

**HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE SURVEY REPORT
FOR
THE “BUNGALOW” COURT PROJECT
Fresno, California**



**Court at 3234 E. Balch Avenue
Photo by: Michael Karibian for the City of Fresno**

**Prepared for: The City of Fresno’s Historic Preservation
Program and the State of California Office
of Historic Preservation**

**Prepared by: Karana Hattersley-Drayton _____
Historic Preservation Project Manager
City of Fresno**

**DPR survey forms prepared by Jon Brady and
Dana Supernowicz**

September 29, 2004

“The activity which is the subject of this survey report has been financed in part with Federal funds from the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, through the California Office of Historic Preservation. However, the contents and opinions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Interior or the California Office of Historic Preservation, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation by the Department of the Interior or the California Office of Historic Preservation.”

“Regulations of the U.S. Department of the Interior strictly prohibit unlawful discrimination in departmental Federally assisted programs on the basis of race, color, sex, age, disability, or national origin. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against in any program, activity or facility operated by a recipient of Federal assistance should write to:

***Director, Equal Opportunity Program
U.S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service
P.O. Box 37127
Washington, D.C. 20013-7127***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary4-5

Research Methods6-7

Historical Overview 8-20

- Early History and Development of Fresno**
- History and Development of Courtyard Housing**
- Courts in Fresno**
- Property Type**
- Typology**
- Architectural Styles**
- Periods of Significance**
- Architecture for a New Urbanism**

Findings and Conclusions 21-31

Qualifications of Project Staff 32

References33-35

Appendix:

- Figure 1: Project Vicinity Map**
- Figure 2: Map of Reconnaissance Survey Areas**
- Figure 3: Map of Evaluated Courts**
- Figure 4: Fresno Bee article**
- Figure 5: Database for Fresno City courts**
- Field Report: Jon Brady and Dana Supernowicz**

Inventory Forms

Summary

Over the course of a year (2003-2004) staff, volunteers and consultants for the City of Fresno's Historic Preservation Program identified 128 examples of "bungalow" courts within the City limits. Numerous other courts also lie within County islands. The stylistic term "bungalow" initially used was a bit misleading, as only three of the extant courts are in fact bungalows or cottages. In fairness, however, the term "bungalow court" has been used as a generic term for courts built in a variety of styles (cf Chase:1981 and Curtis and Ford:1988). Most complexes in Fresno were in fact designed in a pared down Spanish Revival or Minimal Traditional style.

Courtyard housing was identified in the 1991 Tower District Specific Plan as an important thematic group, with court defined as "an arrangement of several separate dwellings on one lot, usually around a central open space" (Tower District Specific Plan 1991:3-17). Thirteen of the 128 examples located within the Fresno City limits were chosen due to age, stylistic elegance or other factors and were fully evaluated on State of California DPR historic inventory forms as part of this historic survey. Consultants Jon Brady and Dana Supernowicz were hired to consider both the individual eligibility of these court complexes and the courts as contributors to a thematic district for the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources and/or Fresno's Local Register of Historic Resources. Court complexes were chosen not only for their age and architectural significance but also for their distribution throughout the City. Thus although several are from the Tower District, other evaluated courts are from the Downtown Triangle area or from the Alta Vista Tract. In addition to the survey photos, professional photographer Michael Karibian was retained to document the courts with an eye to capturing both architectural detail and social history. Ten of these photographs were mounted and hung in an exhibition that was installed at the Fresno City Hall (opening October 4th), "The Art of Historic Preservation." Several of his images are also used with permission in this report.

Brady and Supernowicz (J and R Environmental Services and Historic Resource Associates) surveyed and evaluated the thirteen properties. They concluded that one court, Normandy Village located at 840 E. Brown Avenue (Map Reference # 1) appears to be eligible to the National Register of Historic Places and is eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources as well. This court complex is already listed on Fresno's Local Register of Historic Resources. The consultants found that four courts were eligible to both the California Register and Local Registers: 832 E. Hedges (Map Reference # 2), 3234 E. Balch Avenue

(Map Reference #3), 1333-1353 N. Palm (Map Reference #4) and 950-960 E. Divisadero (Map Reference #5). City staff has since discovered that the court at 1333-1353 N. Palm appears to be associated with William Saroyan and family. If so, it may be that this court will also be eligible to the National Register of Historic Places. Eight courts appeared eligible only to Fresno's Local Register of Historic Resources: 850-858 E. Hedges (Map Reference #6), 830 E. Pine (Map Reference #7), 841 E. Pine (Map Reference #8), 543-607 W. Hammond (Map Reference #9), 1231 P Street (Map Reference #10), 1325 M Street (Map Reference #11), 1331 N Street (Map Reference #12) and 2014-2026 Mayfair Way (Map Reference #13). All thirteen courts will be considered as a thematic non-contiguous historic district for Fresno's Local Register (See Figure #3).

A federal grant of \$5,000 through the California State Office of Historic Preservation partially underwrote the survey. An additional \$2,000 was contributed from the Planning and Development Department's budget. In addition, numerous volunteer and staff hours served as in-kind.

The impetus for this project came from two sources. One was the previous identification of court housing in Fresno's Tower District, and the well-reasoned essay that discussed this important urban property type. The second stemmed from the observation that so much new publicly funded single-family housing in older neighborhoods is not much more than stucco boxes and thus incompatible with the neighborhood. It was easy to predict, without too much cynicism, that these new houses will be the site of serious code violations in the future. Couldn't we do better than this? As a consequence housing staff for the City of Fresno worked on an in-fill home plan that quotes the bungalow, with porch and wood cladding. A second response is the study that follows.

As with the authors of Courtyard Housing in Los Angeles and other articles, City staff endorses the potential viability of court housing as spot in-fill in older neighborhoods of Fresno. Of importance is that the bungalow court design was and remains an expedient and efficient use of land. The central communal space is equally important as a safe retreat, separated from street noise and traffic. Following identification and survey work, a future project will be to locate funding to sponsor a design competition for an updated bungalow court in-fill project. The winning design would hopefully then be constructed on a City owned parcel.

Research Methods

To start the project, the map of identified courts from the 1991 Tower District Specific Plan was used to help identify concentrations of court housing. Numerous other courts in this Specific Plan area as well as other areas of the City were added from informal reconnaissance on the part of the City's Historic Preservation and Planning staff. The oldest areas of the City were then divided into 14 survey areas (see Appendix Figure 2) and a reconnaissance survey of most of these sections was performed in December 2003. Volunteer teams of two, comprised of Planning and Code Enforcement personnel, several environmental planners from Caltrans (both architectural historians and archaeologists), and members of the Tower District Specific Plan Implementation Committee, spent a morning driving and walking their assigned area. The survey teams were given any addresses and building dates of court housing previously identified. A brief training session was held the afternoon prior to the survey and survey teams were asked to identify all potential court housing, and photograph and record basic data on a form that was developed for the survey. Few of the volunteers were trained in architectural history and thus only broad style categories were included. Following the morning survey all teams met for lunch and a debriefing.

A press release was sent out to the media and as a consequence a Fresno Bee reporter, Sandy Nax, tagged along with two separate survey teams, and did an extensive story in the Real Estate section of the paper the following Saturday (see Appendix Figure 4). One television station also sent a reporter and camera crew although it is unknown whether or not that footage was used.

Following the reconnaissance survey the Project Director, Karana Hattersley-Drayton, collated all survey forms and created files for each area. A Research Assistant, Will Tackett, was hired and completed photography and survey work on sections as needed, pulled all building permits, and compiled spread sheets with Assessor Parcel Numbers, addresses, architectural style, original owner if known, date of construction, contractor and subdivision (Appendix Figure 5). Will also went through the Polk Directories to research the tenants who lived in several of the courts that were ultimately chosen to be evaluated.

In July 2004 an RFQ was sent out to eight separate consulting firms and individuals, who met the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications for architecture history. The consulting team of Dana Supernowicz and Jon Brady was hired to prepare DPR forms for at least ten of an identified 20 of the best, most interesting courts. In addition

the consultants were asked to provide updated DPR forms, if needed, for three courts previously evaluated for other projects, including Normandy Village, which was already on Fresno's Local Register of Historic Resources. Karana Hattersley-Drayton (Project Director), Jon and Dana spent one afternoon in the field on July 30th. The Consultants spent the following weekends photographing and recording the courts.

At the City's end the Project Director developed a draft historic overview with a delineation of the property type and typology, based on original research and field observations. Library research included a visit to U.C. Berkeley's Environmental Design Library. The essay on courts from the 1991 Tower District Specific Plan was particularly useful in developing the context for Fresno. Easily the most definitive work on courts, however, was the seminal work, Courtyard Housing in Los Angeles, first published in 1982. Although one could make a distinction between bungalow courts and garden apartments, as did Laura Chase in her 1981 Landscape article, the authors of Courtyard Housing perceived continuity between the earliest "bungalow" courts and the later, more elaborate complexes. The typology, which the authors developed for Los Angeles was therefore adopted, modified and applied to the housing stock here in Fresno.

A questionnaire was also developed and sent to all Certified Local Governments on the Office of Historic Preservation List-Serve. Three cities responded with information, with a spreadsheet and forms from Betty Marvin, Director of Oakland's Preservation program particularly helpful.



Historical Overview

Early History and Development of Fresno

The Yokuts were the first residents of the Fresno area, with small tribes occupying the floodplains of the Big Dry Creek and Little Dry Creek (Gayton 1948:153; Latta 1997:163). Although there were no missions in the Valley, there were small Mexican era settlements including Pueblo de las Junta, located at the confluence of the San Joaquin River and the Fresno Slough (Hoover 1990:86). The Spanish and Mexican influence is indicated through place names such as "Fresno," which means "ash tree" and which was first applied to the Fresno River (Hoover et al 1990:85). Following the Gold Rush of 1849, miners were drawn to the southern gold fields, and cattle ranchers and dryland farmers moved into the area. Three momentous changes occurred in the 1870s, which dramatically changed settlement patterns and history: the construction of the Central Pacific railroad, the introduction of agricultural colonies and the concomitant development of a labyrinth of canals to bring water to these colonies.

In 1870 the Central Pacific Railroad began its diagonal push down the San Joaquin Valley. New towns were surveyed along the corridor--- several were planned by the railroad itself---and earlier villages situated away from the tracks often vanished overnight. In 1872 the railroad reached what is now Fresno. The Contract and Finance Company, a subsidiary of the Railroad, bought 4,480 acres in a desolate area where Dry Creek drained into the plains. Surveyor Edward H. Mix laid out the new town in blocks 320 feet by 400 feet, with 20 foot alleys, lots 25x 150 feet fronting on 80-foot wide streets parallel to and on both sides of the tracks (Clough 1984:121). The gridiron plan was filed in 1873 and was remarkably rigid, broken only by the space reserved for a future courthouse and the broad swaths through the center of town for the tracks, depot and yards (Reps 1979:187).

Fresno's location was uninviting at best, with barren sand plains in all directions. The nearest substantial supply of water was the San Joaquin River, 10 miles to the north (Reps 1979:187). Fresno grew slowly but in 1874 it was able to wrestle the county seat away from the former mining town of Millerton (Hoover 1990:88). The population of Fresno in 1875 was 600, with a third of the residents Chinese who lived west of the tracks. A new resident, R.W. Riggs described the community in 1878 as "not much of a town, a handful of houses in a desert of sand" (Reps 1979:187). Fresno's population was 1,112 in 1880 and 3,464 in 1885. "Yet the town remained a collection of buildings on the prairie

rather than a full-fledged city. There was no police force, sewer system or truly efficient fire department, and cattle were still roaming the dusty streets that became winter lakes” (Clough 1984:141).

The 1880s, however, were prosperous years and the desert was turned into profitable farmland with the introduction of irrigation and agricultural colonies. The model for the system that ultimately served throughout the San Joaquin Valley was the Central California Colony, established in 1875 three miles south of Fresno. Many of the earliest settlers were former miners as well as Scandinavian immigrants: Danes, Swedes and Norwegians (Rehart and Patterson 1988:8). By 1903 there were 48 separate colonies or tracts in Fresno County representing approximately 71,080 acres (Panter 1994:9). These colonies helped to break up the vast estates and initiated what agricultural historian Donald Pisani has termed "the horticultural small-farm phase" of California agriculture (Datel 1999:97).

Fresno was incorporated in 1885 and with incorporation street grades and town lot numbers were established. Streets were first paved in 1889 (Clough 1984:319). In November 1887, 1,100 deeds were filed at the county courthouse and the last of the original railroad lots in Fresno were sold. By 1890 the population of Fresno was over 10,000, and land outside of the original town site was subdivided into streets and lots (Reps 1979:191). The first streetcars were introduced in 1892, and this greater mobility allowed for the construction of a variety of streetcar suburbs (Bulbulian 2001:38; Clough 1984:319). Van Ness Blvd. for example was constructed to link Fresno and the San Joaquin River. Van Ness led to the prestigious Fig Garden residential area. Homes along Van Ness were built between 1917 and 1940 (Fresno Bee 25 May 1985).

The “west” side of the Southern Pacific tracks quickly became “Chinatown,” where Chinese, as well as disreputable whites were forced to settle. The 1898 Sanborn Map shows a remarkably dense in-fill of saloons, lodging houses, lottery and gambling parlors between G Street, Mariposa, F Street and Kern. A Chinese theatre is noted on China Alley and a Joss House faced G Street (1898 Sanborn Map of Fresno).

In addition to Chinese and Scandinavian farmers, other early ethnic groups in the Fresno area included Germans from Russia, Japanese and Armenians. Volga Germans from Russia first came to Fresno in 1887, seeking work as farm laborers. By 1920 there were approximately 20,000 Germans from Russia in Fresno, with up to 12 churches serving the German-speaking population (Clough 1986:7). Although there were only 12 Japanese in Fresno in 1890, by 1900 there were 3,000 (Bulbulian 2001:34). The first Armenians arrived in 1881 and eventually settled in an area between the Santa Fe and Southern Pacific tracks

appropriately called “Armenian Town” (Ibid. 37-38). African-Americans were also present early on and organized an African Methodist Church in 1882 (Clough 1984:137).

Fresno can claim several “firsts” including the first demonstration for free speech and the first Junior College in the State. The Industrial Workers of the World attempted to organize the unskilled workers of the Valley and demonstrated at the corner of Mariposa and I [Broadway] Streets from October 1910 to March 1911. Fresno Junior College, the oldest two-year college in California, opened in 1910 with three teachers and 28 students (Hoover 1990:90).

The raisin industry developed in the 1870s, after the scorching heat of 1875 dried grapes on the vine (Ibid.:91). The Sun-Maid raisin cooperative was founded in 1913 and became one of the most successful in America (Ibid.:89, 91) and Fresno became the principle-packing center for the raisin grape industry with fourteen packinghouses in the city. Other crops such as cotton and figs helped to diversify the local economy and Fresno became the market town for a large portion of the San Joaquin Valley (Reps 1979:192).

Subdivisions north of the original railroad town were added beginning in the 1880s. Although the original “parent grid” of Fresno was parallel to the Central Pacific tracks, these new subdivisions were surveyed to be parallel to the surrounding agricultural sections. Thus today, when one crosses “Divisadero Street” it is necessary to make a 45% shift in entering the old part of the town. Odd-shaped triangular lots exist where the newer grid system meets the old.

In 1902 the Fresno City Railway Company opened its Forthcamp Avenue line, which tied the newer subdivisions north of the old town to the Fresno City grid (Tower District Specific Plan 1991:3-9). Forthcamp was later renamed Fulton Street. In 1908 Rosanna C. Wilson and her son A. Polette Wilson surveyed and opened the Wilson’s North Fresno Tract, a subdivision of 18 blocks in what is now Fresno’s Tower District (Raymond 2004). The opening of the Roeding street car line in 1912 and the Wishon Avenue line in 1914 connected this new subdivision with the business community in downtown Fresno. Even so, the Sanborn map of 1919 shows numerous empty lots and it was only in the 1920s-1940s that the tract filled in. This section of the Tower District became a prime area for intensification and mixed-use development with numerous courts constructed within single family residential neighborhoods, particularly east of Wishon and close to Olive Avenue.

In anticipation of growth following World War I, Fresno’s Board of Trustees hired Charles Henry Cheney to prepare a new city plan.

Cheney was an architect and city planner from San Francisco and he filed his report on May 31, 1918. To quote former City Planning Director, George Kerber:

“[His] report introduced many of the community development programs that influenced the city’s physical growth and style, and established a progressive plan for orderly development. It not only introduced zoning and land use planning to Fresno, but Chaney [sic] also proposed a civic center, a street system to accommodate the growing use of the automobile, a park and recreation plan (including a park on the San Joaquin River), a scenic road and boulevard system, railroad consolidation and a union passenger and freight station, and downtown revitalization.” (...) All plans that have been prepared for the city since 1918 have utilized Chaney’s plan as the basis for Fresno” (Kerber in Clough et al 1986:11)

Fresno continued to grow following World War I and in 1930 had a population of 52,513 (Kerber 1986:9) During and after World War II there was a severe shortage of housing as thousands of homeless transients arrived looking for agricultural work. In addition, thousands of returning servicemen and their families also needed housing and in response to this need, new subdivisions sprang up north of Shields Avenue.

The first major Post-War subdivision completed was Mayfair, northeast of McKinley and the First Street intersection. Mayfair included the first of the suburban shopping centers (Ibid:14). The sudden growth, from a population of 60,685 in 1940 to 91,669 in 1950, created extraordinary pressure on both city and county planning officials. “There was no master plan; only zoning and a weak subdivision ordinance to address the multiple problems of growth. At the time Fresno County, which was approving most of the new subdivisions, including Mayfair, didn’t even have a building code to establish minimum housing standards” (Ibid.) In 1944 the City Commission led an aggressive campaign to bring many of the new subdivisions into the City limits. “The city boundaries were a crazy and meaningless zigzag maze that wandered in and out of the growing suburbs... Large physical obstacles such as canals, railroad tracks and commercial or industrial districts encouraged the uneven growth” (Clough 1986:60-63).

By 1950 the economic function of Fresno had gradually evolved from an agricultural service center to a multifunction metropolitan community (Kerber 1986:9). Fresno is now a city of 500,000 and the center of the richest agricultural county in the United States (Haslam1993:194).

History and Development of Courtyard Housing:

The numerous “bungalow” courts in the City of Fresno developed from three major typological and stylistic sources: 1) the bungalow courts of the early 20th century, 2) auto courts and early motels, and 3) Hispanic courtyard housing.

The bungalow, normally a one-story home with wide overhanging eaves, projecting rafter tails and an informal floor plan that opened to the garden, became the new American cottage in the early 20th century. Not everyone who wanted a bungalow could afford one, however. This fact, coupled with an influx of new workers needing housing led to the development of bungalow courts, with individual cottages arranged around a common area. One could have the amenities of home, without the cost and maintenance that came with a larger single family residence on its own lot.

The earliest bungalow courts were developed in Southern California and are nominally linked to the early shanty settlements of Los Angeles. These horizontal tenements were a ragged assortment of cottages built by or for immigrants, many of them Mexican workers who came to the area to do seasonal work for the railroad. The reformer Jacob Riis considered these “cholo courts” “slum conditions as bad, if not as extensive, as anything to be found in New York.” Bungalow courts were distinguished from these earlier house courts by the higher building and construction standards, as well as by their more rationale plan and landscaping (Chase 1981:29).

One of the earliest known bungalow courts is a complex of 16 units, depicted on the Sanborn Insurance Map of 1909 in Santa Monica (Ibid:33). That same year the Cornell educated architect, Sylvanus Marston, also designed a bungalow court in Pasadena. His St. Francis Court was constructed for wealthy tourists and even included rooms for servants. Of interest was Marston’s incorporation of the automobile with a driveway down the center (Ibid.) A year later Arthur S. Heineman designed the Los Robles Court, which included a common laundry and drying yard (Winter 1980:60-61). Heineman was probably influenced by his earlier work in designing a complex of cottages for the White Oak Sanatorium near Columbus, Ohio (Wight 1919:16). In 1911 he and his brother Alfred Heineman opened the rustic Bowen Court in Pasadena, a grouping of 23 tiny bungalows on a large L-shaped lot with a clubhouse in the center. The Arts and Crafts architect Charles Sumner Greene was aghast at this new development and sniffed: “It would seem to have no other reason for being than that of making money for the investor” (Winter and Vertikoff 1996:20).

Bungalow courts were especially popular in California, Florida and Southern Arizona but caught on in other parts of the United States and Canada as well. Bungalows were also used for hotels, and the Heineman firm was apparently the first to call these courts designed for motorists, "mo-tels," a contraction of "motorist hostel" or "motor hotel." The Milestone Motels designed by Arthur S. Heineman opened in San Luis Obispo in 1925 (Curtis and Ford 1988; Liebes 1995:182; Winter and Vertikoff 1996:20)

According to Robert Winter, bungalow courts were influenced by the religious campgrounds of the East and Midwest, which featured cottages built around a common green (Winter 1980:58). Undoubtedly the plan for both bungalow courts and the first motels were influenced not only by religious campgrounds of the 19th century but also by temporary tourist facilities established in Southern California in the early 20th century. As former tourists returned to California to retire, builders may have been encouraged to provide permanent housing in the form of these earlier temporary courts (Polyzoides et al 1992:16). Simple detached units, usually wood frame and of similar style, were the dominant form of court housing through the early 1920s in Los Angeles. These courts were usually built by contractors rather than architects, although there are some notable exceptions (Ibid.:1992:9). "Bungalow" courts also appear to be the first used in Fresno as well. For example, the earliest extant court here (1916) is a complex of six cottages, arranged in two rows of three units which face onto a common area and driveway.

The cabin camps developed for early 20th century motorists along the nation's highways developed into a variety of "courts" in the 1930s. These new complexes were constructed in a variety of quaint styles and employed a more rational plan. The proprietors, termed "Courtiers," arranged their cottages into a long U, crescent, or in lines parallel to the road. All of these plans included some kind of open space, usually a central common area. In more populated areas courtiers had to use sites with narrower road frontages. In these urban areas tighter site plans, including use of an "L," were favored (Liebs 1985:175). Although bungalow courts predated these motor courts, later court housing and auto courts shared many similarities. One distinct difference of course is that auto courts initially were intended for travelers, and were not considered permanent housing.

By the late 1920s bungalow courts in Los Angeles had developed into garden apartments and were designed by architects for a growing middle-class clientele (Chase 1981:36). These courts were stylistically richer and had ground plans that were often far more complex than the earlier bungalow courts. Unlike courts in Fresno, most of these courtyard complexes were a full two stories. Although every major architectural

style was adapted and applied, from Hansel and Gretel to Streamline Moderne, by far the style most ubiquitous was “Spanish Revival” (Polyzoides et al 1992:193-196).

“California style” architects practicing in Southern California were influenced by Hispanic vernacular architecture from a variety of sources. The California Missions were buildings usually organized around a garden courtyard with fountains. Verandahs, porches and arcades opened directly onto this space. “The buildings tended to have bland exteriors and active, enriched interiors” (Polyzoides 1992:16). In addition to this early California resource, during World War I most European countries were closed and architects wanting to take the traditional “Grand Tour” went to Spain, one of the few countries open to outside visitors. Many architects were particularly attracted to Andalusia due to the architecture, climate and light. Both in published studies and from first-hand experience, the courtyard housing of Spain thus became a rich source of inspiration for a new California style architecture. Although some California building was clearly derivative and thus “revivalistic,” most architects were more eclectic in spirit and practice and mixed elements from a variety of traditions in a process of *bricolage*, to use a term coined by anthropologist Claude Levi Strauss. The Spanish Revival style in Los Angeles was responsive to its context and open to programmatic necessities. It was both “emotionally regressive and thoroughly modern” (*Ibid*: 192, 197).

San Diego and Los Angeles led the way with the highest number of court complexes built between 1910 and 1940. In both these Southern California cities, “bungalow” courts were rarely built after World War II. Contractors and builders also constructed courts in the Bay Area, with Oakland having 53 examples still standing (Betty Marvin 28 September 2004). Most of the Oakland courts were built prior to World War II.

Courts in Fresno:

The inspiration for bungalow courts in Fresno probably originated in Los Angeles. An examination of the 1918 Sanborn map for Fresno indicates no footprints of bungalow or auto courts for the years through World War I although one six-unit court was apparently constructed in 1916, outside City limits at the time. This court reflects the earliest cottage or bungalow style prevalent in Southern California in 1909-1920. The two other early bungalow style courts that survive in Fresno date to 1922 and 1925. Of interest is that these three units are all located in different areas of the City, and all are in-fill within residential neighborhoods. Of the 128 courts located and mapped within the

current City limits 34 were constructed prior to the War and 62 were built Post World War II (1945- 1953) during a period of rapid growth.

Courts appear to have been constructed as rentals, rather than as entry-level homes. At least three contractors were also listed as owners for the courts they constructed: Andrew T. Gardner built three within the Harvard Terrace area. Bruce A Younger constructed three separate units within the same tract. L.B. Pines built four in three separate early subdivisions of the City: Wilson's North Fresno Tract, the Fortcamp Addition and the Central Addition. In addition he served as the contractor for the North Park Extension. Unlike Los Angeles or Berkeley, which attracted major architects such as Irving Gill, Rudolph M. Shindler and the Fox Brothers, no architects have been connected to date with the courts in Fresno.

Although court housing was constructed throughout the City and indeed was found in most of the 14 survey areas, one of the richest concentrations lies within the Tower District, named for the 1939 Streamline Moderne Tower Theatre. The authors of the Tower District Specific Plan suggested that this thematic group represents a significant chapter in the "history of American urban housing---one that is perhaps better demonstrated in the Tower District than in almost any other city neighborhood in California" (1991:3-17). They also discussed the important role which court housing played in the developing city:

"The court...was both an expedient way to minimize the value of city land, and an attempt to entice urban residents with a sense of community all too often lacking in fast-growing cities of the early 20th century. Even a narrow 50-foot lot could be made to accommodate two rows of small cottages, facing inward on a lawn or driveway. In this way, a builder might fit four or more small units in a space which otherwise would be occupied by one, slightly larger house. On higher-priced city land, such crowding might be the only way for a developer to guarantee a return on his investment." (...)
"Bungalow courts offered a cheap alternative to the anonymity of apartment living; they represented the opportunity for a patch of lawn and a shelter from the street, all at a cost well below that required for a full home." (3-17)

Unlike Los Angeles and San Diego, court housing continued to be a viable housing type in Fresno immediately following the War and even into the late 1950s and 1960s. The Mayfair area, the first subdivision completed following World War II, has court after court lining the main thoroughfares of the neighborhood, with single family housing on the

inner streets. The area near the Old Saint Agnes Hospital also includes numerous court complexes.

Property Type:

Court housing is an arrangement of several separate dwellings on one lot, usually around a central public open space. This courtyard provides both a “means of access to private areas and a realm for public activity” (Polyzoides 1992:30). The courtyard plan is usually rectangular and includes both “hard” and “soft” elements. The housing can be connected or separate, as in the earliest examples of bungalow (and auto) courts. There is direct access to all dwellings from the ground. The court may include one or more two-story units, which are often used as a focal point for the property. Parking is usually integrated into the complex at the rear of the property, with access via an alley. Some early Fresno courts now include a driveway down the middle of the court for easier access to garages. Courts are an efficient use of urban space. They are both public and private. They turn in on themselves and thus away from city life, but are also open to it and provide an extension of the street. Screen walls and/or entrance gates usually define the street entrance. Early courts often had a wrought-iron gate or entryway, many with the name of the court spelled out.



**A court with Palladian symmetry, Linden Avenue
Photo: Michael Karibian**

Typology:

A typology for Fresno courts is adapted and expanded from the seminal work, Courtyard Housing in Los Angeles. Although there are significant differences in the housing stock between Fresno and Los Angeles the overall typology developed for Los Angeles (what the authors term “parti”) usually applies as well to Fresno.

Single Bar Court: The most “primitive” type of court found in Los Angeles has a single row of units that use the street or buffer areas to create some kind of communal space.

Double Bar Type: According to Polyzoides et al the double bar is an intermediate stage leading to the most common court in Los Angeles, the U-configuration building. Double bar courts are used for mid-block housing in Los Angeles. “The courtyard and units are repetitive efficiencies or one or two-bedroom units crammed into tight spaces.” They cannot adjust to the automobile and represent low end housing.

The one example of a double bar court in Fresno actually more closely resembles the earlier auto courts. Thus although the six units of this 1916 complex are perpendicular to the street and face each other in lines of three, the court space is large, reflecting the fact that this lot was on the edge of new development when built. Each of these bungalows is also differentiated by architectural treatment of the façade. This particular complex was recently completely restored.

L Type Court: According to the authors of Courtyard Housing..., “The L parti is the first in this series whose building form begins to define the enclosure of the courtyard.” “A courtyard conceived as a positive public element introduces into buildings a sense of order and ceremony, which causes immediate differentiation between their formal and informal, front and back, public and service aspects.”

Typically L courts open up to the street, probably to conceal automobiles behind the bar of the leg farthest from the street. “In so doing, these buildings become substantial offerings to the city, as their large, open, and pleasantly landscaped courtyards open directly to the sidewalk and substantially expand the public realm.”

One court in downtown Fresno is constructed of “L” units. At 1231 P Street the builder(s) also constructed an additional L parallel to the first units so that there are now three in a row.

U Court: The U Court is the most common and typical in Los Angeles with 80% of all known courts using this plan. Typically there are

buildings on three sides, with an open end towards the street that has a thin screen wall that connects the front two bars of the U.

Completed Courtyard Type: The courtyard is totally enclosed in this type and is typically a regular grid, often with a central focal point like a fountain. Most enclosed courts in Los Angeles are Spanish Revival in design. One interesting court in Fresno's Tower District achieves a completed courtyard effect by having a unit that faces the street. Only by entering the courtyard space is one able to read the plan.

Picturesque: Several courts in Fresno do not conform to any of the more axial plans identified for Los Angeles. Rather the units, one and two story, are spaced in a more picturesque fashion, with the "court" being in fact a series of public spaces between the various units. An individual is encouraged to engage with the space, and move through and around the various individual apartments.

Architectural Styles:

The earliest courts in Fresno, as for example, those at 950 E. Divisadero (1922) and 1333- 1353 N Palm Avenue (1916) were indeed constructed in a bungalow or cottage style and are wood clad over frame construction. The court at 950 E. Divisadero even includes a Japanesque gateway that provides both a screen wall and stylized entrance to the property. Unfortunately in this U court type the focal unit for the property recently burned and needs to be reconstructed. The lack of a defining perimeter also makes this court less private and more vulnerable to the world outside (See Map Reference # 5).



**Cottage in Palm
Avenue Court
Photo: Michael
Karibian**

Courts constructed in the 1930s were often in a stripped down Spanish Revival style. One stunning example, a 1941 court in the Tower District, exemplified the Streamline Moderne. Of interest is that Streamline Moderne had mostly run its course nationally, culminating with the New York World's Fair of 1939. However, the Tower Theater, constructed in 1939 on Olive Avenue (and thus three blocks away from the site) was undoubtedly the inspiration for the "Tower Village," located at 832 E. Hedges. An addition to the court at 1331 N Street (1931-1949) in downtown Fresno also includes wonderful porch brackets in an art deco (or zigzag moderne) style and would look right at home on a Flash Gordon set.

One very successful downtown court was designed in a Colonial Revival/Minimal Traditional style. Another, The Normandy Village, is an eclectic blend of Period Revival elements. Other contractor/builders borrowed bits and pieces of classicism, or Mediterranean elements in a nuanced bricolage.

In contrast to Southern California cities, courts were also a popular post-World War II housing type in Fresno and were presumably built for a burgeoning population of Veterans and their young families. Many of these courts were designed in a Minimal Traditional or Contemporary style and stair-step back from the street to make a more pleasing visual effect. Built in mass along major arteries of Fresno, these courts often include corner units on the street side that have a fireplace. Perhaps these nicer amenities were intended for the property managers.

Periods of Significance:

Court housing in Fresno falls within three historic contexts, or broad periods of significance.

1910-1929: Early courts in Fresno were constructed in a cottage or bungalow style, usually around a central court and in double bar or U formation and are wood clad over wood frame. An extant court from this pre-Depression period would be among the earliest constructed in Fresno and would be eligible to the National Register (California and/or Local Register of Historic Resources) if it retains sufficient integrity to its period of significance.

1930-1945: Most courts in the Tower District and downtown Fresno were constructed during this period. A court from this era would be eligible to the National Register (California and/or Local Register) if it was pivotal in the development of a particular tract or subdivision, is associated with a significant individual or family, and/or is an

exceptional example of a particular architectural style or type and retains sufficient integrity to convey its period of significance.

1945-1959: Following World War II numerous courts were built along major corridors of the City. For the most part these courts are more utilitarian and are less architecturally distinguished than the courts of the first two periods. However it is possible that one or more may be eligible to the National Register (and/or California and Local Registers) if they are an exemplary example of this period of building, show distinctive architectural elements and use of space and/or are associated with a significant architect, builder or developer; and retain high integrity to the period of significance.

Architecture of a New Urbanism

The first true bungalow courts were occupied by workers and by retirees. The Ladies Home Journal of 1913 even noted that court apartments were a solution for single women needing safe, reliable housing. Courts were viewed as a compromise between the expense of a single-family home and the “indecent propinquities” of apartment life (Chase and Ford 1988). The design of courts around a communal shared space “necessitated” a sense of community, as typically all doors and windows opened onto the courtyard and one couldn’t help but to interact with the neighbors.

The recently adopted 2025 Fresno General Plan and Master EIR direct most new growth to occur within established city boundaries. Although this directive will limit suburban sprawl and reduce impacts to adjacent farmland, there is renewed pressure, positive as well as negative, on historic resources within Downtown and the City’s older neighborhoods. Low-income in-fill housing often results in stucco boxes that are not context sensitive. One possible solution for compatible in-fill already exists in Fresno’s downtown and Tower Districts and was an important property type from 1910-1960, the bungalow court.

Bungalow courts have been proposed as low-income housing, from Irving Gill’s 1910 Lewis Courts to Davids Killory Architects award-winning projects for homeless families in 1991-1992 (Davis 1995:184). In addition, bungalow courts function as micro-communities for groups such as elderly women or gays, and as housing for workers of all income brackets (Curtis and Ford 1988). Hopefully court housing will continue to fill a niche in the new urbanism that is today’s Fresno.

Findings and Conclusions

One hundred and twenty-seven courts were identified through a reconnaissance level survey within the study area. An additional early auto court constructed of adobe was previously evaluated for a HUD project for a total of 128 units. Thirteen courts were formally evaluated by J and R Environmental Services and Historic Resource Associates for their eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources and Fresno's Local Register of Historic Resources. Normandy Village located at 840 E. Brown Avenue (Map Reference # 1) appears to be eligible to the National Register of Historic Places and is eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources as well. This court complex is already listed on Fresno's Local Register of Historic Resources. The consultants found that four courts were eligible to both the California Register and Local Registers: 8322 E. Hedges (Map Reference #2), 3234 E. Balch Avenue (Map Reference # 3), 1333-1353 N. Palm (Map Reference #4) and 950-960 E. Divisadero (Map Reference # 5). City staff has since discovered that the court at 1333-1353 N. Palm appears to be associated with William Saroyan and family. If so, it may be that this court will also be eligible to the National Register of Historic Places. Eight courts appeared eligible only to Fresno's Local Register of Historic Resources: 850-858 E. Hedges (Map Reference # 6), 830 E. Pine (Map Reference #7), 841 E. Pine (Map Reference #8), 540-608 W. Hammond (Map Reference #9), 1231 P Street (Map Reference #10), 1325 M Street (Map Reference # 11), 1331 N Street (Map Reference # 12) and 2014-2026 Mayfair (Map Reference # 13). All thirteen courts will be considered as a thematic non-contiguous historic district for Fresno's Local Register (See Figure #3).

Regulatory Context

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966 as amended) federal agencies are mandated to "take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties," which may be affected by federally funded or federally approved undertakings. "The Section 106 process seeks to accommodate historic preservation concerns with the needs of Federal undertakings through consultation ... commencing at the early stages of project planning" (36 CFR Part 800.1). Federal agencies can delegate some responsibilities for the Section 106 process. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), for example, is authorized by law to fully delegate its Section 106 responsibilities for some programs to local governments so that the local governments "become the Federal agency." HUD however still has ultimate authority.

In order to assess effects to historic properties, the resources within the project Area of Potential Effects (APE) must be evaluated for their eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places. The criteria for evaluation as provided for in *National Register Bulletin 15* (1990:2) are as follows:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

Criterion A – that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of our history; or

Criterion B – that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

Criterion C – that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

Criterion D – that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The California Environmental Quality Act (1970) requires consideration of project impacts on archaeological or historical sites deemed to be “historical resources.” A substantial adverse change in the significant qualities of a historical resource is considered a significant impact. For the purposes of CEQA, a “historical resource” is a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). Historical resources may include, but are not limited to:

Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California. . . [14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) 15064.5(a)(3)].

The eligibility criteria for the California Register are the definitive criteria for assessing the significance of historical resources for the purposes of CEQA (Office of Historic Preservation n.d.). Generally, a resource shall be considered “historically significant” if it meets the criteria for listing on the CHCR, as defined in the Public Resources Code (PRC):

- (1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.*
- (2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.*
- (3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.*
- (4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. [PRC 5024.1(c)].*

Fresno adopted a Historic Preservation Ordinance in 1979 (FMC Article 4 Chapter 13). The Ordinance (as amended) established the Historic Preservation Commission and the Local Register of Historic Resources. Any building, structure, object or site may be designated as a Historic Resource if it is found by the Commission and Council to meet the following criteria:

- (1) It has been in existence more than fifty years and it possesses integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and:*
 - (i) It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or*
 - (ii) It is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or*
 - (iii) It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values; or*
 - (iv) It has yielded or may be likely to yield, information in prehistory of history.*

Eligibility to the National, State and/or Local Register:

Resource #1 (Map Ref. #1): The **Normandy Village Apartments**, located at **840 E. Brown Avenue**, are on Fresno's Local Register of Historic Resources (HP# 209). The complex includes six structures with a total of 16 individual apartment units, built around a series of communal spaces. First constructed in 1935, the buildings use recycled architectural elements to create a m lange best described as Period Revival fantasy. Unlike other court apartment complexes, the Normandy Village has apparently attracted tenants over the years from Fresno's professional and artistic elite, including forty-one lawyers. Normandy Village was begun by Ida Myra Perry and further developed and enhanced by her son William Robert Perry after the death of his mother in 1949. The complex represents the transition from bungalow courts to apartment courts. The Normandy Village Apartments are unique for Fresno and appear to architecturally reflect the work experiences and foreign travels of William R. Perry. The consultants concluded that the complex is eligible to the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A, for its role in the development of Fresno's courtyard housing; Criterion B, for its association with Ida Myra Perry and William R. Perry, and Criterion C, for its unique architectural design. The Normandy Village Apartments retain integrity to their period of significance, 1935-1959.



**Photo:
Michael
Karibian**

Resource #2 (Map Ref. #2): The **Tower Village Apartment Court**, **826-844 E. Hedges Avenue** was first described in detail in the Tower District Specific Plan of 1991. "...this complex was designed in a self-conscious attempt to evoke the traditional, communal image of older bungalow courts, though its visual distinctiveness derived from a careful use of then-fashionable (circa late 1930s) modernistic motifs: porthole and

metal-sash casement windows, Art Deco signage, a streamlined flagpole base. The Tower Village, with its units carefully arranged around a central palm tree and the above-mentioned flagpole, is one of the finest architectural ensembles in the neighborhood, if not in the city” (1991:3-19). The classic U shaped court was built in 1941 and includes seven buildings around a large central courtyard, which allows for two divided driveways, walkways and lawn areas. With the exception of alterations to the two-story apartment’s railing, the court retains very good integrity. The consultants concluded, however, that the Tower Apartment Court does not meet the threshold for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under A or C. They did feel that the property “appears to be a significant resource for the California Register...” In addition the court appears to be both individually eligible to the Local Register and is a contributor to a proposed thematic district.



**View of former
flagpole, Tower
Court
Photo: Michael
Karibian**

Resource #3 (Map Ref. #3): The court complex located at **3234 E. Balch Avenue** was built in 1925 and is laid out in a U Plan. Six individual cottages and one duplex on axis surround a narrow central courtyard. This court is the only one within the Alta Vista Tract, a subdivision developed on the former eastern edge of Fresno in 1910. The units are wood clad over wood frame with Craftsman attributes. Thus the windows include 10-lite double wide casements on front and side elevations. The clipped side gable roofs are quoted again in the porch hoods. Front doors are 12-lite wood and glass and are framed with fluted pilasters. Other than replacement of original detached garages with a carport, the complex retains excellent integrity to its period of significance. Nevertheless, the consultants concluded that it did not meet the threshold for listing on the National Register nor was it a contributor to a thematic National Register District. They did find that the court was eligible under Criteria 1 and 3 for the California Register of Historical Resources and Criteria i and iii for Fresno’s Local Register.



**Individual Cottage at 3234 E. Balch Avenue
Photo: Michael Karibian**

Resource #4 (Map Ref. #4): The double bar plan court located at **1333-1353 N. Palm** may be the oldest extant bungalow court in Fresno. Although a building permit was issued for the complex in 1916, Polk Directories list no residents at the site until 1922. Six single-story cottages are parallel to one another and are bisected by a tinted red concrete driveway. The side-gabled wood frame cottages are all a bit different, with varying architectural treatment of the porches in particular. The cottages are in fact small homes, and thus share an affinity to the earliest bungalow courts of Southern California. The siting around the central driveway, and the fact that when built the property was outside City limits, leads one to make a connection to early auto courts as well. Although the cottages retain high integrity, and in fact are in the process of full restoration, the consultants found that this court was not eligible to the National Register due to loss of some of the original detached garages and changes in landscaping. Recent information, however, links this complex to the William Saroyan family. If this information is verified this complex would probably be eligible to the National Register for its association with the Pulitzer Prize winning Armenian author, playwright and painter. Further research is required. In the interim, the consultants have found that this early court is eligible to the California Register under Criteria 1 and 3, as an exemplary example of an early bungalow court, and under Criteria i and iii for Fresno's Local Register of Historical Resources.



Resource #5 (Map Ref. #5): The U Plan Court at **950 E. Divisadero Avenue** is among the oldest extant complexes in Fresno, and was built in 1922 along the former northern boundary of the Fresno's parent (railroad) grid. It is also one of three constructed in a true bungalow/cottage style. The court consists of seven detached cottages, although the cottage on axis which faces the street is badly burned and slated to be demolished and (hopefully) rebuilt. The common space is quite narrow, not much more than a walkway between the two rows of cottages. A character defining feature of this complex is a Japanesque style entry gate mounted on brick pillars. The individual units are wood frame and have horizontal beveled wood siding. In design this complex is similar to the early bungalow courts of Southern California. The consultants concluded that the court was not eligible for the National Register but was eligible to both the California Register and Local Register under Criterion 3 (iii).



**Photo:
Karana
Hattersley-
Drayton**

Resource #6 (Map Ref. #6): The **Hedges Apartment Court** at **850-858 E. Hedges Avenue** has an overall U shaped plan and is built in a Spanish Revival style. Three detached single-family units face west and were constructed in 1939. A two story apartment building with a wrought-iron cantilevered balcony was added in 1954. Character defining features of the buildings include Spanish clay tile roofs, stucco cladding and decorative exterior shutters. The one-story cottages are particularly charming and include inset ceramic tiles on the north elevation and arched entryways. Although constructed in two building campaigns, this court is unified through its landscaping, which includes well-tended lawns, mature trees and flower beds. The property appears to be eligible to Fresno's Local Register of Historic Resources under Criterion iii.



**Detached cottage
at Hedges
Apartment Court.
Photo: Michael
Karibian**

Resource #7 (Map Ref. #7): The court at 830-844 E. Pine has a double bar plan and is in a Minimal Traditional style. The four duplexes face one another on a very narrow lot and were constructed in 1937 for a cost of \$2,700. The common area is given over almost completely to a concrete driveway that leads to a garage and carport at the back (south) end of the parcel. The units are similar, with stucco cladding over wood frame, 1/1 double hung sash windows, composition shingle roofs and modest shed-roof porch hoods. The court appears to be eligible to Fresno's Local Register of Historic Resources under Criterion iii as a good example of a court complex built during the second Period of Significance, 1930-1945.

Resource #8 (Map Ref. #8): The court located at **841-861 E. Pine Avenue** is the only property within the study area that is constructed loosely in an inverted U, with the bottom of the U created from a unit that faces the street and functions as a kind of screen wall for the remainder of the court. The complex includes five single-story detached duplexes, two detached two story units with garage below, and a modern detached single story 2-car garage. The Minimal Traditional style court has Spanish Revival influences, as indicated through the use of Spanish clay tiles. The landscaping includes a network of concrete walkways that connect the units. A central lawn area is a focal point for the complex. The court was first constructed in 1941 and added to over the years, although with stylistically similar designs. The complex is a good example of the kind of working class housing that was constructed at the beginning of World War II and it appears to be eligible to Fresno's Local Register of Historical Resources under Criterion i and iii.

Resource #9 (Map Ref. #9): Located in the neighborhood of the former Saint Agnes Hospital, the court complex at **543-607 W. Hammond** is an eclectic stylistic blend of Minimal Traditional, Streamline Moderne and Spanish Revival design. The plan includes two "L" shaped units which are separated by a narrow walkway and thus can be read as a U from the street. The two units include four residences in each, have hip roofs of tile, are stucco clad with light steel casement windows and an impressive expanse of pressed or molded glass blocks on the Hammond Street façade. The court area includes a lawn and a rose garden with a lemon tree. This court was constructed during the height of World War II when Fresno experienced a critical housing shortage. The property appears to be eligible to Fresno's Local Register of Historical Resources under Criterion i and iii.

Resource #10 (Map Ref. #10): The court at **1223-1249 P Street** is a block away from the Fresno City Hall in the downtown "triangle" area. Built in 1940 in a Spanish Eclectic style, the complex includes six separate units of two apartments each. Four of the units face inward to form a U plan court. The other two duplexes are an L plan and are parallel to the larger court. The main property is entered through a brick screen wall possibly of stabilized adobe brick with wrought iron gates at each side. A beautifully sculpted tree stands in the middle of the common lawn. Each unit has smooth stucco walls, a side gable roof of Spanish clay tiles, double hung 1/1 windows, and porch hoods with scalloped wood knee braces. Each L shaped unit has a four-bay garage with clay tile roof at the rear. The court was constructed just prior to World War II when this area of the City was being reinvented with new commercial and residential construction. It is one of three courts within

a three block area of commercial and governmental buildings. The court appears to be eligible to the Local Register under Criteria i and iii.



Looking Towards P Street from Rear of Court
Photo: Karana Hattersley-Drayton

Resource #11 (Map Ref. #11): The **Brix Apartment Court** at **1325-1349 M Street** was previously evaluated in the 1994 Ratkovich Plan Survey. Architectural historian John Edward Powell found that it was eligible to Fresno's Local Register at that time. According to Powell the apartments were completed in 1940 and were constructed by James T. Cowan for Mrs. Helena Brix on the former site of the W.M. Bettridge Home. Mrs. Brix was the widow of the prominent oilman and real estate speculator Herman H. Brix, whose remarkable Italian Villa, designed by Edward T. Foulkes, still stands a few blocks away on Fresno Street. After her husband's death Mrs. Brix managed the family's real estate holdings and built a number of investment properties, including this complex. James T. Cowan was a prominent general contractor in Fresno for 50 years. The apartment complex consists of four duplex units, which face one another across a narrow but lush court space. Four additional units along the rear of the property are built over a ground level series of garages. The buildings were designed in a Minimal Traditional style and appear eligible to the Local Register under Criteria i, ii and iii.

Brix Apartment Court
Photo: Michael Karibian



Resource #12 (Map Ref. #12): The **Royal Court** located at **1331 N Street** is a series of three single bars parallel to one another and perpendicular to the street. A two story unit crosses the back of the court with apartments above and garages below, with entrance from the alley. Most of the complex was built in 1931 in a mélange of Spanish Revival with Streamline Moderne and even Art Deco touches. The southern most “bar” of the group was added in 1949. The one-story attached units have side-gabled roofs of Spanish tile. The porch hoods have scalloped knee braces. All windows are 1/1 double hung sash. The corner units on N Street are decorated with molded glass blocks. Of particular interest are the porch brackets on the third unit which look like decorations from an early Flash Gordon serial and are made of wrought iron, with arrows. This later unit also differs in that it is made of a tan colored brick. The court has a screen flagstone wall with a wrought iron entry way that reads “Royal Court.” The court appears to be eligible to Fresno’s Local Register of Historic Resources under Criterion iii.

Royal Court, Photo by Michael Karibian



Resource #13 (Map Ref. #13): The **Gonzalez Property** at 2026 Mayfair Drive West consists of two “L” shaped cottages, each containing two apartments which face each other on the parcel. Not properly a court, the property was built in the Mayfair District in 1948. The stucco clad apartments have cross-gabled roofs. Both buildings have bay windows on the north end and are situated in a spacious common area with grass and mature trees. The consultants recommend listing the property on Fresno’s Local Register under Criteria i and iii.

Qualifications of Project Staff

Karana Hattersley-Drayton (Project Director) is the Historic Preservation Project Manager for the City of Fresno. From June 1999 to June 2002 Ms. Drayton worked for the California Department of Transportation, Central California Heritage Branch in Fresno as an Associate Environmental Planner (Architectural Historian). She has served on the State Historical Resources Commission (1986-1989) and on the Board of Directors for the Vernacular Architecture Forum. For eight years she worked on Section 106 compliance projects as the Staff Folklorist for the Anthropological Studies Center at Sonoma State University. Ms. Drayton also taught courses in American architecture and urbanism and California architecture at Sonoma State. Areas of particular interest to her include vernacular architecture, gendered spaces and ethnic communities of the American West. Ms. Hattersley-Drayton has a B.A. in Anthropology and an M.A. in Folklore from U.C. Berkeley. In addition, she completed three years of coursework toward the Ph.D. in Architecture History at Berkeley.

Jon Brady (J and R Environmental Services) holds a B.A. in both Political Science and Anthropology and an M.A. in History from California State University, Fresno. Mr. Brady has worked as a consulting archaeologist and historian for over 23 years, working with Section 106 and CEQA compliance. He has served as adjunct faculty at several local junior colleges and is an Associate Environmental Planner with Caltrans, District 06.

Dana Supernowicz (Cultural Resources Consulting) has a B.A. in Social Ecology from the University of California, Irvine, and a M.A. in History from California State University, Sacramento. As owner and Principle of Historic Resource Associates he has completed hundreds of historic architectural and archaeological studies throughout Northern California. Dana is an Associate Environmental Planner with Caltrans and currently serves as the Section 106 Reviewer at Headquarters in Sacramento.

Will Tackett (Research Assistant) recently completed his B.A. in Anthropology from California State University, Fresno (Magna Cum Laude). He is currently employed as a Temporary Planner I in Fresno's Department of Planning and Development and serves part time as staff for the Historic Preservation Program. Previously, Will worked for three years as a student intern and then as an Archaeological Technician for Caltrans, here in Fresno.

Thanks also to Joe Simone (Planning Illustrator II) for the map of the evaluated courts and to the **following staff and volunteers who participated in the Reconnaissance survey, December 12, 2003:** Sarah Gerster, Aprile James and Gene Grinstead (Planning Department); Kelly Hobbs, Sarah Johnston, Jon Brady and Kish La Pierre (Caltrans), Cam Maloy (Historic Preservation Commission); Tom Meisch (Housing Department); John Tanksley, David Jennings and Kendra Mull (Code Enforcement); Steve Weil; and John Alden and Don Standridge (residents, Tower District).

References

Publications:

- Barrie-Anthony, Steven. "Idyllis...and Endangered." Los Angeles Times 24 June 2004.
- Bulbulian, Berge. The Fresno Armenians: History of a Diaspora Community. Sanger, California: World Dancer Press, 2001.
- Cerny, Susan Dinkelspiel. Berkeley Landmarks: An Illustrated Guide to Berkeley, California's Architectural Heritage. Berkeley, California: Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association, 2001.
- Chase, Laura. "Eden in the Orange Groves: Bungalow and Courtyard Houses of Los Angeles." Landscape 25:3 (1981) 29-36.
- Clough, Charles W. and William B. Secrest Jr. Fresno County- The Pioneer Years: From the Beginnings to 1900. Fresno, California: Panorama West Books, 1984.
- Clough, Charles W. et al. Fresno County in the 20th Century: From 1900 to the 1980s. Fresno, California: Panorama West Books, 1986.
- Curtis, James R. and Larry Ford. "Bungalow Courts in San Diego: Monitoring A Sense of Place." The Journal of San Diego History 34:2 (Spring 1988).
- Datel, Robin Elisabeth. "Picturing the Central Valley through Maps." In Picturing California's Other Landscape: the Great Central Valley." Ed. Heath Schenker, 93-116. Berkeley, California: Heyday Books, 1999.
- Davis, Sam. The Architecture of Affordable Housing. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Gayton, A. H. "Yokuts and Western Mono Ethnography II: Northern Foothill Yokuts and Western Mono." University of California Anthropological Records 10(2):143-301. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1948.
- Gellner, Arrol. Red Tile Style: America's Spanish Revival Architecture. New York City: Penguin Books, 2002.
- Hoover, Mildred Brooke, Hero Eugene Rensch, Ethel Grace Rensch and William N. Abeloe. Historic Spots in California, 4th edition, revised by Douglas E. Kyle. Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Howe, Kathryn Welch. "Los Angeles Historic Resource Survey Assessment Project: Summary Report." The Getty Conservation Institute, November 2001.

- Imperial Fresno: Resources, Industries and Scenery Illustrated and Described.
Fresno, California: Fresno Republican, 1897 (rpt. 1979 Fresno City and
County Historical Society.)
- Johnson, Stephen, Gerald Haslam and Robert Dawson. The Great Central
Valley: California's Heartland. Berkeley: University of California Press,
1993.
- King, Thomas F. "Section 106: An Introduction." Alexandria, Virginia:
National Preservation Institute, September 2001.
- Latta, Frank F. Handbook of Yokuts Indians. Santa Cruz: Bear State Books,
1977.
- Liebs, Chester H. Main Street to Miracle Miloe: American Roadside
Architecture. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University
Press, Second edition 1995.
- Panter, John. "Central California Colony: 'Marvel of the Desert.'" Fresno Past
And Present 36:2 (Summer 1994) 1-11.
- Polk's Fresno (Fresno County California) Directory. San Francisco,
California: R.L. Polk and Co., all directories 1913-2000.
- Polyzoides, Stephanos, Roger Sherwood and James Tice. Courtyard
Housing in Los Angeles. New York: Princeton Architectural Press,
Second edition, 1992.
- Powell, John Edward. "Supplementary Historic Building Survey Historic
Resources Survey (Ratkovich Plan) Fresno, California. Prepared for
Department of Housing and Neighborhood Revitalization City of Fresno
Historic Preservation Commission, September 30, 1994.
- Raymond, Jeannine. "Draft Historic Overview of the Wilson Island Historic
District," July 2004.
- Reps, John W. Cities of the American West: A History of Frontier Urban
Planning. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Reuber, Paul. "Miami's Courts." Canadian Architect 46:10 (October 2001) 9.
- "Tower District Specific Plan." Prepared for the City of Fresno's Development
Department by Wallace Roberts and Todd, Robert Bruce Anderson and
TJKM, March 26, 1991.
- Wight, Peter. "Bungalow Courts in California." Western Architect 28 (1919)
16-18.
- Wilson, Henry L. California Bungalows of the Twenties. New York: Dover
Publications, Inc. 1993.

Winter, Robert. The California Bungalow. Los Angeles: Hennessey and Ingalls, Inc. 1980.

Winter, Robert and Alexander Vertikoff. American Bungalow Style. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996.

Maps:

“Insurance Maps of Fresno, California.” New York: Sanborn Perris Map Company, 1898.

“Insurance Maps Fresno California: Volume Two.” New York: Sanborn Map Company, 1919.

“Insurance Maps of Fresno California Volume Two.” New York: Sanborn Map Company 1919 (revised to 1950).

“Map Showing Colony System of Settlement Surrounding Fresno,” San Francisco: Punnett Brothers, 1903.

United States Geological Survey. Topographic Map. Fresno South Quadrangle, 7.5’ series, 1963, photorevised 1981.

**Court life
Photo: Michael
Karibian**

