, porcelain enamel, ceramic tile, prismatic glass, and glass block

Figure 41. Commercial Modern

Former Dreyfuss & Blackford Office, 2729 I Street
Architect: Dreyfuss & Blackford, 1961
Source: SacMod, 2017
Corporate Modern

Like the Commercial Modern style, the Corporate Modern style reflected influences of International style architecture and was applied to largescale corporate buildings and civic projects. The core design principles of Corporate Modernism were lack of ornamentation and expression of structure that was achieved through exposed structural members, either steel or concrete, and a repetition of glass and structural members. Most Corporate Modern buildings have a rectangular form and lack ornamentation other than exterior corporate advertising. Examples of Corporate Modern architecture in Sacramento include the California State Employees Association (1108 O Street) (see Figure 42) and Knorr Architecture (2200 21st Street).

Corporate Modern features:

- Large building footprint and rectangular massing
- Flat or low-pitched roof
- Exposed steel or concrete structural members
- Curtain walls
- Horizontal bands of windows between structural members
- Overall repetitive pattern created by structural members and fenestration
- Overall absence of applied ornamentation, except for corporate advertising mounted on the building

New Formalism

New Formalism emerged in the mid-1950s as a reaction against Modernism’s lack of historical reference and rejection of decorative ornamentation. Architects had grown increasingly weary of the minimalist glass boxes that characterized much of the corporate environment and commercial streetscapes of cities across the country and began experimenting with designs that combined elements and design concepts of classical architecture and Modernism. Interestingly, renowned architects of the International style, including Philip Johnson, Edward Durrell Stone, and Minoru Yamasaki, are credited with pioneering New Formalist architecture. Stone’s 1954 New Delhi American Embassy blended Eastern architectural influences with Modernism and is considered the first foray into New Formalism.
anywhere. New Formalist architects embraced the commonalities between classical architecture and Modernism; balanced building proportions, emphasis on structural form, organized hierarchy of building elements, formal entryways, symmetry, and geometric massing and building forms. New Formalist buildings featured classical elements like arches, stylized colonnades and entablatures, and materials like travertine, marble, and granite; however, these features were non-traditional in that their design was minimalist and decorative rather than structural. New Formalist buildings often incorporated architectural screens to link the building to its site and were often set on a platform reminiscent of the crepidoma, the multi-level platform on which ancient buildings like the Parthenon stood.

New Formalist designs were most often used for civic centers, school campus buildings, auditoriums, and museums due to their monumental aesthetic and were constructed through the 1970s (CAJA 2009:16–17; PAST Consultants 2009:81–82; Fullerton Heritage 2008). Example of New Formalism architecture in Sacramento include the Senator Savings and Loan/Chase Bank (4701 Freeport Boulevard), the Chase Bank (1950 Arden Way) and the former Metropolitan Life Insurance building (see Figure 43).

Typical features of New Formalism included:

- Rectangular and symmetrical plan
- Building set on concrete pad
- Heavy overhanging roof slab
- Full-height panel of stylized columns that visually connect the roof to the ground
- Cast stone or concrete block screens that connect the building to the site
- Exterior expression of solidarity and monumentality
- Stylized ornamentation

**Brutalism**

Brutalism emerged in the early-1950s as a design philosophy held by a group of British architects that rejected the light-hearted nature of Modernism in favor of an honest expression of a building’s function through form and materials, namely concrete. Swiss architect Le Corbusier is typically credited with
designing the first building to evoke these principles in his 1952 United’ Habitation in Marseille, France. Brutalist architecture stemmed from experiments using rough concrete in its crudest and most brutal form. This style features large concrete masses that are poured on-site and left unpolished to convey honesty and texture through visible wood formwork and aggregate in the concrete. Brutalist buildings also feature expansive glass windows that are typically recessed or hidden in dark voids. These buildings simultaneously reflect repetition and irregularity and were most often used for institutional or public buildings (Brown 2010:132; PAST Consultants 2009:85–86; Hopkins 2014).

Example of Brutalism architecture in Sacramento includes the County Courthouse (720 9th Street) and Cal Expo (1600 Exposition Boulevard).

Typical features of Brutalism included:

- Massing that is fully expressed in concrete formed into large blocks or sculptural forms
- Flat roof
- Angular and rectilinear forms
- Exterior concrete walls with visible rough texture
- Windows located in voids

**Other Styles**

While Modernism was a major influence on building design between 1940 and 1970, there were other buildings and styles constructed during this period that did not conform to or reflect the tenets of Modernism. Although they were constructed during the period their architectural influence of the historic trends surrounding their development are separate from that of Modernism. For these reasons, several building types and styles are not discussed here, including Wrightian, Programmatic Architecture, Works Progress Administration-designed properties, Quonset Huts, Minimal Traditional, and tract Ranch homes.
3.4.5 Sacramento’s Architects/Designers of Modernism, 1940-1970

Sacramento, like many of Northern California’s metropolitan centers, benefited from the new wave of development following World War II. While numerous architectural firms produced housing and development plans from other regions or even states, the Sacramento region produced a notable quantity of firms and individuals to meet the housing, commercial and civic needs of a growing community. The following sections outline those more prolific enterprises in the Sacramento region as well as some of their more notable works in Sacramento. Appendix C lists additional names who practiced in the Mid-Century Modernism.

Grant Caywood & Associates, AIA

Grant Caywood, AIA was born in Des Moines, Iowa, in 1918. He grew up in Omaha, Nebraska, and graduated from Iowa State University in 1940 with degrees in architectural engineering (The Sacramento Bee 1953c:8). He joined the Air Force during World War II, flying more than 50 bombing missions and receiving the Silver Star, Purple Heart, and three Distinguished Flying Crosses (Davila 2008:B6).

After World War II, Caywood joined the State Division of Architecture and then moved to the architectural firm of Barovetto & Thomas where he served as chief draftsman from 1948 to 1950. After leaving Barovetto & Thomas, Caywood joined Koblick & Fisher where he worked until he was recalled to active duty in 1951 and was sent to Germany (The Sacramento Bee 1953c:8; Steinberg 2015:2).

Caywood opened a Sacramento architectural firm in 1953 located on 3rd Avenue that eventually grew to five partners (Davila 2008:B6). He was the chair of the Sacramento City Planning Commission from 1953 to 1957 (The Sacramento Bee 1957a:E3). His firm was responsible for buildings at California State University, Sacramento, the Sacramento Zoo, the Sacramento International Airport, and his own residence (see Figure45) (Davila 2008:B6). The architect was also designed swimming pools for the North City Chamber of Directors and Encina High School (The Sacramento Bee 1957b:B4; The Sacramento Bee 1961a:C2). In 1966, he designed the $100,000 expansion of the John Drew’s Arden Dodge on Arden and Bell (The Sacramento Bee 1966c:D22). In 1967, Caywood was appointed by Governor Ronald...
Regan to serve on the Capitol Building and Planning Commission. He served on that commission with Albert Dreyfuss and Sooky Lee, among others. Caywood was also an emeritus member of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) (*The Sacramento Bee* 1967d:A6; Davila 2008: B8).

**Notable Projects**

- 740 Cortlandt Drive (1952)
- 1435 Alhambra Boulevard (1956)
- 5061 24th Street (1957)
- Sacramento County Medical Society, 5380 Elvas Avenue (1960)
- 6140 Wycliffe Way (1961)
- 1915 I Street (1962)

**Harry Devine, Sr., AIA**

Harry Devine, Sr., AIA was born in Sacramento on March 22, 1894, the son of James Devine who was a Sacramento Bee printer. He was a graduate of Christian Brothers High School (*The Sacramento Bee* 1963a:A12). Devine joined the military during World War I and served as an ensign on a submarine chaser. He graduated from the University of California in 1919 (AIA 1953a:1-2). During his early career, he worked at Willis & Polk in San Francisco; as a draftsman at Dean & Dean; E. C. Hemming in Sacramento and the State Architect’s Office (AIA 1953a:2; Michelson 2017b). He established his own firm in 1928. Some of his projects included the Sacramento County Administration Building at 7th and I Streets (see Figure 46), the County Jail at 7th and H Streets, and Roos Atkins Department Store at 10th and K Streets. Devine was the supervising architect for the Sacramento Unified School District between 1947 and 1963. In 1962, he announced plans for the construction of a $4 million 24 story apartment house to be built on the corner of 13th and L Streets opposite Capital Park; however, no evidence was found documenting that this project was actually constructed. Had it been built, it would have become the tallest building in the city. The architect also sat on the Sacramento City Planning Commission and the California State Board of Architectural Exams. He worked with his son Harry Devine, Jr. in their office at 1012 J Street (*The Sacramento Bee* 1963a:12A).
Notable Projects

- Holy Spirit Parish School, 3920 W. Land Park Drive (1948)
- Bing Maloney Clubhouse, 6801 Freeport Boulevard (1951)
- New County Office Building, 827 7th Street (1956/1957)
- Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, 711 T Street (1957)

James C. Dodd, Sr., FAIA

James C. Dodd, Sr., FAIA was born in 1923 in Texarkana, Texas. During World War II he served as an Army first lieutenant. Following the war, he attended UCB where he earned a bachelor’s degree in architecture and in 1952, he and his young family moved to Sacramento (AIA 1959:2). After moving to Sacramento, he joined the architectural firm of Barovetto & Thomas. He left the practice in 1956 and created his own firm – James C. Dodd and Associates. Dodd was Sacramento’s first licensed African-American architect. His firm would operate for nearly 40 years (Chiu 1999:B6). Dodd and his business partner Elbert Mitchell built and managed their own apartment building in Sacramento. As a member of the Central Valley Chapter of the AIA, Dodd served as the chapter’s treasurer (1966), secretary (1967), vice-president (1968), and president (1969), and was also on the board of directors for the AIA (Gane 1970:228). Dodd was a charter member and president of the National Organization of Minority Architects (AIA 1978:1). In 1981, he was elected to the College of Fellows of the AIA (Chiu 1999:B6; Ukiah Daily Journal 1981:5). In addition to architecture, Dodd also undertook several business ventures. One, the Urfab System, was approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development in 1976. This was a pre-fabricated panelized housing system from recycled materials that was a factory built house using a “big plank” system with wall and roof panels ranging in thickness. By 1980, two prototypes were constructed and within a year more than 100 were ordered (Forrest and Entezari n.d.:12). Dodd died in 1999 (Chiu 199:B6).

Notable Works

- Dodd’s Residence, 1860 60th Avenue (1961)
- Shiloh Baptist Church, 3565 9th Avenue (1963) – Listed in the NRHP (see Figure 47)
- 6390 South Land Park Drive (1963)
**Dreyfuss & Blackford, FAIA**

Albert M. Dreyfuss, FAIA a graduate of Tulane University, became a member of the AIA in 1947, working first as an associate at Samuel G. Wiener & Associates and then briefly as an associate designer for the California State Architect. Dreyfuss opened a small firm on J Street in Sacramento in 1950 (AIA 1953b:1–2). His first project in Sacramento was the Santa Paula Manor apartments located in North Sacramento (*Executive Place* 1982:6–7). This was followed by Marconi Manor and several civic buildings at Travis AFB in 1951. Dreyfuss also designed the Corum Houses in northern Sacramento for E. A. Corum & Sons (*Western Building* 1954:20).

Leonard Blackford, FAIA graduated from UCB. He worked for a firm in the San Francisco Bay Area before moving to Sacramento to work for the State as a designer. Blackford and his family lived across the street from Dreyfuss and in 1953 Dreyfuss offered him a job at his firm. In 1954, the two became partners (Koyl 1962:59; Hope 1970:B3).

Dreyfuss & Blackford had a prolific career. Like most architects during the 1950s, they were influenced by post-World War II Modernism that expressed itself in the International style. Their works in this style in Sacramento include the former Vogel Chevrolet Showroom (1959) at 1616 I Street, the former Mansion Inn at 700 16th Street (1958), and Asclepius Medical Building (1964) at 5120 J Street. Their most notable work in Sacramento includes the headquarters building for Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD), which was completed in 1959, and designed in the International style (Roland 2009:8-5). For the SMUD headquarters building the firm received several architectural awards. After the SMUD building the firm designed the condominium tower at 4100 Folsom (1963) and the former IBM Building (1964) (see Figure 48) (Roland 2009:8-13–8-14). With these larger commissions, Dreyfuss & Blackford established itself in the 1960s with a signature style that expressed the International style with pre-stressed concrete panels and fenestration, which often was inset with modular windows (*Executive Place* 1982:6–7). During that period, their work in the International style transformed Sacramento’s architectural landscape.

**Notable Projects**

- 3325 J Street (1955)
- 2661 Riverside Boulevard (1955)
- Former Vogel Chevrolet Showroom, 1630 I Street (1957)
- SMUD Headquarters Building, 6201 S Street (1959) – Listed on the NRHP
- 2729 I Street (1961)
- Former IBM Office Building, 520 Capitol Mall (1964)
- Dreyfuss & Blackford Offices, 3540 Folsom Boulevard (1965)
- 4100 Folsom Boulevard (1966)
Raymond Franceschi, AIA

Raymond Franceschi, AIA was born in San Francisco in June 1910 and graduated from UCB in 1936. Franceschi worked as a junior draftsman at the firm of William C. Hays between 1928 and 1931. During World War II he served as an associate architect with the U.S. District Engineering Office in San Francisco (Koyl 1962:223). After four years as an architectural designer with the state, Franceschi opened his own private office (The Sacramento Bee 1946:18). In 1958, Franceschi received a formal contract to design the County Juvenile Hall (The Sacramento Bee 1958:C1). Franceschi, along with architect Nicholas A. Tomich, designed the 43rd Avenue Public Housing Complex, which housed design features for older and disabled tenants such as shower grab bars and elevated electrical outlets (The Sacramento Bee 1971:E1).

Notable Projects

- Peter Burnett Elementary School, 6032 36th Avenue (1950)
- Former Fairmont Home for Unwed Mothers, 4360 63rd Street (1952, 1957, 1962-65 addition)
- 2500 Stockton Boulevard (1953) (see Figure 49)
- 3701 J Street (1956)
- Iva Gard Shepard Garden and Arts Building, 3330 McKinley Boulevard (1958)
- 2730 C Street (1963)
- 2001 Acoma Street (1965)

Herbert Goodpastor, AIA

Herbert Goodpastor, AIA was born in Marysville, California in 1901. He graduated in 1920 from St. Mary’s College in 1920, and from UCB in 1926 (Koyl 1955:203; The Sacramento Bee 1964b:E1). After graduating Goodpastor worked as a draftsman at the San Francisco-based firm of Willis Polk & Company (AIA 1953c:2). In 1927, he then took a position as a designer for the firm of William C. Hays, also in San Francisco. Two years later, he joined Weeks & Day and continued working as a designer. He left Weeks & Day in 1930 for a position with Harry Devine’s firm where he remained until 1932 (AIA 1953c:2). In 1936, he established his own practice, Herbert E. Goodpastor, and opened offices in the Mitau Building that stood at 10th and J Streets (Koyl 1962:256; The Sacramento Bee 1964b:E1).
During World War II Goodpastor served in the U.S. Marine Corps as a Captain. He earned the Asiatic Pacific Medal; received a Presidential Citation; and three Battle Stars for his service (AIA 1953c:2). From 1947 to 1951, he was on the Sacramento City Planning Commission and was chair of the 1951 Capitol Mall Committee. Goodpastor was the architect of homes, movie theaters, civic buildings, and churches in Sacramento. In 1940, he designed a residence at 3350 56th Street with builder Gus Blomberg using basalite blocks (The Sacramento Bee 1940:26). He was also responsible for the Colonial Movie Theater at 3522 Stockton Boulevard, which opened in 1940; the Lux at 1194 West El Camino in 1947 (no longer extant); and the Manor on Stockton Boulevard in 1948 (now closed) (Cinema Treasures 2017).

In 1961, Goodpastor designed the Hart Senior Citizens Center at 915 27th Street and the Reformed Chinese Church of Christ at 517-519 N Street. The Chinese Church of Christ was founded in 1927 and the Goodpastor project was opened in 1941. Goodpastor died in December 1964 (SacMod 2017a; The Sacramento Bee 1964:E1).

**Notable Projects**

- 2220 J Street (1946)
- 1812 J Street (1948)
- 1967 13th Avenue (1949), Listed on the Sacramento Register
- 2201 Capitol Avenue (1952)
- First Christian Church, 3901 Folsom Boulevard (1954)
- Alice Birney Elementary School, 6251 13th Street (1958)
- Calvary Christian Center, 2727 Del Paso Boulevard (1959) (see Figure 50)
- Ethel McLeod Hart Senior Center, 915 27th Street (1961)
- H.W. Harness Elementary School, 2147 54th Avenue (1961)
**Lawrence Halprin, FASLA**

Lawrence Halprin, FASLA was born in New York City and raised in Brooklyn, New York. He attended Cornell University and the University of Wisconsin where he received an M.S. in horticulture. Afterwards, he earned his B.L.A. from Harvard’s Graduate School of Design in 1942. He then enlisted in the U.S. Navy during World War II and served in the Pacific theater. After the war, Halprin went on to an apprenticeship with Thomas Church in San Francisco. He worked there until he opened his own office in 1949. During the 1950s, Halprin’s typical projects included residential gardens, small housing projects in San Francisco, university master plans, and suburban shopping centers. By the 1960s, he was working on the site plan for Sea Ranch, in Sonoma County (Cultural Landscape Foundation 2017b). His first major urban plaza was Sacramento’s Capitol Towers (Chou 2014:8-18). Halprin garnered numerous awards, including the Thomas Jefferson Medal in Architecture and the National Medal of Arts given by the President of the U. S. (Cultural Landscape Foundation 2017b).

**Notable Projects**
- Capitol Towers (1959-1965) (see Figure 51)
- Cal Expo (1967)

**Jones & Emmons, FAIA**

A. Quincy Jones, Jr., FAIA was born in Kansas City, Missouri, in 1913 and came to Los Angeles in 1919 with his family. He attended the University of Washington and upon his 1936 graduation, returned to Los Angeles before serving in the Navy in World War II. From 1975 to 1978 Jones served as the dean of the University of Southern California’s Architecture and Fine Arts school. Jones became a Fellow in the AIA. He died in 1979 (Maltum 2014).

Frederick Emmons, FAIA was born in Olean, New York, in 1907, and graduated from the

Jones was interested in designing economical, modern houses. His work on a modern house in San Diego was recognized in 1950 by Architectural Forum as the Builder’s House of the Year. That recognition drew the attention of Joseph Eichler whose work in Palo Alto was awarded the Subdivision of the Year by the same publication (Caltrans 2011:101–102). Jones and Emmons formed a partnership in 1950 and they helped design thousands of Eichler homes, some of them in Sacramento. The Eichlers built between 1955 and 1956, specifically plans JE-80, 83-85, and 89 were work of Jones & Emmons (Weinstein 2017d). Jones was the principal designer for the Eichlers and he refined the Eichler atrium plan in later models by adding the central carport topped by a high-pitched gable roof (Caltrans 2011:102). In 1960, the two architects designed 540 units of Capehart Housing on McClellan AFB in Sacramento County. The housing development master plan and site design was completed in 1960 and covered 148 acres with housing units and adjacent schools (Buckner 2017).

**Notable Projects**

- Sacramento’s Historic Eichler District (see Figure 52)

**Koblik & Fisher**


Engineers in the Sacramento District as a specification writer. After the dissolution of Koblik & Fisher he started the firm Fisher & Metcalf in 1961 (Koyl 1962:214). In May 1948, Koblik & Fisher was occupying an office at 2203 13th Street (The Sacramento Bee 1948a:27). The firm was responsible for the design of schools, religious buildings, including Temple B’nai Israel, and restaurants.

Notable Projects

- 2203 13th Street (1948)
- Gunther’s Ice Cream (building), 2801 Franklin Boulevard (1949)
- Ba’Nai Israel, 3600 Riverside Boulevard (1954)
- 2430 L Street (1955)
- 4637 Cabana Way (1959)
- 5930 South Land Park Drive (1960) (Koblik & Fisher)
- Novack Residence, 6219 Oakridge Way (1963) (Koblik) (see Figure 53)

Sooky Lee, AIA

Sooky Lee, AIA was born in Sacramento on December 24, 1928. He attended Sacramento Junior College (now Sacramento City College) and graduated from UCB’s School of Architecture in 1954. Lee’s thesis focused on the redevelopment of Sacramento’s West End and his ideas for a downtown shopping center extension (Lee 1953:7). While in school, Lee was awarded the Medal of the School of Architecture and won $200 for the Mario Ciampi Prize (The Sacramento Bee 1953b:21). In 1958, he opened his private practice on 16th Street (The Sacramento Bee 1969b:C1).

In 1959, Lee served as the chairman for the seventh annual Central Valley Chapter of the AIA’s architecture exhibit (The Sacramento Bee 1959b:D8). He also served on the City’s Planning Commission from 1959-1968 (Koyl 1962:412; The Sacramento Bee 1959a:C1). In 1967, he was appointed by Governor Reagan to serve on the Capitol Building and Planning Commission (The Sacramento Bee 1967d:A6).

Lee had a prolific career as an architect, particularly in the city. He saw architecture as something that should be open and beautiful (The Sacramento Bee 1969b:C1). He designed Al and Bud’s Platter Restaurant on Broadway in 1961, which later became Pancake Circus (The Sacramento Bee 1961b:D8). He also designed the Soo Yuen Benevolent Association building on 4th and J Streets, which was a major...
contributor to the downtown redevelopment’s Chinese Community Center (*The Sacramento Bee* 1970:A7).

**Notable Projects**

- Oyoung Residence, 2000 56th Avenue (1959) (see Figure 54)
- Pancake Circus, 2101 Broadway (1961)
- 2131 Capitol Avenue (1963)
- 1214 25th Street (1965)
- Former Jumbo Market #4, 5820 South Land Park Drive (1968)
- Soo Yuen Benevolent Association, 401 J Street (1970)
- Hong Kong Lum Restaurant, 419 J Street (1970)

**George Muraki, AIA**

George Muraki, AIA was born in 1918 in Sacramento (SacMod 2010:34; Michelson 2017c). He married Kinuye “Kini” Makishima in 1941 in Sacramento. After Executive Order 9066 was issued, Muraki was fired from his job at the California Department of Employment. Shortly afterwards he and his wife were interned at the Tule Lake Internment Camp. While in the camp Muraki was a block manager and his wife was secretary to the mess hall supervisor. Muraki graduated from the Army Military Intelligence Service Language School. In 1944, he and his wife left Tule Lake and settled in Chicago. After graduating from Chicago Technical College, he moved the family back to Sacramento in 1949. He designed and built his family home in South Land Park in 1955 (*The Sacramento Bee* 1973:B2; *The Sacramento Bee* 1985:A8; *The Sacramento Bee* 2015).

In 1961, Muraki participated in the Pleasure Tour of Homes, the city’s annual showcase of homes. Muraki’s design was one of 38 on display and was built for Jerome Blomberg. The house, located at 1440 Tradewinds Avenue (see Figure 55), featured seven rooms, a work and play area, three private garden terraces, a swimming pool, and a fallout shelter. The house displayed masonry and maintenance fee building materials and four different types of glass by American-Saint Gobain. The glass served as both a functional and finishing material (Jackson 1961:W10C; Building Division 1961; A-SG n.d.).
Muraki ran for City Council in 1965, but withdrew his candidacy because his architectural practice was flourishing (The Sacramento Bee 1965b:C1). He would run again in 1967, but was not elected (The Sacramento Bee 1967c:A8). In 1968, he was appointed by the City Council to serve on the Building Appeals Board (The Sacramento Bee 1968a:C1). Starting in 1973, he served an important role on the Sacramento City Planning Commission for the next 10 years (SacMod 2010:34). He died May 21, 1991 (Michelson 2017c).

**Notable Projects**

- 1620 Potrero Way (family residence) (1955)
- Centennial United Methodist Church, 5401 Freeport Boulevard (1957)
- Ouye’s Pharmacy, 2130 10th Street (1959)
- 1440 Tradewinds Avenue (1961)
- 6091 South Land Park Drive (1963)
- 1631 Broadway (1964)
- Imperial House, 6083 S. Land Park Drive (1965)
- 2014 10th Street (1965-1967)

**Carter Sparks, AIA**

Carter Sparks, AIA was born in Utah in 1923, but later moved to Klamath Fall, Oregon (Weinstein 2017d). He studied engineering at Oregon State University and enlisted as an aviation cadet in the U.S. Navy in 1944. After the war, Sparks was assigned to work at the Bureau of Naval Personnel in Washington, D.C. In 1946, he enrolled at UCB and began his studies in the School of Architecture (Gibson 1996:B5). He graduated in 1950 and began working for the firm of Anshen and Allen in San Francisco. He left the company in 1953 and was briefly associated with Mario Corbett in San Francisco (Weinstein 2017c). Sparks moved to Sacramento in 1955. Here he partnered with Don Thaden and together they designed residences and schools (Gibson 1996:B5). Most of Sparks’ career was spent running his own practice (Caltrans 2011:105).

In Sacramento, he designed approximately 50 custom homes and was Sacramento’s...
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premier architect for his modern designs (caltrans 2011:105). he was inspired by frank lloyd wright and how wright’s buildings blended with the immediate surroundings and incorporated natural elements. sparks would integrate large expanses of glass, wood, rock, and natural materials (sacmod 2010:36). sparks was commissioned to design more than 3,000 residences for the streng bros. homes in sacramento and the surrounding communities (sacmod 2016:30). his designs were post-and-beam contemporary houses that also included models for duplexes (caltrans 2011:105). sparks died in 1997 (weinstein 2017a).

notable projects

▪ 1240 kaylar drive (1957) (with donald thaden)
▪ 1500 potrero way (1958) (with donald thaden) (see figure 56)
▪ blomberg window systems, 1453 blair avenue (1958) (with donald thaden)
▪ 812 McClatchy Way (with donald thaden) (1959)
▪ 270 messina drive (1959) (with donald thaden)
▪ 5609 seward court (1960) (with donald thaden)
▪ 6170 wycliffe way (1960) (with donald thaden)
▪ 6271 eichler street (1961)
▪ 85 starlit circle (1963) (streng brothers house)
▪ 1222 Woodfield Avenue (1963) (streng brothers house)
▪ 6377 oakridge way (1970) (streng brothers house)

Leonard Starks, AIA

Starks was born in 1891 in Healdsburg, California. He graduated from san francisco’s lick wilmerding technical high school in 1908. He went on to the san francisco architectural club where he studied architecture (powell 2017). Starks began his professional career as a draftsman with the oakland architectural firm of John J. Donovan from 1911 until 1912. Between 1913 and 1915 he was a designer for the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in san francisco. In 1917, he joined the practice of architect Thomas Lamb in New York as an architectural designer (Michelson 2017d).

While working for Lamb, Starks came to california in 1921 to supervise the design and construction of a chain of theaters, but an anti-trust suit prevented the theaters from being built. He quit Lamb’s firm that year and, settled in sacramento to open his own firm. In 1923, he formed a partnership with E.C. Hemmings.

Figure 57. YMCA Pool Building (at far left)

2021 W Street
Architect: Leonard Starks (Unauthenticated), 1957
Source: City of Sacramento, 2017
(Hemmings and Starks). The partnership only lasted two years because Hemmings died. His work with Hemmings provided Starks with contacts in local governments that led to future commissions. In 1925, he partnered with Edward Flanders and created Starks and Flanders, which operated until 1941. He then started his own practice which lasted until his retirement in 1965 (Michelson 2017d; SacMod 2016:34).

### Notable Projects
- State Garage, 1416 10th Street (1948)
- 1220 25th Street (1948)
- 1331 T Street (1951)
- YMCA Pool Building (unauthenticated), 2021 W Street (1957) (Figure 57)
- Sacramento Executive Airport, 6151 Freeport Boulevard (1956) (with Starks, Jozens Nacht)
- Parkside Community Church, 5700 South Land Park Drive (1959) (with Starks, Jozens Nacht)
- County Courthouse, 720 9th Street (1960) (with Starks, Jozens Nacht)
- Scottish Rite Masonic Center, 6151 H Street (1961) (with Starks, Jozens Nacht)

### Dean Frederick Unger, FAIA
Dean F. Unger, FAIA was born in Sacramento in 1928. He graduated from McClatchy High School and earned a master’s degree in architecture from UCB. He volunteered for the Korean War and upon his return worked as a draftsman for Rickey & Brooks in Sacramento. In 1959, he opened his own architecture firm, Dean F. Unger, AIA Inc. Unger was a member of the Sacramento City Housing Appeals Board; and was on the first Sacramento County Parks and Recreation Commission. He was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to the State Board of Architectural Examiners, an appointment he held for 12 years. He was board president for four of those years. During that time, California was producing more architects than any other state and Unger signed more certificates for architecture than anyone else in that position (AIA Central Valley 2011). In 1965, Unger became the president of the Central Valley Chapter of the AIA (*The Sacramento Bee* 1964a:61). In 1982, he was awarded a Fellowship in the AIA (AIA Central Valley 2011). His firm remained in business for more than 50 years and Unger
was awarded 40 design awards. He was responsible for more than 2,000 projects in Sacramento and the surrounding region (AIA Central Valley 2011). Unger died on July 5, 2011 (The Davis Enterprise 2011).

**Notable Projects**

- 2319 K Street (1960)
- 2705-2707 K Street (1963)
- 4910 Freeport Boulevard (1965)
- 1909 H Street (1965)
- 2327 L Street (1966)
- Teichert Corporate Office, 3500 American River Drive (1969)
- 2200 21st Street (1969)
- 700 Alhambra Boulevard (1970) (see Figure 58)

**Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons, FAIA**

William Wurster, FAIA graduated from the UCB in 1919 with a degree in architecture. He began his career as a draftsman with the Sacramento-based architectural firm Dean and Dean in the early 1920s. Between 1926 and 1942 he had his own firm based in Berkeley. In 1942, Thomas Bernardi joined him (Michelson 2017e). By the mid-1930s Wurster was practicing mostly in the International style. Wurster would later expand his practice to urban planning and mass housing during the 1940s.

Theodore Bernardi earned his degree in architecture from UCB in 1924. Between the 1920s and 1930s he worked at several San Francisco Bay Area-focused firms before opening his own practice in 1937. He joined Wurster in 1942. Donn Emmons, FAIA studied at Cornell University, the University of Southern California, and at the San Francisco Architecture Club (Michelson 2017a). The firm, WBE, was established in 1945 when Donn Emmons became a partner in William Wurster and Theodore Bernardi’s firm Wurster and Bernardi (Chou 2014: 8-29–8-30). WBE continued to design single-family properties in
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the 1960s, but those projects became fewer and fewer as the firm ventured into large-scale educational, commercial, and redevelopment projects, including Capitol Towers in Sacramento.

**Notable Projects**

- California State Printing Plant, 344 N. 7th Street (1954)
- Former Bank of America, 730 I Street (1960) (see Figure 59)
- Capitol Towers (1959-1965) (with Edward Larrabee Barnes, DeMars & Reay, and Lawrence Halprin), Determined eligible by The Keeper of the NRHP, listed on the CRHR
- Cal Expo (1968) (master plan and buildings)

### 3.4.6 Sacramento’s Developers of Modernism, 1940-1970

Often confused with the architects who produced the plans for the buildings and landscapes, the developers more often bore the responsibility of implementing the architect’s vision on an individual custom home or building and often large-scale development of hundreds of lots. Working in conjunction with the architects, landowners, and contractors, several Sacramento developers became synonymous with Modernism and retain that connection to the present. Below is a listing of some of the most influential developers who brought Modernism to the Sacramento region. Appendix C lists additional builders and developers.

**Blomberg Building Materials**

Blomberg Building Materials was created in 1946 and originally started as a building materials firm, specializing in Basalite concrete blocks. Basalite blocks were designed by the patriarch of the family Gustaf (Gus) Blomberg. He created the lightweight blocks in 1933 and the Basalite Rock Company, in Napa, California, manufactured the blocks for the Blombergs. Gus moved to Sacramento in 1939 and worked as a building contractor constructing nearly 25 houses in the Sierra View Terrace development on 57th Street. After World War II he became a salesman for Basalite Rock Company (Ancestry.com 2001; *The Sacramento Bee* 2013).
The Blombergs were mainly a building materials company and the residences were a means for them to showcase the basalite blocks (see Figure 60). Basalite blocks were made from mixing pumice sand and cement. The advantage of this material was its durability, noise control, low cost, low maintenance, ease of installation, and the blocks provided uniformity of size and design (Atomicpear 2011). The Blomberg Material Company house at 4744 Del Rio Road was considered experimental and opened to the public in 1952. A model of one of the Blomberg basalite homes was on display at the 1952 California State Fair (The Sacramento Bee 1952b).

The Blombergs built residential developments primarily south of William Land Park in the neighborhoods of South Land Park. The builders worked with local architects, including Raymond Franceschi, George Muraki, Carter Sparks, and Donald Thaden. They also worked with in-house drafters and developed a plan library. Most of their work used basalite concrete blocks and are Post-and-Beam styled residences (Weinstein 2017b).

Blombergs also designed bomb shelter bathrooms in some of their Carter Sparks’ designed homes. In 1955, the company touted that the bathroom in its home design was shock resistant from a bomb blast. Again, using basalite blocks, Blombergs designed a five-by-six-by-eight room with an eight-inch-thick, reinforced ceiling, a three-inch-thick door, and no windows. The room was large enough to shelter six people and had a vast amount of storage space for canned goods and fresh water (Sargent 1955). These houses were designed with input from Sacramento’s civil defense leaders (Sacramento Union 1961:10).

Manuel Jacinto was an important client of the Blombergs and used their blocks to build more than 1,500 houses, including those in Tallac Village. The Streng Brothers also used Blomberg’s basalite blocks in many of their developments. In the late-1950s and early-1960s Blombergs built high-style residences with bomb shelters. Gus was also a land developer and would subdivide the land into lots. Later the company shifted its emphasis to producing windows and sliding glass doors (Weinstein 2017b).

**Notable Projects**

- The Humphreys Residence, 1421 Claremont Way (1950)
- 1440 Tradewinds Avenue (1961)
**Joseph Eichler**

Joseph Eichler was born in 1900 in New York and earned a business degree from New York University. After graduation, he began a career on Wall Street and then worked for his in-laws’ poultry business. He and his family moved to California in 1925, and he became treasurer in the family’s business, which was based in San Francisco. In the early 1940s, the business was involved in a scandal and Eichler was forced to find a new career (Adamson 2017; Arbunich 2005:8-1–8-2).

Eichler was a fan of Frank Lloyd Wright and after having rented a Frank Lloyd Wright Usonian house in Hillsborough, California. Eichler had an even deeper appreciation for modernism. After World War II he initially built prefabricated houses on individual lots (Adamson 2017). Eichler had no experience in rapid housing construction the way many of his contemporaries did, so he proceeded cautiously, but Eichler’s homes were contemporary in their design and over the course of two years he was building small tracts (Caltrans 2011:114; Arbunich 2005: 8-2). Eichler, unlike other builders of his time, worked with architects to design his tracts. In 1949, he hired the architectural firm of Anshen and Allen to design the houses in Eichler’s new subdivision in Sunnyvale, California. Robert Ashen developed three prototypes for the 50-unit subdivision and it sold out in two weeks. Eichler would hire Jones & Emmons to design his Sacramento tracts, including those on South Land Park Drive, Fordham Way, and Oakridge Way (Caltrans 2011:114; Adamson 2017).

Eichler’s homes were distinctly modern using post-and-beam construction. The houses were intentionally built with low-cost products so that he could address California’s post-World War II housing shortage. Eichler was also different from his competitors because he had a non-discrimination policy and his tracts were open to any qualified buyer. He further committed himself to this policy when he resigned from the National Association of Home Builders in 1958 because the association continued to press for racial restrictions (Caltrans 2011:34).

In 1961, Eichler’s company went public and in 1967 he sold the company. He continued to build homes until his death in 1974, but none of these endeavors were as successful as his earlier projects (Adamson 2017).
Notable Projects

- Eichler Historic District on South Land Park Drive, Fordham Way, and Oakridge Way (see Appendix F for complete listing of addresses and built dates)

Moss & Moss

Moss & Moss was a real estate development firm created by Henry M. Moss and his wife Charlotte (The Sacramento Bee 1967b:B3). Henry a Utah native, was nine when the family moved to Sacramento. He married Charlotte (Keane) Moss in 1933. During World War II, he worked at McClellan AFB as the civilian head of the signal section. He was also working part-time in real estate and after the war pursued it as a career (The Sacramento Bee 1967b:B3; Montano 1999:B5). Henry was a partner in Moss & Lucas, but left the firm to form Moss & Moss in 1950 with him and Charlotte as equal partners. The couple would later divorce in 1954 (The Sacramento Bee 1967b:B3). In 1959, Allan H. Lindsay and Associates purchased Moss & Moss’ firm at 913 8th Street, its Carmichael office and the Moss & Moss Insurance Agency. Henry would continue in real estate and subdivision development (The Sacramento Bee 1959d:C-1). By 1969, Moss & Moss Realtors had seven branches in Sacramento and the surrounding communities (The Sacramento Bee 1969a:D16).

Henry’s brother, John Moss was a World War II Navy veteran and later entered politics where he served in Congress for 26 years (The Sacramento Bee 1952c:8; Montano 1999:B5). The John E. Moss Building, at 650 Capitol Mall, is named after him. He was born in 1915 and attended Sacramento Junior College. In 1933, John married Jean (Keuny) Moss. After World War II, he opened an appliance store in Sacramento and earned his real estate broker’s license and worked with his brother (Wiegand 1997:A1). At its peak, the firm had 13 offices and employed approximately 350 people (Montano 1999:B5). The real estate/construction firm of Moss & Moss was advertised as the exclusive sales agent for Eichler homes in Sacramento (The Sacramento Bee 1955a:F19). John died in 1997 and Henry died in 1999 (Wiegand 1997:A1; Montano 1999:B5).

Notable Projects

- South Land Park Hills (various years)
- Campus Commons (1965+)

Source: SacMod Ephemera Collection, date unknown
Brothers Bill and Jim Streng were raised in Pennsylvania and attended Dartmouth College. In the early 1950s they moved to California and worked for their uncle Phil Heraty. Heraty was a small-scale builder who retired in 1957 and the brothers took over the business. In 1959, they incorporated as the Streng Brothers Homes (Caltrans 2011:117). The brothers were admirers of Joseph Eichler and the work he did with architects. Jim Streng met architect Carter Sparks at an expectant parents’ class they both attended and they instantly liked each other. The Strengs asked Sparks to work with them the way Eichler was using modernist architects in his tracts. Sparks was hesitant because he preferred his work not to be duplicated, but eventually agreed and began working the brothers in 1959 (Weinstein 2017c).

Streng Brothers

Sparks designed what was called the “Carter Classic,” which was a flexible plan featuring various roof lines and either three or four bedrooms; an open-plan blending the living room, dining room and kitchen; and high ceilings with beams following the roof line. The plan used a large amount of glass with sliding glass doors and high transom windows in the bedrooms. These houses were built to accommodate Sacramento’s high summer temperatures and Sparks designed houses with atriums—that rather than walled in with glass—were open to the living areas. The atriums were domed with tinted acrylic that helped block the heat. The Streng Brothers Homes also offered a version with a low-pitched glass-filled gable end that resembled the more traditional Ranch style house. This version of the atrium model became the Strengs’ most popular model (Weinstein 2017c).

The Streng Brothers averaged 100 to 200 homes per year and kept approximately 100 employees on the payroll. By keeping their volume relatively low compared to some of their contemporaries, the Strengs were able customize their houses for individual buyers (Caltrans 2011:118). Together the Streng Brothers built nearly 4,000 homes in roughly 40 subdivisions and on individual lots. The company stopped building houses in the 1980. Their houses can be found in such Sacramento neighborhoods as Greenhaven, Little Pocket, and Wilhaggin (Weinstein 2017c; Streng Bros. Homes 2017.).

Notable Projects

- 1222 Woodfield Avenue (1963)
- 6483 Driftwood Street (1964)
- 11 Sunlit Circle (1967)
- 6377 Oakridge Way (1970)
Chapter 4. Survey Results

4.1 Summary of Reconnaissance-Level Survey Results

As part of the overall program of which this historic context statement is part, the City undertook a reconnaissance-level survey of potential resources demonstrating the Mid-Century Modern aesthetic within the city limits. As noted in the preceding methodology section, the survey was conducted by volunteers in the spring and summer of 2017, and data was collected electronically using smartphones and readily available GIS data-collection software. Within the survey window that was available, more than 1,800 parcels within the city were surveyed by volunteers and information was collected into the City’s GIS database. The results of the survey are described and categorized below using some initial queries that can be expanded or otherwise reconfigured for specific future needs. It is anticipated that upcoming work by the City will add to and refine the current dataset to both broaden the comprehensiveness of the survey analysis as well as extract more detail from notes, research materials, or photographs. Post-processing of the survey data overseen by GIS and planning professionals in a manner that helps focus potential future survey work should be undertaken as soon as practical. This will ensure that future surveyors are using methods that are clearly documented, easy to follow, and result in the collection of the greatest amount of data in the field and other sources. Eventually this data should be made available to the City and SacMod in a web-based format that can be amended as conditions change for identified resources or more resources are surveyed.

As part of the reconnaissance-level survey, 1,812 parcels were surveyed by project volunteers (see Figure 64). Of that number 726 parcels were:

- recorded without a surveyor identified (155 parcels)
- recorded without an identified architectural style (221 parcels)
- identified as containing buildings pre-dating 1940 (30 parcels)
- identified as containing buildings post-dating 1970 (152 parcels)
- recorded with no built date in the estimated built year field (168 parcels)

As part of this analysis, those 726 parcels are not included in the results below. Only 1,086 parcels were recorded within the 1940 to 1970 period, which is the timeframe identified for this project, and had complete data fields. The reconnaissance-level survey results are broken down into the following tables. Appendix D contains a tabular listing of 1,657 parcels extracted from the City’s GIS database. That list does not include the 155 parcels that were recorded without a surveyor identified. For questions on those parcels, readers should contact the City’s Preservation Director.
Figure 64. Parcels Surveyed

Source: City of Sacramento, 2017
Figure 65 is a visual representation of the parcels surveyed by the volunteers.

**Figure 65. Surveyed Parcels by Year**

Source: City of Sacramento, 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recorded Estimated Built Date</th>
<th>Number of Parcels Recorded¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 66 is a visual representation of the architectural styles identified by the volunteer surveyors.

¹ These numbers are reflective of the 1,086 parcels recorded between 1940-1970 that contained complete data fields.
Figure 66. Architectural Styles by Parcel

Source: City of Sacramento, 2017
### Table 2. Parcels by Architectural Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Style</th>
<th>Number of Parcels Surveyed²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Frame</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Deco</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exaggerated Modern</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalist</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Googie/Space Age Modern</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderne</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-and-Beam</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quonset</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranch Eclectic</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regency Modern</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split-Level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrightian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² These numbers are reflective of the 1,086 parcels recorded between 1940-1970 that contained complete data fields.

### Table 3. Parcels by Building Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Number of Parcels Surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Story Commercial</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+Story Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center/Social Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Motel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Building Type Identified</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Summary of Intensive Survey Results

Five properties were inventoried and evaluated as part of the intensive-level survey. Basic descriptions of the properties and significance statements are included below; however, more complete documentation is included in the appended DPR form sets in Appendix F.

4.2.1 Gordon D. Schaber Sacramento County Courthouse

Description

The County Courthouse is a 6-story rectangular building designed in the Brutalist style (see Figure 67). It features a small elevator floor at the top of the building and a basement level parking garage. The sixth floor is recessed and of steel construction and floors 2 through 5 are concrete and feature rectangular, pre-cast concrete panels that function as solar louvers to control sunlight. The first floor is also concrete but is clad with black granite veneer and is accessed by glass doors at the east side main entrance. A second entrance is on the west side. A concrete base with a concrete railing supports the building. The east side of the building features an elevated entry plaza with several stops connecting the building to the plaza. A concrete and bronze fountain with benches and planters sit at the center of the plaza.

Evaluation

The County Courthouse appears to meet NRHP Criterion C, CRHR Criterion 3, and the Sacramento Register Criteria iii and iv within the context of architecture. The County Courthouse is an important example in Sacramento of the Brutalist style of architecture and represents the work of master architects Starks, Jozens & Nacht. The period of significance is 1965, the year the County Courthouse was completed.

4.2.2 Gunther’s Ice Cream

Description

Gunther’s Ice Cream is a single-story commercial building located at 2801 Franklin Boulevard (see Figure 68). The building has a flat roofline with wide overhanging eaves and distinctive folded roof portions that jut downward and then continue along the west and north elevations. The majority of the building storefront consists of floor-to-ceiling metal-frame glass windows that tilt outward; other exterior wall surfaces have stone veneer. The main entryway is located at the northwest corner of the building and consists of a single, metal-frame door with a sidelight. Above the main entryway is an animated, custom-designed neon sign the depicts in a 10-step sequence a soda jerk tossing an ice cream scoop over his head and onto an ice cream cone.
Gunther’s Ice Cream appears to meet the NRHP/CRHR Criterion A/1 for its association with postwar commercial expansion and development and as an early example of Mid-Century Modern architecture in Sacramento, illustrating an important transition of post-World War II (postwar) styles applied to a commercial property. This building illustrates through its distinctive characteristics the transition away from the Moderne style of the 1930s toward the Googie style of the 1950s and 1960s and was designed by notable Sacramento architectural firm Koblik & Fisher. The animated neon sign on top of the building also appears to meet NRHP/CRHR Criterion C/3, and the Sacramento Register Criteria iii, as a distinctive local example of commercial signage and neon technology. Designed by the Electrical Products Corporation, its design features multiple colors and incorporates multiple layers of neon lighting tubes powered in a timed sequence. Gunther’s neon sign reflects a level of artistic and technological creativity that render this sign as a distinctive example of commercial neon signage, which developed nationally during the 1930s and was in decline by the 1950s due to the increasing popularity of Plexiglass shadow box signs. The period of significance for the building and neon sign correspond to 1949, the year of their design and construction. Despite the addition of stone veneer on some exterior wall surfaces and some non-original additions to the rear of the building, Gunther’s Ice Cream retains sufficient integrity to convey its architectural significance.

4.2.3 Iva Gard Shepard Garden & Arts Center

Description

The Iva Gard Shepard Garden & Art Center is a single-story park building located at 3330 McKinley Boulevard (see Figure 69). The building has a post-and-beam structural system consisting of wood and stone load-bearing walls placed at relatively wide intervals that in-turn support the roof structure, including exposed glu-lam beams. The building features a distinctive butterfly roof and a shed-roof entryway with metal supports. A stone chimney protrudes from the center of the roof. Exterior wall surfaces consist of stone, composite wood, textured plywood, and glass placed between the load-bearing walls. Windows are primarily wood fixed-frame and expansive clerestory windows in gable ends. The building also has two outdoor patio spaces that help emphasize the indoor/outdoor design of the building.
**Evaluation**

The Iva Gard Shepard Garden & Arts Center appears to meet the NRHP/CRHR Criterion A/1 and Sacramento Register Criteria I for its association with important post-World War II development patterns in recreation and entertainment within the City of Sacramento. It also meets NRHP/CRHR Criterion C/3, and the Sacramento Register Criteria iii as an important and distinctive example of post-and-beam Mid-Century Modern architecture and was designed by notable Sacramento architect Raymond R. Franceschi. The period of significance corresponds to its 1958 year of construction. The building retains a high degree of integrity.

### 4.2.4 Senator Savings & Loan/Chase Bank Branch

**Description**

The Senator Savings & Loan/Chase Bank Building is a round two-story building designed in the New Formalism style (see Figure 70). It features a flat circular roof with an overhang. The building eaves connect to pre-cast concrete pillars that extend to the ground level of the building. The elevations feature banks of vertical glass windows bordered by metal that form the inner walls of the building. The windows on the second floor are recessed. Clay square tiles cover the outer walls of the building and anodized sun shades are on the east side. The main entrance features large vertical windows and doors with metal trim. Stairs access the doors and a sign saying, “Chase” is near the front entrance.
Evaluation

The Senator Savings & Loan/Chase Bank Branch building appears to meet NRHP/CRHR Criterion C/3, and the Sacramento Register Criteria iii. This building is an important and distinctive example of New Formalism architecture and was designed by architects Silvio Barovetto and Albert Thomas. The period of significance corresponds to its 1958 year of construction. The building retains a high degree of integrity.

4.2.5 South Land Park Hills Unit No. 7 Eichler Historic District

Description

The South Land Park Hills Unit No. 7 Eichler Historic District includes approximately 53 (47 contributors and 6 non-contributors) located on South Land Park Drive, Fordham Way, and Oakridge Way (see Figure 71). The contributors consist of semi-customized single-story residences, presenting relatively plain facades to the street (almost no street-facing windows were used). The Eichler residences feature flat or low-pitch gabled roofs, exposed post-and-beam construction, floor-to-ceiling, wall-to-wall plate glass along the back wall (or on the side, in the case of those with side entrances) and clerestory windows on the front. All feature two-car garages with garage doors oriented to the street, with fixed transom glass windows above them and across the entire front elevation.

Evaluation

The Sacramento Eichler Historic District appears to meet the NRHP/CRHR Criterion C/3, and the Sacramento Register Criteria iii, iv, and v for architecture in the context of Mid-Century Modern construction in the City of Sacramento. The period of significance is 1955-1956. The Sacramento Eichler Historic District is an excellent example of the Eichler company’s mid-century modern design and a well-preserved development built in the 1950s. Builder Joseph Eichler's reputation was one of the pre-eminent developers in the modern style, building quality-designed homes targeted at middle-income families. The Sacramento Eichler development represents Eichler homes during the most productive period of design, exhibiting sophistication equaled in limited other parts of the state. The district’s architects, A. Quincy Jones and Frederick Emmons, whose Jones & Emmons firm became internationally renowned during their 18-year partnership (1950-1968), were affiliated with Eichler Homes throughout the building company's life, designing approximately 5,000 of Eichler’s 11,000 California homes.

Figure 71. Representative Contributing Property

6465 Fordham Way
Architect: Jones & Emmons, 1955
Source: GEI Consultants, Inc., 2017
Chapter 5. Associated Property Types and Evaluation Criteria

The following describes the four primary categories of associated property types encountered during the reconnaissance survey including residential, commercial, public, and religious properties. The associated property type analysis addresses three of the four primary criteria for historic evaluation (see Appendix E for complete criteria discussion). For the purposes of this historic context statement, Mid-Century Modern resources can be assessed for historical significance under NRHP Criterion A and CRHR Criterion 1 for historic events or trends in history; NRHP Criterion B and CRHR Criterion 2 for associations with persons; architectural significance under NRHP Criterion C and CRHR Criterion 3; as well as applicable criteria under the Sacramento Register. It should be noted that Criterion D of the NRHP (Criterion 4 of the CRHR) and certain criteria from the Sacramento Register pertain primarily (though not entirely) to archaeological resources given the relative lack of historic documentation for those types of resources. Given the relatively high level of existing documentation for the period of 1940 to 1970 of Mid-Century Modern architecture in Sacramento, it is low probability that resources would be significant under these criteria. Thus, these criteria are not discussed as part of this historic context statement.

There exists a wide variety of property types associated with the Mid-Century Modern movement in Sacramento including residences, commercial properties, religious properties, and industrial types. More rare types of resources displaying the Mid-Century Modern aesthetic exist within Sacramento wherein only a couple were ever constructed. These examples would likely find significance as individual properties at a minimum and potentially contribute to a larger district. Conversely, residences of the period are much more in number currently given the high number constructed during the subject time-period. Evaluations will very likely need to consider the potential for historic districts assuming association with a particular development.

From the preceding historic context, some primary historic themes were identified that could be tied to resources evaluated for historic significance. These themes include: Community Planning, Urban Renewal/Redevelopment, Transportation/Suburbanization, Commercial Development, Architecture, and Architects of Modernism. More specific subthemes not considered in this document may also exist and be brought forward during intensive research of a property conducted over the course of the evaluation process.
5.1 Residential Properties

Sacramento experienced rapid residential growth. This occurred through annexation, development projects where farm land was subdivided for neighborhoods, and infill projects. Residential property types include single- and multi-family residences, townhouses, and duplexes.

5.1.1 Evaluation Criteria and Integrity

To be eligible for the NRHP, CRHR or Sacramento Register a residential property must be significant under one or more of the themes: Community Planning, Suburbanization, Architecture, or Architects of Modernism. The property might be significant using the following criteria:

Figure 72. 6090 South Land Park Drive

Architect: Unknown, 1966
### A/1/i
Residential properties might be eligible under this criterion if they are directly associated with the growth or suburbanization of Sacramento. Residences might not be individually eligible under this criterion, but might contribute to a residential historic district.

It must be demonstrated that the properties played an important role in post-World War II suburbanization or community planning/development.

The aspects of integrity that must be displayed are: Location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association.

### B/2/ii
To meet this criterion there must be a direct association with significant persons in Sacramento’s history. These might include civic or community leaders, local developers, authors, or artists. The association with the individual must have an important association with the person’s productive life and be the best representation to demonstrate their significance. Residential properties are typically unlikely to be significant under this criterion unless research clearly supports that a significant person performed the activity for which they were known at the property.

Should research support that a residential property is eligible under this criterion, the aspects of integrity that must be displayed are: Location, design, materials, setting, feeling and association.

### C/3/iii, iv, v
Most individual residences in suburban developments will likely not qualify for individual listing. These residences might qualify as contributing resources to a historic residential district. Such a district may be eligible if it can be identified that the residential district represents post-World War II planning or design principals. A residential historic district may also include shopping centers, schools, places of worship, libraries, site plans, landscape designs, and streetscapes that were planned as part of the residential neighborhood.

Individual custom designed or architect designed residential properties must be designed by an architect or builder for a specific client and a specific site. The residence must be an important example of a Mid-Century Modern architectural styles identified in this historic context statement. Or the property must represent the work of a master architect or builder identified in this historic context statement. Custom designed homes might also qualify as a residential historic district if there is a high concentration of the residences.

An individual property eligible under this criterion must be display these aspects of integrity: Location, design, setting, and materials. A historic district eligible under this criterion must display these aspects of integrity: Location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association.
5.2 Commercial Properties

Sacramento experienced commercial growth proportionally equal to that of its residential growth during the 1940 to 1970 period. Commercial properties expanded alongside new residential developments as well as within older areas as redevelopment or infill projects. Examples of commercial properties are shopping centers, or stand-alone stores/shops, restaurants, gas stations, motels/hotels, as well as banks or other financial institutions.

Figure 73. Former Phillips 66 Gas Station

2025 Broadway
Architect: Clarence Reinhardt, 1960
Source: SacMod, 2017
| A/1/i | Commercial properties might be eligible under this criterion if they are directly associated with the growth or suburbanization of Sacramento. Commercial properties (shopping centers, banks, hotels, etc.) might not be individually eligible under this criterion, but might contribute to a commercial historic district.

It must be demonstrated that the properties played an important role in post-World War II suburbanization, community planning/development, or business development (including but not limited to: retail operations, banking, restaurant management, and hotelkeeping).

The aspects of integrity that must displayed are: Location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association. |
|---|---|
| B/2/ii | To meet this criterion there must be a direct association with significant persons in Sacramento’s history. These might include civic or community leaders, store owners/operators, restaurant owners/operators, bankers, or hoteliers. The association with the individual must have an important association with the person’s productive life and be the best representation to demonstrate their significance. Commercial properties may be significant under this criterion if research clearly supports that a significant person performed the activity for which they were known at the property which may include some sort of trade or business activity.

Should research support that a commercial property is eligible under this criterion, the aspects of integrity that must displayed are: Location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association. |
| C/3/iii, iv, v | Individual custom-designed or architect-designed commercial properties must be designed by an architect or builder for a specific client, a specific site, or a specific commercial purpose. The commercial property must be an important example of a Mid-Century Modern architectural styles identified in this historic context statement. Or the property must represent the work of a master architect or builder identified in this historic context statement.

Commercial properties may also qualify as a commercial historic district if there is a high concentration of buildings and/or structures that constitute a defined contiguous area or if a cohesive theme links otherwise discontiguous properties by way of their commercial purpose or linked historic association.

Signage may also play a role in significance of a commercial property and may be noteworthy on its own or in association with the building.

An individual property eligible under this criterion must display these aspects of integrity: Location, design, setting, and materials. A historic district eligible under this criterion must display these aspects of integrity: Location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association. |
5.3 Public Properties

The rapid post-World War II growth Sacramento experienced required increased public services to meet the demands of the residents. New schools, libraries, fire stations, and community centers were built. Sacramento County’s services also grew and it built a new courthouse and other buildings to accommodate its expanding departments and staff. As California’s capital, Sacramento also witnessed an increase in the construction of State buildings, particularly near the Capitol as part of the urban renewal and redevelopment in Sacramento’s downtown.

Figure 74. Elder Creek Elementary School

7934 Lemon Hill Avenue
Architect: Unknown
Source: City of Sacramento Reconnaissance Level Survey, 2017
| A/1/i | Public properties might be eligible under this criterion if they are directly associated with important trends in community development, urban renewal/redevelopment, or suburbanization. These properties might be individually eligible or they may contribute to a historic district.  

The aspects of integrity that must be displayed are: Location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association. |
| B/2/ii | To meet this criterion there must be a direct association with significant persons in the history of Sacramento. For public properties, this could include civic and community leaders, judges or teachers/professors. The association with the individual must have an important association with the person’s productive life and be the best representation to demonstrate their significance.  

The aspects of integrity that must be displayed are: Location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association. |
| C/3/iii, iv, v | Individual properties might be eligible under this criterion if they are important examples of a Mid-Century Modern architectural style identified in this historic context statement. Or the property must represent the work of a master architect or builder identified in this historic context statement.  

Public buildings might also be eligible as a historic district even if the properties lack individual distinction. Certain public buildings, such as schools, libraries, and community centers, may also contribute to a historic residential district.  

The aspects of integrity that must be displayed for individually eligible properties are: Location, design, setting, and materials. A historic district eligible under this criterion must display these aspects of integrity: Location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association. |
5.4 Religious Properties

During the post-war period, as residential neighborhoods expanded throughout the region, religious institutions such as churches and synagogues were built to serve the growing communities. Religious properties dating to this period typically included a main building which served as a place of worship and smaller ancillary buildings that functioned as a rectory, meeting rooms, or social halls.

To meet the eligibility requirements of the NRHP, a religious property must derive its primary significance from architectural distinction or historical importance per Criteria Consideration A. A religious property must also meet Criterion A or C, or both.

Figure 75. Covenant Reformed Church

2020 16th Avenue
Architect: Clovis McGuire, 1957
Source: City of Sacramento, 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associated Property Types and Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A/1/i** Religious properties might be eligible under this criterion if they are directly associated with an important historical event in the community or with a broad pattern related to the history of religion in the region. These properties might be individually eligible or they may contribute to a historic district.  

The aspects of integrity that must be displayed are: location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association. |
| **B/2/ii** To meet this criterion there must be a direct association with significant persons in religious history related to religious institutions, a religious or cultural group, or religious movements in the Sacramento area or in the social, economic, or political history of the region.  

The aspects of integrity that must be displayed are: location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association. |
| **C/3/iii, iv, v** Individual properties might be eligible under this criterion if they are important examples of a Mid-Century Modern architectural style identified in this historic context statement. Or the property must represent the work of a master architect or builder identified in this historic context statement.  

Religious properties might be made up of several related buildings and these should be treated as an individual resource and not as a historic district.  

The aspects of integrity that must be displayed for individually eligible properties are: location, design, setting, and materials. A historic district eligible under this criterion must display these aspects of integrity: location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association. |
5.5 Industrial Properties

As growth spread beyond the central grid, the undeveloped land was filled with residential, commercial, and industrial property types. The industrial buildings were constructed for light and heavy industrial uses and were designed to support various business operations. These building types included warehouses and factories and manufacturing spaces and tended to be located along commercial corridors at the edge of residential neighborhoods.

Figure 76. 8151 Fruitridge Road

Source GEI Consultants, Inc., 2016
| A/1/i | Industrial properties might be eligible under this criterion if they are directly associated with an important historical event in the Sacramento region or with significant suburban or urban development patterns in the area. These properties might be individually eligible or they might contribute to a historic district.  

The aspects of integrity that must be displayed are: location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association. |
| B/2/ii | To meet this criterion there must be a direct association with significant persons in history of the Sacramento. For industrial properties, this might include individuals related to business, warehousing, or manufacturing work associated with industrial properties. The association with the individual must have an important association with the person’s productive life and be the best representation to demonstrate their significance.  

The aspects of integrity that must be displayed are: location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association. |
| C/3/iii, iv, v | Individual properties might be eligible under this criterion if they are important examples of a Mid-Century Modern architectural style identified in this historic context. Although because of their functional nature, industrial properties will exhibit restrained and modest elements of the style. In addition, the property can also represent the work of a master architect or builder identified in this historic context.  

Industrial properties might also be eligible as a historic district if the properties lack individual distinction.  

The aspects of integrity that must be displayed for individually eligible properties are: location, design, setting, and materials. A historic district eligible under this criterion must display these aspects of integrity: location, design, materials, setting, feeling, and association. |
6.1 Recommendations

It should be understood that the content within this document represents what is considered the first phase of a multiphase undertaking to more fully document Mid-Century Modern resources in Sacramento.

The reconnaissance-level survey resulted in 1,087 properties identified and documented as having been built between 1940 and 1970. Under the direction of the City, work was completed on the reconnaissance-level survey by volunteers. Intensive-level survey and evaluation was completed by the project’s consultant team on the five properties.

The next steps in the survey and evaluation are outlined below as preservation goals and priorities for the City in how to use the historic context statement and survey data collected to date.

6.1.1 Preservation Goals

With this project, the City identified Mid-Century Modern architecture as a historically significant theme and compiled a historic context in which to understand the theme’s development in Sacramento in Chapters 2 and 3, and the associated property types in Chapter 5. This project also collected a large amount of data during the reconnaissance-level survey that may relate to one of more of the themes identified. This section provides goals of advance work by the City and other preservation organizations to further understand, identify, and help protect important examples of Mid-Century Modern properties in Sacramento that may qualify for the NRHP, CRHR, or the Sacramento Register. The goals also address additional work, beyond the ability of this first step, of a large project to address questions and needs identified during the development of the historic context and completing reconnaissance-level survey and intensive-level survey and research.

As such, the goals support establishing how further work can contribute to (1) collaborating with preservation organizations and interested individuals to collect additional information, (2) increasing the understanding of Mid-Century Modern properties in Sacramento, (3) identifying important properties associated with Mid-Century Modernism, and (4) developing a process to evaluate whether properties qualify for local, state, or national designation. The goals are discussed below.

**Goal 1: Collaborating with Preservation Organizations and Interested Individuals to Collect Information for the Database**

One result of this project was for the development of a database to hold information in possession of the City, SacMod, and interested individuals on Mid-Century Modern architecture. The first step was to develop a broad selection of properties across the city that may represent the themes in the historic context. By developing this database and investing in survey data collection equipment, such as the development of smartphone applications and tablets for use in the field, a variety of means are available to contribute information. The database should be made available as in a “wiki” format in which
descriptive information, property history, research materials, and current and historic images can be added to records about Mid-Century Modern properties within Sacramento. The hard work has been completed in that a database has been populated with more than 1,800 properties within the city, but a process needs to be established in which the City and preservation organizations, such as SacMod, have access and may choose to continue to add information such as known architects, builders, and other relevant information.

Survey data also needs to be reviewed to help ensure verification of each record’s correct information and that missing information is obtained to complete the required data fields. Such tasks may include: quality review of the digital images; confirmation on the date of construction; confirmation on the style and property type, and processing the numerous field notes within the database, among others. Working to ensure the reconnaissance-level survey data is complete and accurate is the first step in its being a useful tool to gain a more complete understanding of Mid-Century Modern architecture in Sacramento.

The city features a few educational institutions that offer classes and internships that could be of value to this undertaking. Volunteers have contributed greatly to the survey effort that was part of this project, and a possible avenue for reaching out to new volunteers could be to make connections with local and even more distant educational institutions such as California State University, Sacramento’s Public History Program. The educational curriculum in this program attracts students who may also be interested in historic architectural subjects and may be interested in helping to add to existing documentation or refining collected data. This relationship could potentially help them with college credits, building working skills, and accrue a better Mid-Century Modern resource understanding.

**Goal 2: Identifying Important Themes and Property Types Associated with Mid-Century Modern Architecture**

The historic context and architectural styles broadly described the important main themes related to Mid-Century Modern architecture in Sacramento. Through achieving the previous goal, the variety of types, styles, and periods will be revealed as to how they manifested themselves in Sacramento. The numerous subthemes and property-specific topics, many of which were identified during the review of the historic context and through a preliminary review of the reconnaissance-level survey data, exist and need further investigation such as the examples provided below.

- Provide expanded contextual research on themes mentioned in the historic context, but not directly related to Mid-Century Modern architecture, e.g., additional detail on housing discrimination in Sacramento; infill trends in parts of the city; the influence of national and regional architects and styles and how they disseminated in Sacramento; site planning and its effects on the orientation and relationship between buildings and the surrounding environment; special study on neon signs; landscape architecture, bring the outside “in,” and the relationship between the interior and exterior; illustrated discussion of how specific elements of Mid-Century Modern architectural styles were applied to various property types beyond residential and commercial.

- Geospatial analysis to identify concentrations of important architectural styles and property types.

- Identification of subthemes for further study, such as developing Multiple Property Documentation Form for styles or property types, including possible historic districts. This effort would evaluate associated property types in a similar manner and provide for a streamlined and efficient evaluation process.
**Goal 3: Developing an Evaluation Process Specific for Mid-Century Modern Architecture**

Through the completion and/or ongoing work of the goals above, the City should work to complete a list of character-defining features and integrity considerations for Mid-Century Modern properties based on style and property types identified in Sacramento. The current context report provides the contextual background and initial survey of resources throughout the city. A standard level of evaluation process and framework is provided based on the wide array of Mid-Century Modern resources identified through this project as well as those yet to be identified in the city limits in the future. While the process is tailored to address Mid-Century Modern resources, a more focused evaluation process is one possibility.

Based on discussions between the City and SacMod, an initial screening methodology may be developed to organize, rank, and prioritize properties for further research and survey that may be associated by location, common architects, common construction companies, common historic themes, similar construction methods/style or that may be subjected to more pressing or similar development pressures. Tailored survey and evaluation approaches might work to focus the efforts to identify significant resources more expediently and effectively as well as result in a more cohesive grouping of resources that can be preserved collectively.

For example, a focus could be on creating evaluation standards and character-defining features for properties designed by specific local builders/developers such as the Streng Brothers. Their collaboration with Carter Sparks resulted in the “Carter Classic” and evaluation criteria could be developed to identify multi-layered themes of significance as well as pertinent features that constitute sufficient historic integrity of buildings representing this unique mid-century architectural collaboration.

Another option is to focus on evaluation requirements and integrity considerations specifically for Mid-Century Modern architectural styles. This may lead to preservation guidance that can address the needs of more specific stylistic considerations. With this focus, an evaluation of a Brutalist style building, as one example, may benefit from special consideration of previous repair needs that necessitated the exposed concrete be treated through application of a thin veneer. In this case, the covering of the exposed concrete, while contrary to the original stylistic principles, might not be considered detrimental to the evaluation results. Stylistic-specific evaluation considerations may also explain to future evaluators why windows of Mid-Century Modern buildings may have been replaced if the originals were possibly experimental and are now known to have construction or material limitations that prevented a simpler repair option. Given the known use of new and experimental materials during the period, a focused materials study could be a beneficial addition to this goal.

**Goal 4: Increasing the Understanding of the Mid-Century Modernism Through a Popular Publication or Other Outreach Materials**

This project can be viewed as a process wherein the City is working with preservation organizations and interested individuals to collect and better understand Mid-Century Modern architecture in Sacramento. The historic context serves the purpose of the first step of providing baseline information and further needs. One of the primary purposes of this context and report is to provide the City with a tool to understand the local stock of Mid-Century Modern resources for planning and preservation efforts. Thus, the format of this report is more formulaic and based on similar examples that have been produced by other municipalities in previous years under the same funding program.
This report; however, also provides an opportunity to use the results found within it to serve additional outreach purposes beyond the City. Contextual themes and subthemes can be used to illustrate, in a popular manner and format, certain topics that better appeal to residents and even non-residents advocating for Mid-Century Modern preservation. The results may be a series of pamphlets or white papers on individual styles with examples or architectural features or materials with examples.

SacMod has proven very successful in using stylized web-based content, focused social media, and artistic informative hardcopy to connect with the public and interact with their members and advocacy-focused constituency. Similarly, SacMod’s home tour brochures are presented in a format that is visually engaging and informative to a broader range of audience than might be a more technical document such as this context report. The content of these SacMod materials (particularly the home tour guides) are intentionally more concise to quickly capture and retain the attention of the audience while keeping the physical package (home tour guides) manageable for people taking the tour or getting a specific preservation message to the audience clearly, quickly, and succinctly (social media).

Educational opportunities can be created by merging focused factual-based information or guidance with a format that is interesting and that would continue to connect broadly with people interested in the preservation of Mid-Century Modern resources. The results may be a series of pamphlets using the SacMod home tour format or web modules on individual styles with examples or architectural features, design reasoning, or construction materials with examples.

6.1.2 Priorities

Priorities for the City to accomplish its goals to collaborate, understand, identify, and evaluate its outstanding Mid-Century Modern properties in Sacramento include:

- Provide access to an interactive database for preservation organizations and interested individuals.
- Initiate intensive-level survey and research to address specific subthemes and important properties.
- Investigate funding opportunities to achieve goals and accomplish priorities. This priority could include future CLG grants to continue the program commenced under this grant. Future CEQA legal precedents may outline future mitigation banking possibilities that could be used to help fund Mid-Century Modern preservation efforts.

6.1.3 Candidates for Further Study

Candidates for further study will be identified as the reconnaissance-level survey data is synthesized. As part of the project, SacMod suggested five potential properties that should be examined further as part of another phase.

Sacramento Zoo Entrance Structures

In 2012, as part of the Cultural Landscape Survey and Evaluation of William Land Park project, the Sacramento Zoo Entrance structures, designed in 1961 by the architectural firm Rickey and Brooks, were identified as significant in the area of architecture. The previous project recommended that the three structures are individually eligible as one property for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and the Sacramento Register (Mead & Hunt and PGA Design 2012:B2-1). The Sacramento Zoo Entrance structures are an individual property that should be the subject of an intensive-level evaluation.
In their research and advocacy efforts, SacMod has identified 21 Streng Brothers homes built before 1970; eight built after 1970; and seven that require further research. These houses require additional study to determine the best approach for evaluating these properties. It could be that these properties lend themselves to a multiple property documentation.

6377 Oakridge Way
Architect: Carter Sparks, 1970
Source: SacMod, 2013
**Blomberg Block Residences**

In the South Land Park neighborhood, there is a high concentration of Blomberg built residences. As part of the reconnaissance-level survey, several of the original model homes were identified. Further research and intensive-level evaluation is needed to identify the potential for a historic district. Boundaries for the potential district would need to be defined and an assessment of integrity to determine which residences would qualify as contributors or non-contributors to the potential historic district.

**Figure 79. Blomberg Advertisement**

![Blomberg Advertisement]

Source: *The Sacramento Bee*, 1948
South Hills Shopping Center

This shopping center is Sacramento’s last important example of a Googie shopping center. A previous evaluation by Historic Environment Consultants was prepared. That initial documentation evaluated the shopping center as a historic district and its potential eligibility for listing on the CRHR and Sacramento Register. That original evaluation determined that the South Hills Shopping Center is likely eligible for the two registers. Additional research and evaluation for all three registration programs is needed.

Figure 80. South Hills Shopping Center

Source: GEI Consultants, Inc., 2016
**Historic Neon Signs**

Sacramento has some excellent examples of historic neon signs. SacMod has compiled a comprehensive list of the city’s neon signs. A multiple property document should be prepared to provide an appropriate historic context, and evaluate the signs’ significance, both as individual properties and as possible historic districts.

**Figure 81. A&A Building Supply**

6800 Folsom Boulevard
Source: City of Sacramento Reconnaissance Level Survey, 2017
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Appendix A. City Reviewed Mid-Century Modern Resources
As part of the background research for the project, the City provided the project team with documentation on previously evaluated resources constructed between 1940 to 1970. The following table is a list of those materials provided. It is not intended to be a comprehensive list and inquiries about additional evaluations should be directed to the City’s Preservation Director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Historic Name</th>
<th>Built Date</th>
<th>CHR Status Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th Avenue, 3565</td>
<td>Shiloh Baptist Church</td>
<td>1958-1963</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th Avenue, 1967</td>
<td>Murphy Residence</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>5S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Street, 720</td>
<td>Sacramento County Courthouse</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Street, 1811</td>
<td>Firestone Tire Warehouse</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd Street, 2940</td>
<td>Kyles Temple African Methodist Zion Church</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58th Street, 5312</td>
<td>Episcopal Zion Church</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway, 1518</td>
<td>Tower Theater</td>
<td>ca. 1940</td>
<td>3/5D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Avenue, 2620</td>
<td>Trinity Episcopal Cathedral and Bishop’s House</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>6Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dos Rios Boulevard, 700</td>
<td>Dos Rios School</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>3S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom Boulevard, 5900</td>
<td>Transportation Laboratory</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeport Boulevard, 4701</td>
<td>Senator Savings and Loan Association</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Street, 1630</td>
<td>Vogel Chevrolet</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Street, 1217</td>
<td>Esquire Theater</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. 7th Street, 344</td>
<td>State of California Printing Plant</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>5S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. 10th Street, 521</td>
<td>William Volker Company</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. 7th Street, 524</td>
<td>McKesson &amp; Robbins Wholesale Drug &amp; Liquor Distribution Center</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>5S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. 16th Street, 318</td>
<td>Flying “A” Gas Station Building</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>5D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. C Street, 1341</td>
<td>Fire Station #14</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>5S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. C Street, 1610-1620</td>
<td>L.R. Murphy Scale Co./Top Hot Potato Chip Factory</td>
<td>ca. 1941</td>
<td>5D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Boulevard, 950</td>
<td>Coffin-Reddington Drugs</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>5S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Boulevard, 1100</td>
<td>Zellerbach Paper Company</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>5S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Boulevard, 1400</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1946-1948</td>
<td>5S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Street, 2513-2519</td>
<td>Mirabella Apartments</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Street, 6301</td>
<td>SMUD Headquarters Building</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton Boulevard, 3522</td>
<td>Colonial Theatre</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>3S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SacMod’s List of Notable MCM Places in the City of Sacramento

Notes from SacMod:
- Very difficult to rank these places/resources.
- Places/resources below grouped by primary category.
- List is more qualitative than database spreadsheet, but both are still works in progress. We will undoubtedly be updating this list and spreadsheet over time, based on new info as it is presented.
- No list or spreadsheet can replace an active and ongoing dialog regarding the reasons behind why we believe these places/resources are significant / have integrity / are eligible / should be recognized.

Eichler Homes Historic District

- Jones & Emmons, 1955. (~ Less than 60 homes remain)
- All homes located on three streets:
  - Homes on South Land Park Drive: 6280 to 6525 SLP Dr.
  - Homes on Fordham Way: 6408 to 6500 Fordham Way
  - Homes on Oakridge Way: 6406 to 6448 Oakridge Way

William Land Park Historic District

- Sacramento Zoo
  - Zoo: Garrett Eckbo animal sculptures. Relocated from K Street Mall. 1968.
    - Snake slide; hippo; ostrich
  - Zoo: Reptile House. Sacramento Zoo.

- Fairytale Town

- WPA Rock Garden. Works Progress Administration, 1940.
  - 15th Avenue, east of Land Park Drive.

- William Land Park Golf Clubhouse

Iva Gard Shepard Garden and Arts Building
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**Gunther’s Ice Cream & Animated Neon Sign**
- Original animated neon sign designed by Samuel Stover / Electrical Products Corporation.

**Capitol Mall / Downtown Redevelopment Historic District**
**1940-1970**
- Has been previously and partially evaluated.

- **Master Plan:** Neutra & Alexander. 1950. Ask for report.

- **Capitol Mall Gateway Concept:** Sasaki, Walker, Lackey Associates, 1964.

- **Capitol Mall Spun Aluminum Light standards:** Line 2E2 Mercury Luminaires.

- **IBM Building:** 520 Capitol Mall. Dreyfuss & Blackford. 1964.

- **Downtown Plaza Towers:** 555 Capitol Mall.

- **Federal Office & Court Building:** 650 Capitol Mall. 1959-1961.
  - Devine, Goodpastor, Franceschi, Dreyfuss & Blackford, Rickey & Brooks


- **5th Street Underpass:** Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, roughly 1961.

- **400 O Street:** Leo A. Daly & Associates, 1962.

- **Pioneer House:** 415 P Street. Scholer and Fuller. 1966.

- **Governor’s Square Apartments:** 1451 3rd Street (West), 520 P Street (East).
  Robert Powell, Developer. 1970+

**Capitol Towers Historic District**
- Arguably, part of the whole Redevelopment of Downtown.
  - See Fact Sheet & National Register nomination.
  - Determined eligible by the Keeper of the National Register and is on the CRHR.
  - Includes residential tower, site plan, landscaping, garden apartments, etc.
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Chinatown Mall Historic District
- Arguably, part of the whole Redevelopment of Downtown
- Includes an intact phone booth (rare!)
    - NOTE: Already identified as eligible by CalTrans in 2008.
  - **Landscape Design**: Baronian & Danielson. 1967+.
  - **Hong Kong Lum Restaurant**: 419 K Street. Sooky Lee. 1970.
  - **J. Sun Yat-Sen Memorial**:
  - **Ping Yuen Center**: 420 I Street. Warren Wong. 1970. (Demolished/alterd?)
  - **Bing Kong Tong**: 918 5th Street. Henry Yee. 1971.
  - **Hong Kong Bank**: 429 J. Hertzka & Knowles. 1970.

Nisei War Memorial. 1515 4th Street
- One of the few West End survivors. Was formerly The Flower Garden, an African-American owned restaurant. It then became the Nisei VFW Post in 1956.
- Last surviving commercial building of Sacramento's Japantown.

Outstanding MCM Banks
- **1108 O Street - California State Employees Association Building**
  - Prefabricated ThinLite Curtain Walls
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- **730 I Street - former Bank of America and interim City Hall**
  - mosaic tile work: Alfonso Pardiñas of Byzantine Mosaics

- **4701 Freeport Boulevard; former Senator Savings & Loan**
  - Baravetto & Thomas, 1964.

- **2200 J Street: former Fort Sutter Savings.** Kenneth C. Rickey. 1953.

- **1300 21st Street: former West Coast Savings and Loan Association**

- **2101 J Street: former Capital Federal Savings & Loan**

- **1331 Broadway: former Sumimoto Bank.**

- **1631 Broadway: former Guild Savings and Loan Association**
  - George Muraki. 1964.

- **5660 Freeport: Wells Fargo Bank. Part of Crossroads development**
  - Dean F. Unger & Ernest Kump Associates. 1965.
  - Sasaki, Walker, Lackey Associates
  - Part of Crossroads development (which was affected by the jet crash at Farrell’s in 1972).

Outstanding Local Modern Master Architect / Builder Offices

- **Offices for Dreyfuss & Blackford**
  - **2729 I Street.** Dreyfuss & Blackford. 1961.
  - **3540 Folsom Boulevard.** Dreyfuss & Blackford. 1965.


- **Office for Dean F. Unger:** 700 Alhambra Boulevard. Dean F. Unger. 1970.

- **Sacramento Builders Exchange:** 1331 T Street. Leonard F. Starks. 1951
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Sacramento Googie Greats

- South Hills Shopping Center Historic District. 1960-1968. Rare and intact.
  - Three parcels, including these highlighted buildings:
    - Barrel vault concrete shells
    - Folded plate roofline with clerestory windows

  - Of note, Lee was a local consulting architect for renowned firm Armet & Davis

- Mahoroba Japanese Bakery, Formerly Mac Farlane’s Candies

- Land Park Ski & Sports, Formerly Woody’s Smorgasburger

  - Rare and intact hyperbolic paraboloids.
    - 2240 Northgate
    - 4716 Auburn Boulevard

- Phillips 66 Stations.
  - Rare and intact "double bat wing" style, aka "The New Look," "Harlequin."
    - Suzie Burger. 2820 P Street
    - A-1 Auto Repair, 2025 Broadway.

- Orbit Wash, Formerly Wilshire Gas Station. 2000 9th Street.
  - George Christensen. 1963.

- Former Safeway: 915 Broadway. Tod Hart. 1957


Streng Bros Homes Multiple Property Listing

Pre- to 1970:
- 1222 Woodfield Avenue (1963) South Land Park Hills #27: R123, F547-554
- 85 Starlit (1963) Greenhaven #1: visual identification / no original permit
- 71 Lakeshore Circle (1964) Greenhaven #2: R146, F586-593
- 6483 Driftwood (1964) South Land Park Riviera (Pocket): R123, F559-565
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- 1100 Foxhall Way (1965) South Land Park Hills #44: R172, F339-345
- 6481 Lake Park Drive (1965) South Land Park Hills #44: R167, F205-213
- 41 Springbrook (1965) Greenhaven 70 Unit 2: R168, F382-387
- 1005 Piedmont (1965) Little Pocket: R166, F388-384
- 7375 Willow Lake Way (1966) South Land Park Hills 29:
  visual identification / no original permit
- 11 Sunlit (1966) Greenhaven #3: R181, F204-201
- 80 Sunlit (1967) Greenhaven #4: R212 F351-358
- 7360 Willow Lake Way (1968) South Land Park Hills 29: R235, F564-569
- 71 Starglow Circle (1968) Greenhaven #4: R226, F369-374; R227 F595rev
- 102 Starglow Circle (1968) Greenhaven #4: R226, F375-380
- 6443 Driftwood (1968) South Land Park Riviera (Pocket): R231, F328-333
- 57 Starglow Circle (1969) Greenhaven #4: R268, F606-614

Post 1970:

- 1320 42nd Avenue (1971) South Land Park Hills 10A: R318(?), F515-521
- 15 Bajia Court (1975) South Land Park Riviera 03: R402, F819-622
- 1200 Roadway Drive (1976) South Land Park Unit #2: R461, F520-526
- 1253 Noonan & 5140 South Land Park Drive (duplex) (1981) Noonan’s SLP Terrace:
  R552, F378-391

Subdivision: River City Commons
http://www.rivercitycommons.com

“The River City Commons Association (RCCA) is a Streng Bros. Homes common interest
development comprised of 196 single family and half-plex homes built between 1978 and 1981.”

Needs further research:

- 1113 Silver Lake Drive (1964 Herb Niliya) South Land Park Hills #42: R142, F266-273
- 1266 Gilcrest Way (1969) South Land Park Hills #27 (no permit)
- 7575 Rush River Drive (1991) - needs verification
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Carter Sparks Custom Homes Multiple Property Listing
(list compiled by Justin Wood, Carter Sparks Archive/SacMod board member)


Notable MCM in Downtown and Midtown

- Former Dunn Edwards Paint Store: 600 Q Street

  81 poles in 32 hues set in a 9 x 9 grid at the corner of 16th and Q streets.
  Originally all 81 poles were a different color.
  Long attributed to Saul Bass; Bass commissioned and approved a 12-inch model
  designed by USC-trained Hastings who was working for Herb Rosenthal &
  Associates. These poles had been originally designed by Hastings for the 1964
  World Fair but had not been used for that project.

- Gordon D. Schaber Sacramento County Courthouse + Plaza:
  720 9th Street. 1965.
  Starks, Jozens & Nacht, Architects
  Sasaki Walker & Associates, Landscape Architects
  Proteus Fountain, Aristides Demetrios. Bronze and copper.

- Court Plaza Building. 901 H Street. Rickey & Brooks. 1964.


- Sacramento Convention Center (aka Sacramento Community Center Complex)
  1301 L Street and 1400 J Street. 1968-74.
  Architects: Pietro Belluschi, consultant; plus Sacramento Architects Collaborative:
  - Angello-Vitiello Associates;
  - Barovetto, Carissimi and Rohrer;
  - James C. Dodd & Associates;
  - Koblik, Cordoba, Gerwin & Associates
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  - Landscape architects: Robert Deering (1958) and Daniel Yoshpe (1962)
- **Office for Associate Brokers, Inc.**: 2319 K Street. Dean F. Unger. 1960.
- **Office Building**: 2730 C Street. Raymond Franceschi. 1963
- **Office Building**: 1912 F Street, Murray & McCormick, Inc. 1962.
- **The Bermuda Apartments**: 2301 H Street. 1955.
- **Bus Station**: 1129 I Street. Tod Hart. 1960.
- **Vogel Chevrolet**: 1630 I Street. Dreyfuss & Blackford. 1957.
- **Restaurant - Frank Fat’s**: 806 L Street. Sooky Lee remodel. Check year.
- **Office Building**: 1812 J Street: Herbert Goodpastor. 1948.
- **Office Building**: 2327 L Street. Dean Unger. 1966.
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- **Office Building**: 2201 Capitol Ave. Herbert Goodpastor. 1952.
- **Apartments**: 2425 Capitol Ave. 1959.
- **Ouye’s Pharmacy**: 2130 10th Street. George Muraki. 1959.
- **Sac State Mental Clinic**: 2815 O Street. Roy Swedin / Swedin & Carlson. 1961.
- **Sacramento Bee**: 2100 Q Street. Lockwood Greene Engineers. 1952.
- **YMCA**: 2021 W Street. Herbert Goodpastor, Master Plan. 1953+
  - Unsubstantiated attribution to Leonard Starks, 1951, via Nacht & Lewis.
  - Trent was one of the first African-American doctors in Sacramento.
- **Young’s Fireside Shop**: 1627 16th Street. Sooky Lee. 1961.
  - Has VERY RARE MCM gold shadow ceramic tiles from Gladding McBean!
- **Office Building**: 1220 25th Street. Leonard F. Starks. 1948

Compiled by Gretchen Steinberg/SacModPage 9 of 21In Progress 9.28.17
SacMod’s List of Notable MCM Places in the City of Sacramento

- **Office Building**: 2200 21st Street. Dean F. Unger. 1969.
- **Office Building**: 2028 K Street. Harry Devine, Sr. 1953.

South Land Park Neighborhood MCM - multiple residential and commercial. (Includes South Land Park Terrace, South Land Park Hills, etc.)
- *This area probably has the highest concentration of MCM within city limits.*
- This area also includes the architectural work of women and people of color.
- Many other places / resources - listed under other categories/headers;
- Many significant examples of MCM from several significant architects/builder/designers. Including, *but not limited to*:
  - Sparks & Thaden
  - Rickey & Brooks
  - Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons
  - Herbert Goodpastor
  - Koblik & Fisher
  - Grant Caywood
  - Sooky Lee
  - Henry Yee
  - James Dodd
  - Dean Unger
  - Mau & Barnum
  - Harry Jang
  - Joseph Angello
  - George Muraki
  - Eva Fong Low
  - Gale Sosnick
  - Streng Bros.
  - Lewis & Bristow
  - Spore & White
  - G.W. Haggett

- **Blomberg Homes Neighborhood / Potential District in South Land Park**:
  - Area known as “Vista Del Rio.” Example: 1421 Claremont Way. 1950
  - **Blomberg Window Systems**: 1453 Blair Avenue. Sparks & Thaden. 1958.

- **Eichler Homes Historic District** is located in South Land Park
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- **Corum Village** (Gilgumn/Claudia/32nd Ave/Rickey) is located in South Land Park
  - Dreyfuss & Blackford. 1952-1954.

- **Sacramento Executive Airport**: 6151 Freeport Boulevard.

- **Sacramento Fire Department Reserve HQ**: 1910 Arica Way.
  - William Koblik. 1950.

- **Harry A Nauman & Son**: 4041 Freeport Boulevard

- **Sutterville Shopping Center**: 4400-4408 Del Rio Road. Kooper & Maybeck. 1955.

**Land Park Neighborhood MCM**
- See also **William Land Park Historic District**, mentioned above
- Many other places / resources - listed under other headings

- **Alder Grove/New Helvetia Public Housing** on Broadway
  - Listed on National Register and California Register of Historic Resources.


  - On Sacramento Register. Ask for a copy.

**Greenhaven Neighborhood MCM** - multiple residential and commercial
- Greenhaven is an outstanding example of cluster planning.
- Many significant examples of MCM from several significant architects/builders/designers. Examples include, but are not limited to:
  - Spore & White;
  - Lewis & Bristow;
  - Edward Schlick, AIA;
  - Faszer Drafting;
  - And many, many others.

- **Frank H. Seymour Park / beltway with greenspaces**

- **Streng Bros. Homes; suggest multi-property listing / district (see above)**
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- **Kennedy High School.** 6715 Gloria Drive. Used modular components.
  - Stafford and Peckinpaugh, 1957.

**East Sacramento Neighborhood MCM** - multiple residential and commercial

- Includes **River Park Neighborhood** - residential and commercial; heavy concentration of MCM

  - Homes and buildings designed by modern masters and others — including, but not limited to:
    - Carter Sparks and Donald Thaden
    - George Muraki
    - William Koblik
    - Raymond L. Watson
    - Chris Larson
    - Perich Bros.
    - Weiland Henry
    - Harry J. Devine, Sr.
    - Starks, Jozens and Nacht
    - Cox & Liske
    - Grant Caywood & Associates
    - Dreyfuss & Blackford
    - Wallace Alexander
    - Erling Olauson
    - Dean Unger
    - Rickey & Brooks
    - Saterlee & Tomich
    - Armet & Davis
    - Alfred W. Johnson
    - George Haggett
    - Barovetto, Rohrer & Carissini
    - Herbert Goodpastor
    - Gordon Stafford
    - Raymond R. Franceschi
    - Earl John Taylor

- **Fire Station 8.** 5990 H Street. Cox & Liske, 1959.

- **Scottish Rite Masonic Center,** 6151 H. Starks, Jozens and Nacht. 1961.

- **Clunie Center Library & Pool House.** 601 Alhambra Boulevard.

  - Landscape architects = Royston, Hanamoto, Mayes & Beck
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- **Mercy General Hospital**: 4001 J St. Harry J. Devine, Sr. 1950s.
- **Mercy General Hospital Chapel**: 4050 H St. Rex Whittaker Allen & Associates. 1963

**Golf Course Terrace Neighborhood MCM** - residential and commercial

- **Dr. Oyoung Residence**: 2000 56th Avenue. Sooky Lee. 1959
- **Schorr Residence**: 1611 59th Avenue. 1957/58. Research in progress.
- **Bing Maloney Clubhouse**: 6801 Freeport Boulevard. Harry Devine, Sr. 1951.
- **James Dodd Residence**: 1860 60th Avenue. James Dodd.

**Tallac Village / Tahoe Park**

- Includes the **Jacinto Homes Neighborhood**. Manuel Jacinto, late 1940s - mid-50s.
  - conventional plus MCM Basalite (via Blomberg)/cinderblock models
  - many have been modified, but could be rehabilitated. Definitely important for context statement.
  - Jacinto also used these for the Mabel Gillis Library; 4001 60th Street. 1957.
    - intact, but repurposed as a house.

- **Includes a block of early (1947 +/-) Basalite homes based upon a Blomberg design “The Pioneer” by Raymond Franceschi**
  - 5915 - 6071 Jansen Drive
  - They have been modified, but they are important for context statement.

- Shopping center on 14th Ave. Research in progress.
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- **Village Drive-In.** 3810 60th Street. 1958. Intact, with tilted roof and glass

**Campus Commons Neighborhood MCM**

- multiple residential and commercial
- Includes the work of Charles Warren Callister, Dreyfuss & Blackford, etc.
- Research in progress.

**American River Neighborhood MCM** - multiple residential and commercial

- Mostly in County, but some in City. Research in progress.
- Includes places designed by, but not limited to:
  - Homes and buildings designed by modern masters and others — including, but not limited to:
    - Carter Sparks
    - Cox & Liske
    - Streng Bros. Homes
    - Richard Krieger
    - Dean Unger
    - John Harvey Carter
    - Dreyfuss & Blackford

**Parker Homes**

- Near McClellan Field, off of Raley Boulevard, north and south of I-80.
- Streets include Doolittle St, MacArthur St, Nimitz St, Goss Ct, Dewitt Ct, etc
- "Temporary" military housing; one story ranch and raised homes. ~1K square feet, included pre-fabricated components.
- William Wurster and Charles Dean. 1942-1946. Landscaping by Thomas Church
- Parker Homes for the Federal Works Agency
  * Example: 407 Stillwell Ct

**Places of Worship and Faith**

**Note:** there are many places; this is just a small sampling

- **Christian Science Reading Room.** 3325 J Street. Albert M. Dreyfuss. 1955.
- **Covenant Reform Church, Formerly Church of Christ**
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- **Lutheran Church of the Master**: 1900 Potrero Way. Satterlee & Tomich. 1960

- **Parkside Community Church**: 5700 South Land Park Drive.
  - Starks, Jozens & Nacht. 1959.

- **First Christian Church**: 3901 Folsom. Herbert E. Goodpastor. 1954.

- **Central Methodist Church**: 5265 H Street.
  - Original building - Charles F. Dean, 1955
  - Addition by Satterlee & Tomich 60s

- **First English Lutheran Church**: Oak Park. Cox & Liske addition.

- **Kyles Temple AME Zion Church**: 2940 42nd Street.
  - Whitson Cox and James Dodd. 1956
  - on Sacramento Register. M14-018

- **Sacramento Buddhist Church**: 2401 Riverside Boulevard. 1959+1967.
  - 1959: Adams & Mastrototaro
  - 1967: Ray Takata

- **Our Lady of Guadalupe Church**: 711 T Street. Harry J Devine, Sr. 1957.

- **Fremont Presbyterian Church**: 5770 Carlson Drive, River Park


**MCM schools**

*Note: there are many places; this is just a small sampling*

- **Holy Spirit Parish School**: 3920 West Land Park Drive.
  - Harry J. Devine, Sr. 1948.

- **Sacramento City College Buildings (Various)**, including stadium

  All three schools with same design. They appear to be by Koblik & Fisher:
  - **Rosa Parks Middle School**: 2250 68th Ave. 1960.
    - Formerly Charles M Goethe Jr High
  - **Fern Bacon**: 4140 Cuny Avenue. 1958 Additions.
  - **Will C. Wood**: 6201 Lemon Hill. 1958 Additions.
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- **Hiram Johnson**: 6879 14th Ave. Charles F. Dean. 1958.

- **McGeorge School of Law**: Additions. Sook Lee. 1971.


- **Sutter Middle School**: 3150 1 St. Gordon Stafford. 1958.

- **Luther Burbank High School**: 3500 Florin. Satterlee & Tomich. 1958.
  - Raymond Franceschi identified with project in a May, 1963 Masonry Joint Industry Board of Sacramento award, per Sacramento Bee.

State and Federal Buildings

- **Capitol Annex**: Alfred Eichler. 1952.

- **Office Buildings #8 and #9**: 714 / 744 P Street. 1969.
  - Office of the State Architect, Fred Hummel
  - Research in progress re: additional architects and landscape architect.

- **Cal Expo**
  - Landscape architecture: Lawrence Halprin

- **CSUS**
  - Research in progress.
  - Master plan: Charles F. Dean. 1949.
  - Additional architects:
    - Herbert E. Goodpastor
      - Cafeteria. 1951
    - Gordon Stafford.
      - Library. 1951.
      - Administration Building. 1951.

  - Nacht & Lewis
    - Psychology Building. 1971.
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- **UCD Med Center**: Formerly Sacramento County Hospital.
  - North/South Hospital Wing: George Sellon. 1951

- **California State Printing Plant**: 344 N. 7th Street. 1954.
  - Wurster, Bernardi and Emmons

**HISTORIC NEON SIGNS**

**Notes re neon signs:**
- **Need further research to definitively determine who did what.** Estimates below.
- Some cases are clear. Others need verification
- **Electrical Products Corporation** went by several nicknames: **EPCO, Eplo, Epleo; Zeon**
- Not all notable neon signs are listed here.

**Neon/Sign Corridor / District - Broadway and Land Park**

- **Quick Lunch**: 513 Broadway.
  - Electric Sign Service Co. 1946

- **Tower Theatre**: 2508 Land Park Drive
  - Architect William B. David. 1938. Protected already?

- **Tower Records Dancing Kids**: **ANIMATED!** 1518 Broadway.
  - Samuel Stover / Electrical Products Corporation. 1949. Protected already?

- **Joe Marty's**: 1500 Broadway. Protected already?
  - Coastal Neon. 1953.

- **Pancake Circus**: 2101 Broadway

- **Ring up Rivett**: 2300 Broadway. Protected already?

- **Vic's Ice Cream**: 3199 Riverside Boulevard

- **76 Rotating Ball**: original and operational. Ed's 76 gas station. 2400 15th Street

(Also: Gunther's - previously listed for building + sign)
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Neon Corridor / District - Freeport Boulevard

- **Trails**: 2530 21st Street.
  - Epco. 1955.

- **College Cyclery**: 2760 21st Street.
  - Electric Sign Service Co. 1946.

- **Marie’s Donuts**: 2950 Freeport Boulevard. (Currently broken)
  - Could encourage reintroduction with development of district

- **Raley’s**: 4850 Freeport Boulevard.
  - Electrical Products Corporation. 1958

- **Gem Auto Wash**: 5150 Freeport Boulevard.
  - Recently rehabilitated and returned to the cityscape
  - Sign from 1956, 1969 or 1972. Needs further research to pinpoint.

- **Hollywood Hardware**: 5303 Freeport Boulevard.

Neon Corridor / District - Folsom Boulevard, East Sacramento

- **Club Raven** (80s repro; ANIMATED): 3246 J Street. Original 1946 Electric Sign Co.

- **East Lawn Clock**: 4300 Folsom Boulevard. 1940s by Ed Farrens.

- **Español**: 5723 Folsom. Likely 1959, Pacific Neon.

- **Hilltop Bar**: 4757 Folsom. Likely 1958, Best Neon.


Neon Corridor / District - Downtown

- **Downtown Garage**: 501 T Street. Likely 1959, Epleo Signs.

- **KCRA**: 310 10th Street. Early 50s.

- **Hotel Berry**: 729 L Street.

- **Jim Denny’s**: 816 12th Street.
  - Electric Sign Service. 1940.
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- **Hotel Marshall**: 1122 7th Street (Two signs; threatened)
- **Crest Marquee**: 1013 K Street. PROTECTED?
- **CSAC and clock**: 1100 K Street. 1956? 1966?
- **Esquire**: 1211 K Street. Epco. 1940.
- **Mayes Clock** (reportedly used to be near Crest and was relocated)
  - 1006 J Street. Reportedly one of the earliest uses of neon in the city.
- **Pfaff Sewing**: 1022 J Street. 1951, Pacific Neon.
- **Fong’s Liquors**: 1126 I Street. 1947, Pacific Neon. 1956, Sierra Neon.
- **Posey’s**: 1100 O Street
- **Old Ironsides**: 1901 10th Street
  - Electrical Sign Service Co. 1939.
- **Osaka Ya**: 2215 10th Street.
- **Wakano Ura**: 2217 10th Street
  - Eplo Co. 1959.

**Neon Corridor / District - Midtown**

- **Family Laundry**: 2110 16th Street (being repaired and returned to the cityscape).
  - Pacific Neon. 1954
- **Harry’s Cafe**: 2026 16th Street (repurposed Yee Pharmacy sign?)
  - Sunset Neon. 1962.
- **Flame Club**: 2130 16th Street
- **Mercury Cleaners**: 1420 16th Street. Recently rehabilitated by Pacific Neon.
  - Hard to pinpoint. Permits show ‘47/’57/’67. Likely ’47 per reports during repairs.
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Appendix C. Sacramento’s “Architects” of Modernism 1940-1970
## MCM Architects, Designers, Builders, etc. in the City of Sacramento circa 1940-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacramento Area / Region Architects</th>
<th>(Incomplete List)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Wallace J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angello</td>
<td>Joseph F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnum</td>
<td>Wesley J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barovetto</td>
<td>Silvio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackford</td>
<td>Leonard D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>Gary Spencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Jr.</td>
<td>Earl V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>John Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caywood</td>
<td>Grant D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox</td>
<td>Whitson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devine, Jr</td>
<td>Harry Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devine, Sr</td>
<td>Harry Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodd</td>
<td>James C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreyfuss</td>
<td>Albert M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eatough</td>
<td>C. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eichler</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fong</td>
<td>Bucky H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franceschi</td>
<td>Raymond R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Clifford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodpastor</td>
<td>Herbert E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Frederick F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgins</td>
<td>George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummel</td>
<td>Fred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jang</td>
<td>Harry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jozens</td>
<td>Joseph J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Area / Region Architects</td>
<td>(Incomplete List)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koblik</td>
<td>William AIA, Koblik &amp; Fisher, Koblik, Cordoba, Garwin &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Sooky AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leighton</td>
<td>Francis E. AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lionakis</td>
<td>George AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liske</td>
<td>J.R. AIA, Cox &amp; Liske</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mau</td>
<td>Malcom Otto &quot;Bud&quot; AIA, Barnum &amp; Mau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuire</td>
<td>Clovis AIA, McGuire &amp; Eatough, McGuire, Eatough &amp; Fong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muraki</td>
<td>George AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacht</td>
<td>Daniel J. FAIA, Starks, Jozens, &amp; Nacht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niiya</td>
<td>Herbert Y. AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nopp</td>
<td>Jack AIA, Caywood &amp; Nopp, Nopp, Takata, Hansen, &amp; Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okholm</td>
<td>Harold C. AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olauson</td>
<td>Erling AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>Melvin L. AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rickey</td>
<td>Kenneth C. AIA, Rickey &amp; Brooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachs</td>
<td>Mort L. AIA, Office of the State Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satterlee</td>
<td>Ivan C. AIA, Satterlee &amp; Tomich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer</td>
<td>Micheal AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soesnick</td>
<td>Gale AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparks</td>
<td>Carter E. AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>Gordon AIA, Stafford, King &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starks</td>
<td>Leonard F. AIA, Starks &amp; Flanders, Starks, Jozens, &amp; Nacht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedin</td>
<td>Roy O. AIA, Swedin &amp; Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Earl John AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaden</td>
<td>Donald AIA, Worked w/ Sparks in late 50s-early 60s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Albert M. AIA, Barovetto &amp; Thomas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sacramento Area / Region Architects (Incomplete List)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Firm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomich</td>
<td>Nicholas A.</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>Satterlee &amp; Tomich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unger</td>
<td>Dean F.</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitiello</td>
<td>Ralph E.</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>Angello-Vitiello &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Frank G.</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yee</td>
<td>Henry F.</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Nationally & Internationally Acclaimed Architects with examples of work in Sacramento (Incomplete list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Firm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Richard E.</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armet</td>
<td>Louis L.</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>Armet &amp; Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Edward Larabee</td>
<td>FAIA Gold Medal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belusschi</td>
<td>Pietro</td>
<td>FAIA Gold Medal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardi</td>
<td>Theodore C.</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td>Wurster, Bernardi &amp; Emmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloch</td>
<td>Bernard J.</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>Wurster, Bernardi &amp; Emmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolles</td>
<td>John S.</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td>Wurster, Bernardi &amp; Emmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callister</td>
<td>Charles Warren</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>Wurster, Bernardi &amp; Emmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan</td>
<td>Lun</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>Wurster, Bernardi &amp; Emmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Eldon C.</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>Armet &amp; Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMars</td>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmons</td>
<td>Frederick E.</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td>Jones &amp; Emmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmons</td>
<td>Donn</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td>Wurster, Bernardi &amp; Emmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>M. Milton</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td>Mayer, Whittlesey, &amp; Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertzka</td>
<td>Wayne Soloman</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td>Hertzka &amp; Knowles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Neil Munroe</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationally &amp; Internationally Acclaimed Architects with examples of work in Sacramento (incomplete list)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Firm Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Lyman</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Alfred W.</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>A. Quincy</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td>Jones &amp; Emmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowles</td>
<td>William Howard</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>Hertzka &amp; Knowles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kooper</td>
<td>Karel</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krisel</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td>Mayer, Whittlesey, &amp; Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKay</td>
<td>Jock</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutra</td>
<td>Richard J.</td>
<td>FAIA Gold Medal</td>
<td>Neutra &amp; Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reay</td>
<td>Donald P.</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rojko</td>
<td>Melvin</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>Bank Building Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treffinger</td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td>Wurster, Bernardi &amp; Emmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittlesey</td>
<td>Julian H.</td>
<td>FAIA</td>
<td>Mayer, Whittlesey, &amp; Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurster</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>FAIA Gold Medal</td>
<td>Wurster, Bernardi &amp; Emmons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Mid-Century Modern Context Statement and Survey Results
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### Appendix C

#### Landscape Architects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Architects</th>
<th>(incomplete list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deering</td>
<td>Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckbo</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halprin</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>James W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasaki Walker</td>
<td>Hideo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittet</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Designers / Drafters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designers / Drafters</th>
<th>(incomplete list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>J. Selby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>Fred E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faszer</td>
<td>Jerome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>Buzz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggett</td>
<td>George W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis &amp; Stonham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loewy</td>
<td>Raymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Eva Fong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastrototaro</td>
<td>John “Mastro”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholtz Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spore White</td>
<td>R. L. M. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Landor &amp; Associates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>Burt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MCM Architects, Designers, Builders, etc. in the City of Sacramento circa 1940-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Engineers</th>
<th>(Incomplete list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McGlade</td>
<td>Leo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klippel</td>
<td>Gordon H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiyama</td>
<td>Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>Fred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amundson</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leo McGlade &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Builders / Developers</th>
<th>(Incomplete list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streng Bros.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blomberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacinto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Builders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis &amp; Bristow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss &amp; Moss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eichler Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See next page
### Contractors / Construction (incomplete list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1 Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.E. Erickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apex Builders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Guro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal-Central Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Construction Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles F. Unger Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental-Heller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David A. Hulse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest L. Mackey Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernandez Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd C. Cantrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Marsala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Schiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guth &amp; Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry W. Robertson, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Y. Yamasaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Beale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dravis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Otto, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Basford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark L. Ures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul R. Christman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perich Bros.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractors / Construction (incomplete list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peterson &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard McGee, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stetson Shuey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoddard Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Construction Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. A historic district should have integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship and association, and

B. The collective historic value of the buildings and structures in a historic district taken together may be greater than the historic value of each individual building or structure.

**Contributing Resources to Historic Districts (City Code Section17.604.210 (C))**

A nominated resource shall be listed in the Sacramento Register as a contributing resource if the City Council finds, after holding the hearing(s) required, that all of the following requirements are satisfied.

A. The nominated resource is within a historic district;

B. The nominated resource either embodies the significant features and characteristics of the historic district or adds to the historical associations, historical architectural qualities or archaeological values identified for the historic district;

C. The nominated resource was present during the period of historical significance of the historic district and relates to the documented historical significance of the historic district;

D. The nominated resource either possesses historic integrity or is capable of yielding important information about the period of historical significance of the historic district; and

E. The nominated resource has important historic or architectural worth, and its designation as a contributing resource is reasonable, appropriate and necessary to promote, protect and further the goals and purposes of the City Code.
Appendix F. Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 Forms
Insert Appendix F PDF here
Listed below are the volunteers who participated in the reconnaissance-level survey, conducted archival research, assisted with writing portions of the historic context, and aided with the intensive-level evaluations. The City and the project’s consultants thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barbara Bass</th>
<th>Sarah Kozal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caru Bowns</td>
<td>Brandy Larrabee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Brown</td>
<td>Brian Menter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Brown</td>
<td>Ian Merker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta Deering</td>
<td>Melissa Montag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zann Gates</td>
<td>Margo Nayyar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Gray</td>
<td>David Orr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Green</td>
<td>JoAnn Pavlinec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Hawkins</td>
<td>Daniel Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Herrick</td>
<td>Gretchen Steinberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Hoover</td>
<td>Janette Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David A. Hoover</td>
<td>Pati Jane Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Hotchkiss</td>
<td>Ryan Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby Kendrick</td>
<td>Laura West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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