NPS Form 10-900-b
(Revised March 1992)

OMB No. 1024-0018

RECEIVED 2280
2 1 [illegible]
NAT. REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

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

x New Submission ___ Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

Middle Class Apartment Buildings in East Portland

B. Associated Historic Contexts

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

Townhouse Apartments Designed by Ewald T. Pape in Portland between 1920 and 1945

C. Form Prepared by

name/title John M. Tess, President, and Robert L. Mawson, Senior Associate
organization Heritage Investment Corporation
date July 7, 1996
street & number 123 NW 2nd Avenue, Suite 200
telephone (503) 228-0272
city or town Portland
state OR
zip code 97209

D. Certification

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

Signature and title of certifying official Deputy SHPO
Date January 15, 1997

Oregon State Historic Preservation Office
State or Federal agency and bureau

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

Edson H. Beall
Signature of the Keeper

2/21/97
Date of Action

Middle Class Apartment Buildings in East Portland
Name of Multiple Property Listing

Oregon
State

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

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

		Page Numbers
E.	**Statement of Historic Contexts** (If more than one historic context is documented, present them in sequential order.)	E-2-13
F.	**Associated Property Types** (Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)	F-2-7
G.	**Geographical Data**	G/H-2
H.	**Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods** (Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.)	G/H-2
I.	**Major Bibliographical References** (List major written works and primary location of additional documentation: State Historic Preservation Office, other State agency, Federal agency, local government, university, or other, specifying repository.)	I-2-2

Primary location of additional data:

☐ State Historic Preservation Office
☐ Other State agency
☐ Federal agency
☒ Local government
☐ University
☒ Other

Name of repository:

Oregon Historical Society

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq.*).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 120 hours per response including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

MIDDLE CLASS APARTMENT BUILDINGS IN EAST PORTLAND MPS (1920-1945)
Portland, Multnomah County, Oregon

COMMENTS OF THE STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

This multiple property context treats the Portland townhouse apartment buildings designed by Ewald T. Pape in the context of multi-unit housing for middle class on Portland's east side as it developed between the world wars [1920-1945]. It is the premise of the proposal that of Pape's documented works in this class, the Burrell Heights, San Farlando, and Thompson Court Apartments, are good representative examples of the townhouse type. There is potential for additional apartment complexes by Pape to be added under this context in the future as owner consent allows.

The scope of evaluation in this case is narrow in that it is focused on a particular apartment house type by a particular designer. But the geographic context is broad enough to encompass a number of east side neighborhoods, both north and south. The resources proposed for nomination are appropriately evaluated under Criteria A and C in the areas of community planning and development and architecture.

The explosive growth of Portland's population following the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition of 1905 and the demand it created for affordable housing is well understood. What has not been so well dicussed before is how the burgeoning of varied types of apartment buildings has defined the character of certain neighborhoods, most notably Nob Hill in the northwest sector and the Hawthorne district in the southeast.

This multiple property context includes a discussion of the sociological, economic and land use factors which influenced the rise of apartment living. It was prepared by Heritage Investment Corporation at the urging of the state review board as an aid to evaluation. Following are the highlights.

Between the time of the 1905 fair, or exposition, and 1920, over 400 new apartment building had been erected the city. The phenomenon is seen as a countercurrent in the American impulse to own one's own home. The clustering of dwelling units in single large buildings in urban areas where land values were unaffordable to the working class was at first required by economic necessity and eventually became fashionable for society's well-to-do who preferred the amenities of inner city life. Another force contributing to the viability of apartment living was the rising strength of women in the work force, and the need for both single working men and women to have respectable and affordable quarters. Social reformers and architects who worked to improve the crowded and unsanitary tenements in big cities contributed to a new paradigm, buildings with plans which included wells for light and ventilation to all living units. The hydraulic elevator was key among technical innovations which made high rise living units possible. Shared dwelling units nonetheless retained a stigma because of their perceived similarity to tenements.

In the 1920s, some Eastern architects and developers were involved in suburban residential projects which experimented with such schemes as row houses arranged around a common court. Standardization of plans was, in the more imaginative schemes, offset by variation in surface articulation and roofline features.

According to this context, Portland's housing history followed national norms. Tenements arose with the influx of ethnic immigrant groups, notably the Asiatics who arrived in significant numbers at the height of the gold mining, salmon packing and railroad construction activity in the 1850s to 1870s. Respectable multi-unit housing for Euro-Americans did not emerge before the early years of the 20th century. W. L. Morgan built what are considered the earliest Portland apartment houses in 1904 and 1905 near the downtown and in Nob Hill. When other developers followed his lead, more apartment buildings sprang up along the streetcar lines in the northwest.

In East Portland, mass housing development was dependent upon improved access from the central business district and waterfront industrial areas to the east bank of the Willamette River via bridges and street car lines. After real estate investors acquired extensive tracts for single family housing developments for both the middle class and well-to-do, apartment buildings appeared as infill along the arterials. In 1924, the City passed its first zoning law to control the growth of multi-family developments into residential neighborhoods since they had the potential to devalue prime residential property. Builders and developers looked for ways to distinguish their projects from tenements and make them compatible in neighborhoods of detached dwellings. The preferred solution on the east side was to design one and two story duplexes and fourplexes disguised as houses, whereas in northwest Portland the model was a three or four-story block of flats with a double-loaded corridor in a L, H, or U shaped plan that provided light and air to each studio or multi-bedroom unit. On the east side, where level undeveloped land was more abundant, the garden court apartment complex offering a separate entrance for each living unit was especially popular. According to City records, over a dozen garden court developments were opened in the years 1925 to 1927. The context points out that developers were motivated to realize advantage from market forces, but at the same time some were interested in creating multiple housing that was genuinely liveable. Ewald Pape was one such builder.

It is shown that comparatively little is known about E. T. Pape except what can be gleaned from Bureau of Building file plans and city directories. Pape was not a registered architect. His plan sheet signature block read "Designer of Character Homes." Yet, like his contemporaries, Elmer Feig, Claussen & Claussen, Carl Linde, and others, he made an imprint upon the cityscape by his serviceable east side houses and apartments. It is known that Pape arrived in Portland in 1923 and worked as an independent draftsman. By 1925, newly married, he commenced operating as a house designer. It was at this time that developer Robert McFarland gave Pape his first multi-unit commission, two small apartment buildings on adjoining lots at SE 24th and Madison. By 1928, with McFarland as investor, Pape's projects had evolved as substantial complexes overspreading a quarter or half city block.

With the 1928 Burrell Court Apartments at 2904-2918 SE Hawthorne, Pape introduced two-story townhouse units, the first of their kind in Portland, as a variation within a mixed scheme. The Burrell Heights Apartments, opened the same year at 2903-2919 SE Clay, was the first building exclusively dedicated to two-story townhouse units. Essentially the same floor plan was repeated for the San Farlando Apartments at 2903-2925 SE Hawthorne in 1929. In this period, Pape also designed four projects for William K. Johnson, one of which was the Thompson Court Apartments of 1929 at 2304-2314 SE Eleventh Avenue.

Pape's work fell off with material shortages during the Second World War. He took a job as estimator for the Portland Door Company for the duration and returned to house designs with the post war housing boom. By 1955, Pape's name was absent from city directories.

The essence of E. T. Pape's contribution to Portland housing was the refinement of a particular apartment house type which he had introduced, namely, the two-story townhouse. The projects were well constructed and well appointed without being luxurious. The hallmarks of these complexes are adopted as the registration requirements for the multiple property submission. In addition to the basic requirement of integrity, to be eligible, the apartment building must be two stories in height, have individualized floorplans, and place more emphasis on liveable space than exterior showiness. It must have separate front and rear entrances and individual street numbers, and it must have interior features of some quality. It might also be a component of a compound grouping of apartments for middle class tenants. Comparative merit within the body of Pape's work is more difficult to evaluate in this context since much of the work is variation upon recurring themes. Nevertheless, subtle shifts as well as more decided turning points in design will be noted.

This documentation, which is the context for a multiple property submission, is accompanied by the endorsement of the City of Portland, by and through its Historic Landmarks Commission. The City of Portland is newly enlisted as a local government certified for expanded participation in the National Register program. The concerns about future initiatives under this context that are expressed by the commission's chairman, Deborah Gruenfeld, are addressed in the SHPO's response, a copy of which also is appended. The commission's concerns will be discussed at greater length in forthcoming consultation.

E. STATEMENT OF HISTORICAL CONTEXT:

In the years following the Lewis & Clark Exposition of 1905, Portland's population boomed. An ever increasing proportion of that development occurred on the east side of the Willamette River in East Portland. Most of the development concentrated on traditional detached single-family dwellings. Interspersed were apartment buildings constructed distinctly for the middle class. Within a twenty-year period, over 400 new apartment buildings appeared in the city. The present multiple property submission is intended to provide a context for evaluating those middle class apartments as they pertain to Criterion 'A" for Community Planning and Development and "C" for Architecture.

THE RISE OF THE APARTMENT BUILDING IN AMERICA

For the vast majority of Americans, throughout this country's history, the American dream has been to own your own home. It is a direct contradiction to that mainstream dream that the apartment building as a residence appeared. That expression in the United States appeared distinctly beginning in the 19th century. It came first by virtue of hard economic reality. With exploding population raising the price of land, those at the lower end of the economic spectrum could not afford single-family residences and collected in substandard housing known as tenements.

By the 1870s, apartment living by choice appeared among society's well-to-do. Still prompted in part by scarce land, apartments grew in popularity based on their convenience and the advanced domestic technology they offered to those who could afford. Returns on investment of 10-30% prompted developers to respond to this choice of lifestyle.

Throughout the 19th century, however, mainstream America viewed apartment living as an aberration. Social activists worked to improve living conditions among the lower classes and sought to find residential designs which were affordable. By the 1900s and well into the 1920s, one option for the middle class was the bungalow, a small single-family detached house with an emphasis on austere simplicity to promote efficiency and cleanliness.

But for many, the bungalow still remained outside their financial reality. With less than half of all Americans owning their own homes, apartment developments remained good investments. Then too, the Great War brought on social changes which lead to the greater independence of women while technological advances in the first part of the 20th century revolutionized domestic life to greater personal mobility. While the American dream remained home ownership, some of the stigma of apartment living waned. Particularly middle class bachelors of both sexes found the apartment an acceptable, if temporary, solution. As a result, with financing available at 70-90% in the 1920s, these strains blended together to open the door to a boom in apartment living that continued well into the modern period.

Population Growth: These buildings were the direct result of the country's enormous population growth. In 1830, the population of the United States was 12.8 million. Beginning in that decade, the country's population grew at an amazing pace of 30-35%, fueled in part by massive European migrations. In the first couple of decades, nearly 2.5 million immigrants arrived, mostly from Germany and Ireland. In 1850, the population was 23 million. In each of the 1850s, 1860s, and 1870s, 2.5 million immigrants arrived. By 1880, the population of the United States was roughly 50 million. Two decades later, it was 76 million, including nine million immigrants arriving mostly from Central, Eastern and Southern Europe. In 1920, the U.S. population was 106 million.

In the early and mid part of the 19th century, much of this population growth settled in the Ohio River Valley and later followed the Oregon Trail to the Pacific Northwest. A large percentage collected in the cities. Between 1880 and 1900, New York grew from 2 to 3.5 million and Chicago from 500,000 to 1.5 million, while Buffalo, Detroit, Milwaukee and others doubled in size. Such increases in density made land precious and housing scarce.

Tenements: Those on the lower end of the economic scale found traditional single-family housing unaffordable. In the 1830s, to accommodate the masses in this unregulated marketplace, landlords first built "double tenements." These were buildings 3-4 stories high with two families on each floor; a second building was then squeezed into the backyard, also 3-4 stories tall but with only one family per floor. Typically, these had a living room, a kitchen and two bedrooms and offered only a minimum of space, light and ventilation. Access to each room was via the central stairwell or by passing through the other rooms of the apartment. The average tenement in New York or Boston contained 65 people.

In the 1850s, landlords improved on the profitability of "double tenements" with the "railroad tenement." These were larger and more crowded. The railroad tenement was a 90-foot long solid rectangular block that left only a narrow alley in the back of the building. Of the 12-16 rooms per floor, only those facing the street or alley received direct light or air. There were no hallways, so people had to walk through every room to cross an apartment and privacy proved difficult. The open sewers outside that were usually clogged and overflowing, a single privy at best in the backyard, garbage that went uncollected, and mud and dust in alleys and streets made these environments unpleasant and unsanitary.

Recurring outbreaks of yellow fever, cholera, smallpox, typhoid and typhus, and their association with grossly unsatisfactory living conditions, alerted concerns for public health and housing reform. Accentuating the concern was the potential for the spread of these diseases to the upper and middle classes through the handmade products manufactured in the tenements. These included cigars, garters, paper flowers, boxes and other small items. Harper's, Atlantic, Arena, Municipal Affairs, Scribners, building trade journals and professional architectural and social work publications, as well as newspapers, all took up the issue of tenement housing and sanitation in the 1870s. The ideal solution was the promotion of inexpensive cottages in the suburbs, accessible through trolleys. Financial realities, however, precluded single-family housing for many, and so architects and planners sought new design options for apartment living.

Several professional journals and magazines sponsored competitions for alternative tenement designs. In 1879, New York Plumber and Sanitary Engineer announced what would be the most significant of these competitions. The editors specified that the tenement should yield the highest economic return, while providing fireproofing, ventilation and sanitation. James E. Ware, Jr. designed the winning entry, immediately labeled the "dumbbell" because it had two narrow air shafts within a solid rectangular block. The New York Times, American Architect and others all criticized the solution as unsound, unhealthy and cruel. Yet, because of its high economic return, the "dumbbell" became an immediate success among speculative buildings and the prevailing model for new tenement construction.

The typical dumbbell tenement was twenty-five feet wide and ninety feet deep. Indentations 28" wide and 50-60 feet long broke the solid block. Entirely closed on all four sides and rising the full height of the building, these air shafts seldom met their ostensible purposes of providing air and light to inside rooms. Tenants on the upper floors often threw their garbage down into the shafts, where it was left to rot. The first floor usually contained two small shops, with bedrooms behind them and another apartment in the rear. On the other floors, there were two 4-room apartments in front and two 3-room apartments in the rear. The public hallway, usually unlit, contained the stairs and one or two toilets per floor. In New York, in 1893, over 800,000 people lived in these buildings.

Apartments by Choice: At the other end of the economic spectrum were those who chose to live in apartments. In the United States, this chosen alternative to single-family housing dates to the last half of the 19th century. The first building designed as an apartment house appeared in Boston in 1855, designed by Arthur Gilman. It offered permanent residences for families and bachelors. The real beginning of the movement came, however, in 1869 when Richard Morris Hunt designed the Stuyvesant on Irving Place in New York. The 5-story building offered 6-10 room suites on the lower floors for a rent of $1200-1800 per year, while the top floor studio apartments rented for $920 per year.

Hunt imported the concept from France. It also came as a direct response to increased land cost that resulted from population density. Building a multi-family building allowed developers to make more money. A month before Hunt completed construction, the Stuyvesant was besieged with 200 applications. The building, which cost $150,000 to build, brought in a profit of $23,000 in the first year. The message to investors was clear. Returns of 10-30% stimulated investors. In New York alone nearly 200 sets of French flats were erected between 1869 and 1876. In Chicago, following the 1871 fire, 1,142 apartment buildings went up in a single year.

The notion of apartment living was sold on the basis of efficiency and unheard-of technological advances: The entrances and public spaces were sumptuous. Marble floors and paneling, crystal chandeliers, imported carpets, and walnut or mahogany wainscoting adorned public doorways, lobbies, staircases and elevator carriages. There were central hot-water heating, central gas mains for lighting and fully equipped bathrooms for each unit. Shortly thereafter, apartment buildings featured steam elevators with uniformed operators. Bathrooms became more elaborate with hot and cold running water, hand painted china basins, and hand carved shower stall screens. Architects experimented with electric generators, later connecting the buildings to the streetcar electric service, and installed central vacuum cleaning systems with nozzles in each room connected to a large pump in the basement; individual attachments could be used as hair dryers or reversed as dust collectors. To increase light and ventilation, subsequent designs grouped apartments around a central courtyard with central corridors. The emphasis on efficiency resulted in some apartments separating the heat and discomfort of cooking and laundry from the living quarters with public dining rooms, kitchens and laundries. Some provided servants for serving meals and cleaning clothes. The cooperative services, technological advances and attention to public spaces made the apartment seem like one of the most advanced institutions in American society.

Not the American Dream: To the vast majority of Americans, any kind of shared dwelling seemed an aberration of the model home. It was felt that close proximity and shared facilities encouraged promiscuity. The proximity of the bedroom to the public spaces in each apartment seemed to further encouraged promiscuity. Several architects experimented with interior staircases for two-floor units, but the expense made it economically wiser to keep all the rooms on one floor. Many believed the reduction of housekeeping chores brought on by the efficiency of the apartment would lead to wifely negligence of duties toward home and children. Finally, for many Americans, the imitation of decadent European living patterns did not seem fitting for good American families.

Well into the twentieth century, the middle class attacks on apartments as inadequate homes continued. The Ladies Home Journal issued dire warnings of Bolshevik influence over American women exerted through the increasing number of apartments. Better Homes in America captured the sense of alarm when it reported to the 1921 National Conference on Housing that a child's sense of individuality, moral character, and intellectual efficiency could only develop in a private, detached dwelling. The apartment was blamed for the rising divorce rate, the declining birth rate, premarital sex, and the social and economic disparities between rich and poor.

> It is hard to think of a real home stored in diminutive pigeon-holes . . . The quarters are so crowded that not only is it necessary to use folding Christmas trees, but the natural, free intercourse of the family is crowded out; there is no room to play, no place for reading room and music and hearthside; and so families fold up their affections too. [Reverend Henry F. Cope, "The Conservation of the Modern Home," in The Child Welfare Manual, 2 vols. (New York, NY: The University Society, 1915), Vol. 1, page 21.]

The Preferred Solution: In contrast to the multi-family dwelling, the bungalow was a preferred solution. It was an expression of "democratic architecture" which meant good homes available to all Americans through economy of construction and materials. As expressed by Gustav Stickley, this approach to design could remedy almost every problem facing the middle class family, from lack of servants to the increased divorce rate. By creating a heathy home environment, it also addressed larger social issues such as crime, disease and civil disorder. This perspective was echoed by the Ladies Home Journal, with a circulation of 2 million.

The bungalow generally referred to a relatively unpretentious small house. They were one or one and a half stories, between 600-800 sf. Bedrooms were little more than bunk spaces. The kitchen fitted like a ship's galley, accommodating one person. The family ate its meals in a large central area, a combined living/dining space. Rarely did houses have a single-purpose room, such as libraries, pantries, sewing rooms and spare bedrooms.

Condemning decoration and ornament as collectors of dust and dirt, proponents of the new style argued for austere simplicity. Eliminating unnecessary housework, uncluttered space, and smooth surfaces was preferred. Instead of cornices with crevices which had to be dusted, painted stencils began to adorn living rooms. Walls often simply received a coats of smooth, white plaster. On the floor were mats, throw rugs and a novel product called linoleum. Kitchen walls called for washable tiles or less expensive enameled sheet metal. Materials for walls, floors and ceilings were to be easy to clean and restful on the eyes.

Built-in conveniences abounded: Bookshelves and cabinets in the living room; fold-down tables, benches and ironing boards in the kitchen, medicine cabinets in the bathroom and more closets throughout the house. Venetian blinds replaced curtains in many houses. Rows of simple casement windows with small leaded panes eliminated the need for curtains at all.

These new and simpler bungalows did not necessarily cost less than the elaborate Victorian dwellings of a generation before. Interest in health and efficiency meant that a larger proportion of the construction costs--sometimes upwards to 25%--now went into household technology. After 1905, the bathroom was considered an essential part of the middle class house. At first, lead pipes were left partly exposed, partly from pride and partly from fear of trapped gases. By 1913, built-in bathtubs and sinks were on the market, making claw feet and visible pipes seem old-fashioned. The compact bathroom, its walls and fixtures gleaming white, became the mark of modernization.

The kitchen, too, was compact and carefully planned. It measured approximately 120 sf. One wall contained space for a Hoosier, with numerous wood drawers. New appliances stood center stage. The sink and drain board were of shiny white porcelain or enameled iron. An automatic pump supplied hot and cold running water. A hood hung over the gas range to cut smells and cookware was intended to hang on the wall.

These changes in house architecture reflected changes in American lifestyle. The average number of children dropped to 3.5 by 1900, and many families only had one or two. Domestic production, such as quilts, home canning, and dowry linens, was disappearing. Formality was declining, with dining habits more relaxed. Family meals were less frequent and dinners had fewer courses. Entrance halls no longer served as a receiving area, while the parlor was viewed old-fashioned. With kindergarten and social groups such as Boy Scouts and Campfire Girls, the home also was no longer the center for training children.

The Middle Class Apartment Building: Even with the reduced cost and size of the bungalow, for many, home ownership remained outside financial reality. In the 1920s, only 46% of all American families were homeowners. That figure was lower in metropolitan areas. An economic depression in 1921 aggravated the postwar housing shortage, limiting the number of new permits and increasing the price of housing that was being built. The average price of a new house rose from $3,972 in 1921 to $4,937 by 1928.

Still, the effort to promote home ownership continued unabated. First Secretary of Commerce and later President Herbert Hoover promoted the American ideal with an "Own Your Own Home" campaign. A broad coalition of developers, realtors, architects, builders, government officials, and sociologists engineered the residential patterns of the 1920s. Each sought to preserve the nuclear family, bolster the economy, provide more affordable houses and encourage community participation. Most popular middle class literature and house guides, architect's manuals and government documents praised the suburbs as a haven of "normalcy."

The architectural profession responded with Architects' Small House Service Bureau. Formed in Minneapolis in 1921, the Bureau's intention was to corner the suburban market which had tripled between 1920 and 1922. It offered a service, making a reasonable profit and offered a rational approach to the housing business. In the bureau's main office, architects and draftsmen produced stock plans for 3-6 room houses and made them available at the minimum price of $6 per room. For houses larger than six rooms, the staff unequivocally recommended the personal services of a professional architect. Recognizing the profitability to the profession, the American Institute of Architects officially sponsored the bureau.

With wartime inflation nearly doubling wholesale and consumer prices, a few attempted to respond to the needs of those just below the home ownership level through creative cooperative designs. They hoped to stabilize residential development, to modernize the suburbs and to open them to more moderate income families. The best known ventures were sponsored by New York's limited-dividend City Housing Corporation. The first project, Sunnyside Gardens, was constructed between 1924 and 1928 in Queens. Unable to convince borough authorities to modify the grid pattern of the streets, architects Clarence Stein and Henry Wright built brick row houses enclosing large interior courts, which were cooperatively owned and maintained. Each group of residents decided how to use their court: for common playgrounds or gardens. Wright gave each architectural distinction, balancing standardized layouts with a variety of roof lines, porches and brick details.

Paralleling these efforts was the rise of the bungalow court and garden apartment which appeared nationally in the 1910s. Developers promoted this apartment form as a modern living environment. They offered convenience, efficiency and simplicity of the bungalow to bachelors of both sexes, thereby freeing them from the constraints of domestic chores. With mortgages of 70-90% available in the 1920s, developers rushed to capture this multi-family market with an onslaught of new construction.

APARTMENT LIVING - THE PORTLAND EXPERIENCE

The Beginnings: Given the societal predisposition toward single-family home ownership, the essential motivator for the development of apartment buildings was expensive land. Through the 19th century, such was rarely the case in Portland.

Tenements did appear in Portland in the latter half of the 19th century, housing immigrant groups as the Chinese. They arrived beginning in the 1850s. This followed the California Gold Rush and the establishment of regular San Francisco-Portland steamship routes. In the following decades, Chinese continued to come in increasingly large numbers in the latter half of the 19th century, supplying cheap labor in railroad construction. As the city grew in stature in the Pacific Northwest, steamship service among China, San Francisco and Portland grew. Racism, cultural preferences and economic circumstances pushed Chinese-Americans into shared housing in the area northwest of the waterfront district. Asiatics were precluded from owning land. Most Chinese viewed their stay as temporary, and acts of violence against Chinese were not uncommon.

The Japanese experience was similar. Beginning in 1886, Japanese also began to immigrate to the United States and to Portland. The largest influx arrived between 1890 and 1920, though most came to work on farms. Those in Portland also collected in an area northwest of the waterfront district and lived in shared housing. They, too, faced racism and tended to see their stay as temporary.

Apartments as a living option among Euro-Americans did not appear until the Lewis & Clark Exposition in 1905. In the year immediately preceding, the city's population swelled with construction workers who viewed their stay in Portland as temporary. W.L. Morgan, Portland developer, built what was reported to be the first apartment building in the city in 1904 at the southeast corner of 16th and Jefferson. The apartment building had 13 rooms and was opened in June of 1904. Morgan built two other apartment buildings at northwest 15th and Everett and the apartments rented immediately. Yet in 1905 there were still only three or four frame apartment houses in Portland.

Nonetheless, Morgan's success set a tone for the Nob Hill neighborhood. In the years following the fair, the national exposure brought extraordinary growth; the city's population nearly tripled in two waves of growth that stretched from 1905 to 1913 and 1917 into the mid-1920s. Building on Morgan's success, developers began building apartments in the Nob Hill area. Following national trends, they marketed the properties to an upscale consumer with an emphasis on the exotic, on elegance, on convenience, and on technological advances. Apartment buildings sprang up around the streetcar lines on 19th and 21st Avenues and the area became the most densely populated district in the state.

THE APARTMENT IN EAST PORTLAND

The experience of East Portland, however, was substantially different. Up until 1891, the city's development was confined primarily to the west bank of the Willamette River. The City of East Portland, incorporated in 1870, stretched from the river to 24th Avenue, and from Halsey to Holgate. Much of the city was unplatted farmland without streets or blocks. In 1891, Portland, East Portland and Albina were consolidated into a single city with about 25 square miles and 63,000 people. Later in that decade, the city of Sellwood and an area of unincorporated land east out to 42nd Avenue on the East Side was annexed. This same era saw the construction of the first bridges over the Willamette River.

But much of the population growth that resulted from the Lewis & Clark Exposition occurred on the east side. Automobile ownership in the city expanded from 1 in 13 in 1918 to 1 in 5 in 1925. And the multitude of trolley lines were consolidated into a single line operated by the Portland Railway, Light and Power Company. These changes made the outlaying areas more accessible. To facilitate east side growth, the city improved access. Portland refurbished the Burnside Bridge and Steel Bridge. It replaced the Morrison Street Bridge and Madison Street Bridge and opened the Broadway Bridge. Burnside Street was widened, while Sandy Road went from hard-packed dirt in 1912 to a widened and paved boulevard.

The balance of population shifted permanently from the west side of the Willamette to the east side and the growth spawned extensive single-family housing developments on the east side. Real estate developers purchased whole farms and developed the parcels as entire neighborhoods. Some developments, such as Laurelhurst, developed in 1909, focused on the upscale market, with curving streets and a $3000 minimum value for homes. Others, such as Rose City Park, sought a lower economic level with a minimum price of $1500. To keep ever more distant neighborhoods convenient and to continue to foster single-family home ownership, trolley lines were developed to neighborhoods such as Sellwood, Sunnyside, Mt. Tabor and Park Rose.

The east side was a bastion of white middle class home ownership. In 1910, 58% of those on the east side owned or were buying their homes, compared with 46% citywide and an average of 32% among all large cities. The west side had two-thirds of the city's 1,045 blacks and almost all of its Asian-Americans.

Still, developers saw a market in this remaining 42%, fueled in part by mortgages of up to 90%. With the development of large tracts of housing keeping them out, apartment buildings appeared as infill in areas already settled and along the major thoroughfares and streetcar lines such as Hawthorne, Belmont and Sandy. In 1924, to control this explosive growth, the city passed its first zoning law, dividing land use into four primary categories: Single-family dwellings, multiple-family dwellings (apartment buildings), business use and industrial use. Quite specifically, the law was designed to protect residential neighborhoods against unwanted intrusions which might lower home values.

But this market was not the upscale consumer found in fashionable Nob Hill. Nor was it the tenement market of the North Burnside district. Generally, this market was the responsible working class which attempted to better itself through diligence and hard work. It was the bachelor (male or female) for whom the convenience, efficiency and lack of domestic chores found in an apartment matched their mobile, active lifestyle. And it was the lower middle class married couple for whom the economy of apartment living was a boon. For these, apartment living was a natural interim step to home ownership.

Given the stigma, however, it was critical for middle class apartments to distinguish themselves from the lower class ones. In part, this was achieved through form. In some instances, particularly in the early efforts of the late 1910s and early 1920s, architects attempted to hide the apartment building by making it look like a large house built in the current styles. These were typically two to three stories tall with two units per floor and often with gabled roofs providing an attic story. Examples include The Clarkton at 2514 SE Ankeny (1913) and the Apartment at 2703 SE Yamhill (1923).

Other developers and architects were less concerned, simply replicating forms that were successful in Nob Hill. These were 3 or 4 story walk-ups with a double-loaded central corridor providing access typically to studios and one-bedroom apartments. Hubert Williams and Elmer Feig produced many of these examples with stylistic appliques ranging from the Spanish Colonial Revival to Egyptian to Tudor. With land more readily available, architects often used an "L," "H" or "U" shape. Examples are numerous, including the apartment by Robert McFarland at 1806 NE 13th (1924), the Parkside Apartments by Williams at 3652 SE Stark (1929) and the Santa Barbara Apartments by Feig at 2052 SE Hawthorne.

It was more common though, for architects and developers on the east-side to exploit the relative abundance of land and experiment with new apartment forms that were less dense. The most common form was the bungalow court or garden apartment with a central courtyard. Typically, architects would use popular revival styles, especially Spanish Revival, English Cottage and Tudor Revival, to give their buildings an exotic in vogue look. The earliest recognized garden apartment on the east side appeared in 1925 in a collection of three bungalow duplex buildings at 2305 SE Ash and in a U-shaped Spanish Revival complex at 630 NE 20th.

As nationally, the bungalow court/garden apartment form proved popular as an apartment form similar to the single-family housing offered by the bungalow. All of these followed a common form: A one (or rarely two) story U-shape surrounding an open courtyard. Each apartment had a separate entry. Like most one-story bungalows, the entry opened to a large living room, sometimes with a dining alcove at the rear. The kitchen was also bungalow-like, and galley in form with a rear entry. Generally, the apartments were studios or one-bedroom.

1925-27 saw a veritable explosion of the form with over a dozen garden apartment complexes being built on the east side. Examples include the Apartment at 5110 SE Division by C. L. Goodrich (1927), Halsey Court Apartments at 1511 NE 45th by Cash & Wolf (1928), and the Apartment at 3087 SE Ankeny by Frank Klinksi (1928).

Despite the success, the design challenges facing apartment developers, architects and social reformers in the period between the wars remained the same:

- Creating a middle class apartment context that philosophically supported the American dream of home ownership. Apartments, locally and nationally represented a threat to traditional family values;

- Creating multi-family housing which offered maximum economic return to the developer while offering individuality to the occupant. Market forces alone would determine the housing choices.

- Distinguishing middle class apartment dwelling from the stigma associated with tenement and lower class apartment dwellers. To be successful as a residential alternative, the apartment building must be an option of choice, not necessity. Historically, this was achieved through style and/or technology. Qualities of natural light, ventilation, green space and privacy were considered important.

F. ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES

TOWNHOUSE APARTMENT DESIGNS OF E. T. PAPE IN EAST PORTLAND BETWEEN 1920-45

As designers and architects grappled with providing middle class apartment housing in East Portland, Ewald T. Pape demonstrated a particular sensitivity to the issue and stands alone in producing an apartment design singularly suited to the physical and psychological needs of middle class tenants. As such, his works are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion "A" for Community Planning and Development and Criterion "C" for Architecture.

ARCHITECT - Ewald T. Pape

"Designer of Character Homes," such reads E. T. Pape's building plans stamp. Little is known about Pape. There is no obituary and no articles. He was not a registered architect. Still, this little-known man left an indelible imprint on the city scape of Portland. He provided both residential and apartment designs, mostly on the east side.

What we do know of Pape comes from the City Directory. He first appeared in 1923, residing at Royal Palms Apartments at 262 Flanders in the North Burnside area and working independently as a draftsman. In the next year, he married Alma and moved to the Houseman Apartments (now Casa Linda) at 730 Hoyt in Nob Hill. Beginning in 1925, Pape established an independent office at 956 Sandy Boulevard and began to market himself as a designer of fine homes. This step coincides with the construction of one of his home designs located in North Portland. The following year, he moved his office to the Couch Building on 4th Avenue. He received several residential commissions for properties in the Alameda and Portland Hills neighborhoods.

It was during this time that he established an ongoing relationship with Robert McFarland and William K. Johnson, designing several apartment buildings for each. In 1925, McFarland gave him his first multi-family commission. The builder had purchased two lots near 24th and Madison and wanted to construct a small apartment building on each. In design, one (1330-1338 SE 24th Avenue) was Spanish Colonial Revival; the other (at 1405-11 SE 24th Avenue) was English Cottage. Each contained four one-bedroom units. Notably, each unit had a separate entrance and address; in a society that looked down upon apartment dwellers, the relatively small matter of an individual address was an attractive element to tenants.

Within a couple years, McFarland had parlayed his lots into half and whole block developments. The first major purchase was the north half of the lot bounded by Madison, Hawthorne, 29th and 30th. In 1928, Pape designed two quarter block apartment buildings for the parcel, both one-story English Cottage style: The Sheffield Manor was at the east end of the parcel at 1411 SE 30th Avenue while the Willister Courts were at the west end at 2910 SE Madison Street. For these parcels, Pape used an "L" shape and placed his units as close to the street as possible. The result was an interior courtyard for garages and greenspace away from the noise, dust and intrusion of the streets. Where McFarland was able to purchase several adjacent lots, the potential for greenspace was significant.

The following year, McFarland developed the block to the south, starting with the Burrell Court property at 2904-2918 SE Hawthorne Avenue. With Burrell Court, Pape also experimented with a two-story townhouse unit. To that point, no architect in Portland had explored the concept. Pape offered a design suggestive of an English Cottage with a high gabled roof. At the corner and the ends, Pape used the added space to create three two-story townhouse units.

Pape's next design for McFarland was the Burrell Heights Apartments at 1510-42 SE Clay Street. The two-story units in the Burrell Courts must have been popular because Pape's design for the Burrell Heights was exclusively dedicated to the two-story unit. After the Burrell Heights, he again repeated the concept in the San Farlando Apartments (2903-25 SE Hawthorne) in 1929. He then used the concept again in the Del Mar Apartments (2931-53 SE Hawthorne). Another work developed for McFarland was a four-family unit at 2703 NW Raleigh.

During this same period, he also began work for developer William K. Johnson. His first project was the Villa Marconi at 3602-14 SE Stark, followed by the Thompson Court Apartments (2304-14 SE 11th Avenue). He also developed the English Cottage-style apartment building at 2904 SE Washington for developer Robert Beat. His last known work was the complex at 4341-53 NE Halsey, developed in 1933.

During this period, with upscale commissions continuing, Pape hired architect O. M. Akers to design a small family house for him in Eastmoreland at 1520 E. 36th Avenue (7528 SE 36th Avenue).

During the war, Pape's commissions stopped. Registered architects were involved with federal projects related to the war effort. These included mass housing projects which kept most busy for the duration. Since Pape was not a registered architect, demand for design services evaporated with the reallocation of raw materials to the war effort. He instead took a job as an estimator for the Portland Door Company. After the war, he returned to home designs. He also attempted to capitalize on the housing boom by developing homes on speculation. In 1955, Pape disappeared from the City Directory. Given the substance of his work, he very likely retired and moved out of the area.

PAPE'S APARTMENT DESIGNS AND MIDDLE CLASS VALUES

Pape's most important contribution to Portland's building environment is in his apartment designs. His designs stand distinctly apart from his peers. He was active as an apartment designer at the time of B. T. Allyn, O. M. Akers, Elmer Feig, Claussen and Claussen, Hubert Williams and Carl Linde. All produced quality garden-style apartments on the east side. Yet unlike his peers, Pape's designs represent a continuing refinement of a single form dedicated to quality middle class housing. This refinement grew from a standard linear form comparable to much of B. T. Allyn's work to a relatively sophisticated "L" shaped two-story structure with townhouse units which provided maximum natural light, ventilation, individuality and privacy. Pape showed a striking understanding of the stigmas of apartment living and demonstrated a commitment to mitigate both the image and reality of that stigma. What is important is not so much the individual quality but the consistency and cumulative effect of these elements. No other designer or architect in Portland demonstrated such a level of initiative, commitment and consistency in creating apartments that are most like homes. Important and consistent elements that distinguish Pape's designs are as follows:

* *Two-story units*

In a world where the visibility of a bedroom from the living room suggested promiscuity, Pape designed two-story, two-bedroom units. These units were more home-like, placing the focus of apartment on the living room. He was the leading practitioner of two-story designs in the city, with only Carl Linde and later George Post experimenting with this floor plan.

* *Unique floor plans.*

Creating a cost-effective apartment building usually translated into a cookie cutter approach to interior floor plans. That is a reality faced even today. In Pape's best designs, each unit had a floor plan unique in that structure. Psychologically, this sense of individuality is an important element in creating a pride of place. No other contemporary designer or architect in Portland is known to have made such a concerted effort to achieve this variety.

* *Emphasis on interior function over exterior design.*

Describing Pape's buildings is difficult. He allowed his goals of unique floor plans, natural light and ventilation to define the building, and then develop the exterior design. This is particularly apparent in his entry and fenestration patterns. Massing, doorways and windows were irregular in pattern. Living rooms had large windows. Bedrooms usually had paired windows. Every room had some window, though bathroom windows were smaller while kitchen windows were wider. Care was made to ensure that no window looked in on another apartment, and to provide the maximum possible ventilation and natural light.

* *Separate entrances with individual addresses.*

Pape realized that one's sense of residence began at the front door and transcended the physical building when placed on job and credit applications. *Apartment A, 1336 SE 24th* carried a stigma that *1330 SE 24th* did not. Then too, individual entrances allowed occupants to decorate their entries in an individual manner, much like a house. With the appearance of the garden-style apartment, the opportunity arose for individual entrances and many architects took advantage. Examples include works by B. F. Allyn, O. M. Akers, Claussen and Claussen and Hubert Williams. Yet many architects also used a single sidewalk entrance leading into a courtyard, much as Carl Linde did at the Sorrento and Salerno Apartment Buildings. Pape consistently placed his buildings near the front of the street line with distinct doorways in rowhouse fashion. While other architects used this approach, Pape was the only designer to use this approach exclusively.

* *Individual rear entrances.*

Much like his concern for individual addresses, rear entries played an important psychological role among the occupants. Each unit had an individual exit to the rear courtyard. Typically, working-class apartments had only one entrance. Those that had two usually opened into a hallway. Front and rear doors reflected life in single-family dwellings, such as the bungalow. Again, Pape was not the only designer/architect to use this device, but he was the only one who always used this device.

* *Distinctive, cost-effective designer "add-ons"*

Pape's townhouse units were designed for the working and middle class. Yet Pape applied distinctive touches which collectively added value to the quality of life in the apartments. The front door was mahogany, as were the baseboards and trim. Front windows and door glass frequently were leaded glass. Built-ins in the dining room were not uncommon. Kitchen cabinets often had distinctive designs, while counters were often tile. The stairway had a decorative wrought iron railing.

Hardware was brass and found on all doors, with locks on the bedroom and bathroom doors. The bathrooms had tile floors and wainscoting.

* *Creative groupings of adjacent projects*

Many of Pape's projects were designed for developer Robert McFarland. Whether by premeditation or luck, Pape had the opportunity on several occasions to develop contiguous parcels. Notably, these were the block bounded by Hawthorne, Madison, 29th and 30th, and the half-block bounded by Hawthorne, Clay, and 29th. In these, by using an "L" pattern sited to the street, Pape was able to created a substantial interior courtyard for light, ventilation, and recreation. This grouping of individual projects is rare in Portland. While these parcels were all developed approximately at the same time, there is no evidence that they were planned at the same time. In fact, all but two (located on the north side of Hawthorne between 29th and 30th) have substantially different design motifs (e.g., Mission Revival versus English Cottage).

* *Middle Class Tenants*

It is also important to note that Pape's designs were successful. Using the City Directory, it is possible to identify the occupancy, marital and employment status of residents of his designs. Typically, residents were married, though a large portion of the occupants were widows. Virtually all were of either the lower middle or sales class. Typical jobs included salesmen, assistant branch managers, buyers, traffic managers, cashiers and clerks, though there was at least one neuropsychiatrist.

REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

In order to be listed under this property type, the building must meet the criteria of designer, geography and time frame. In comparing examples, the degree to which the building reflects those characteristics which were intended to make it attractive to middle class tenants become the critical distinction. As noted above, the distinct characteristics which distinguish Pape's designs for middle class housing include:

* Two-story units
* Unique floor plans
* Emphasis on interior function over exterior design

- Separate entrances with individual addresses
- Individual rear entrances
- Distinctive, cost-effective designer "add-ons"
- Creative groupings of adjacent projects to create open spaces and provide natural light and ventilation
- Middle Class tenants

Finally, in evaluating Pape's works for registration, it is important that the proposed property reflect a significant level of integrity as the design and spatial form play an integral part of the attractiveness of the building to its market.

G. GEOGRAPHIC DATA

The Multiple Property group included in this listing is limited to buildings located within the legal boundary of the City of Portland, Multnomah County, Oregon, and located east of the Willamette River.

H. SUMMARY OF IDENTIFICATION METHODS

The multiple property submission came as a result of a direct concern expressed by the Oregon State Advisory Committee on Historic Preservation. Specifically, the committee wished to have a context for determining the appropriateness of listing individual apartment buildings located in East Portland on the National Register. Between 1980 and 1984, the City of Portland conducted a windshield survey of historic resources within the city. While this survey is at times uneven, it identified some 5,000 individual properties throughout the city. While single-family residences comprise a major portion of that number, the apartment buildings represent a substantial number.

Heritage Investment Corporation, which is a private historic preservation consulting firm, has in the past submitted several apartment buildings for listing and anticipates similar projects in the future. In an effort to facilitate the committee's deliberations, Heritage developed the present submission. As pertains to the specific building type, Heritage has a client which, by virtue of their attractiveness to the marketplace, owns several buildings designed by E. T. Pape. It is anticipated that this multiple property submission will develop further as additional property types are examined and evaluated.

I. MAJOR BIBILIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

Abbott, Carl. Portland: Planning, Politics and Growth in a Twentieth Century City. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1983).

Bemis, Albert Farwell and Burchard, John II, The Evolving House (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1933).

Blumenson, John J. G. Identifying American Architecture. (Nashville, TN: American Association for State and Local History, 1977).

Bosker, Gideon and Lencek, Lena. Frozen Music. (Portland, OR: Western Imprints, 1985).

City of Portland Buildings Bureau microform and card files.

Corning, Howard McKinley, Dictionary of Oregon History (Portland, OR: Binford & Mort, 1956).

Cromley, Elizabeth Collins, Alone Together: A History of New York's Early Apartments. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990).

Ferriday, Virginia Guest, et al., Historic Resource Inventory. (Portland, OR: City of Portland, 1984).

Hawes, Elizabeth, New York, New York: How the Apartment House Transformed the Life of the City, 1869-1930. (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993)

Kreisman, Lawrence, Apartments by Anhalt (Seattle, WA: City of Seattle, 1978).

Labbe, John T., Fares, Please: Those Portland Trolley Years. (Caldwell, ID: The Caxton Printers, 1980)

MacColl, E. Kimbark. The Shaping of a City: Business and Politics in Portland, Oregon, 1885-1915. (Portland, OR: The Georgian Press, 1976)

MacColl, E. Kimbark. The Growth of a City: Power and Politics in Portland Oregon, 1915-50.

(Portland, OR: The Georgian Press, 1979)

Multnomah County Tax Assessor records, microform, automated data files and card files.

Oregon Historical Society, Vertical Files.

The Oregonian

The Oregon Journal

Polk's Portland, Oregon City Directory. (Portland, OR: Polks).

Poppeliers, John C., Chambers, S. Allen, and Schwartz, Nancy B. What Style Is It?. (Washington, D.C.: Preservation Press, 1983).

Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps for Portland, Oregon.

Snyder, Eugene E., Portland Names and Neighborhoods. (Portland,OR: Binford & Mort, 1979).

Snyder, Eugene E., We Claimed This Land: Portland Pioneer Settlers. (Portland, OR: Binford and Mort, 1989).

Vaughan, Thomas and Ferriday, Virginia Guest. Space, Style and Structure: Building in Northwest America. (Portland, OR: Oregon Historical Society, 1974).

Whiffen, Marcus. American Architecture Since 1780: A Guide to Styles. (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1969).

Wright, Gwendolyn, Building the American Dream: A Social History of Housing in America. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981).