


United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Registration Form



This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in *How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form* (National Register Bulletin 16A). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the information requested. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional entries and narrative items on continuation sheets (NPS Form 10-900a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer, to complete all items.

1. Name of Property

historic name **Greenmeadow (Units I and II)**

other names/site number

2. Location

street & number **Nelson Dr., El Capitan Pl., Adobe Pl., Creekside Dr.** NA ☐ not for publication

city or town **Palo Alto** NA ☐ vicinity

state **California** code **CA** county **Santa Clara** code **085** zip code **94306**

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1986, as amended, I hereby certify that this ☒ nomination ☐ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property ☒ meets ☐ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant ☐ nationally ☐ statewide ☒ locally. (☐ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Wanda Wayne Orndorff
Signature of certifying official/Title

15 JUN 2005
Date

California Office of Historic Preservation
State or Federal agency and bureau

In my opinion, the property ☐ meets ☐ does not meet the National Register criteria. (☐ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of commenting or other official

Date

State or Federal agency and bureau

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

☒ entered in the National Register
☐ See continuation sheet.

☐ determined eligible for the
National Register
☐ See continuation sheet.

☐ determined not eligible for the
National Register

☐ removed from the National
Register

☐ other (explain): _____

Signature of the Keeper

Date of Action

B. R. Fugate

7/28/05

Greenmeadow
Name of Property

Santa Clara, California
County and State

5. Classification

Ownership of Property

(Check as many boxes as apply)

- ☒ private
☐ public-local
☐ public-State
☐ public-Federal

Category of Property

(Check only one box)

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

Number of Resources within Property

(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)

Contributing	Noncontributing	
220	25	buildings
		sites
	1	structures
		objects
220	26	Total

Name of related multiple property listing

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

NA

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

None

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions

(Enter categories from instructions)

Domestic/single family

Social/club house

Current Functions

(Enter categories from instructions)

Domestic/single family

Social/club house

7. Description

Architectural Classification

(Enter categories from instructions)

Other: Mid-Century Modern

Modern Movement

Materials

(Enter categories from instructions)

foundation Concrete slab on grade

roof 2x6 Redwood tongue-in-groove with tar & gravel
above, Douglas fir exposed beams

walls Post and beam construction (visible), exterior siding
of vertically grooved redwood plywood, extensive use of
floor-to-ceiling plate glass and sliding glass doors

other Concrete block fireplaces, extensive overhangs

Narrative Description

(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

Greenmeadow (Units I and II)

Name of Property

Santa Clara County, CA

County and State

8. Statement of Significance**Applicable National Register Criteria**

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

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

Areas of Significance

(Enter categories from instructions)

Architecture

Period of Significance**1954-1955**

Significant Dates**NA**

Significant Person

(Complete if Criterion B is marked above)

NA

Cultural Affiliation**NA**

Architect/Builder**Jones, A. Quincy, and Emmons, Frederick****Eichler Homes, Inc.**

Criteria Considerations

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

Property is:

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

Narrative Statement of Significance

(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

9. Major Bibliographical References

(Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

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

Primary Location of Additional Data

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

Name of repository:

Greenmeadow (Units I and II)

Name of Property

Santa Clara County, CA

County and State

10. Geographical Data**Acreage of Property** 73 acres**UTM References**

(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet)

	Zone	Easting	Northing		Zone	Easting	Northing
1	10	578720	4141560	3	10	578760	4140660
2	10	579000	4141000	4	10	578420	4140860

☐ See continuation sheet.**Verbal Boundary Description**

(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification

(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

11. Form Prepared Byname/title **Marty Arbunich (revision)**organization **Eichler Historic Quest Committee** date **11/7/03 (original); 5/21/05 (revision)**street & number **P.O. box 22635** telephone **650-668-0954**city or town **San Francisco** state **CA** zip code **94122****Additional Documentation**

Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets**Maps**A **USGS map** (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.A **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.**Photographs**Representative **black and white photographs** of the property.**Additional items**

(Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

Property Owner

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

name

street & number telephone

city or town state zip code

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 18.1 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.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number 7 Page 1

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

Narrative Description - Greenmeadow

The development of Greenmeadow is comprised of 246 structures: 243 single-story residences (three or four bedrooms, two baths, two-car garages) designed in the mid-century modern style using slab-on-grade post-and-beam construction; one multi-purpose building; one pool services building; and a swimming pool. There is also an adjacent wooded park and auto parking area. Greenmeadow is located in the southern part of the city of Palo Alto, Santa Clara County, California, at its border with Mountain View. Eichler Homes, Inc. constructed the Greenmeadow development in 1954 and 1955 on its own raw land of approximately 73 acres. (In the early 1960s, Eichler built an adjoining but stylistically distinct phase of 27 additional homes at Greenmeadow. These homes are not included in this nomination.) The condition of the homes is remarkably good overall. Greenmeadow remains one of the most well-preserved and well-known Eichler developments, with 220 buildings classified as “contributing,” and 25 buildings and one structure classified as “non-contributing.” While the overall appearance of the district is essentially unchanged since it was built, landscape growth over the past 50 years has obscured much of the streetscape. For decades Greenmeadow’s community has been particularly concerned with preserving the architectural style of the houses. An architectural review committee has been active in reviewing all proposed remodeling plans and providing guidance and advice. This has resulted in the vast majority of houses being remarkably well preserved and remaining true to the spirit of the original design. Ninety-two percent of the buildings are classified as “contributing,” a remarkable number after nearly five decades of occupation.

Some changes to the exterior of the buildings have occurred, the most common being garage doors and front doors replaced with doors that differ in various ways from the original. Generally, exterior siding and garage doors are original. However, some garage doors are now of the aluminum rollup type, and front doors which were originally a plain slab of wood now sometimes have molding, inset windows, and other applied decoration. While the development was originally built with sidewalks with rolled curbs and street lighting, today there are some examples of exposed aggregate added to walkways, brick-like pavers installed in driveways, and occasional examples of new underground accent lighting. Originally tar-and-gravel, roof system applications now include modified bitumen, single-ply sheeting, and polyurethane foam. The community center complex and park look much like they did when they were originally built with little exception. In the 1980s, the swimming pool was rebuilt and expanded ten percent in size. Fifty years of continued but controlled landscape growth has given the center a slightly different appearance.

Six Models

Designed by the firm of A. Quincy Jones and Frederick Emmons, the homes in Greenmeadow are unattached and one story, offering an open plan inspired by architect Frank Lloyd Wright’s Usonian designs. When the subdivision was originally being developed, new home buyers typically selected their home design from several Jones and Emmons models offered by Eichler Homes. (The floor plans for five model interiors – plans JE 14 through 19 – are attached to the end of this section.) For an additional cost, those buyers could request custom variations, usually to the interior, at the time of purchase. The designs emphasize privacy for the residents, presenting relatively blank facades to the street (almost no street-facing windows were used). They feature exposed post-and-beam construction, and usually floor-to-ceiling, wall-to-wall plate glass along the back wall (or on the side, in the case of those with side entrances) and clerestory windows on the front. All feature two-car garages with garage doors oriented to the street, with fixed transom glass windows above them and across the entire front elevation. Eichler roofs do not have attics. Fencing along the lot lines was included with the purchase price to preserve the privacy of

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number 7 Page 2

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

the occupants. Radiant heating systems are standard, as well as built-in electric kitchen appliances. Living space averaged 1,600 square feet.

The entrance area is usually placed along the side of the house, well back from the street, further simplifying the front elevation. In keeping with the modern style, exteriors are clean and simple, almost devoid of decoration. Siding is vertical-grooved redwood plywood, stained in earth-tone colors. Garage doors are finished with matching siding so they blended into the overall design.

Rooflines are flat or approximately at a 2:12 pitch. Because the roof structure is relatively thin and the beams were exposed, the roof appeared to "float" on top of the house. Extensive overhangs provide shade in the summer but let in sunlight in winter. The two-car garage is placed at the front of the houses (no carports are used), in keeping with the increasing reliance on automobiles as primary transportation. Lots are six to seven thousand square feet in size. Many of the broad streets are cul de sacs, so that through traffic is reduced and the safety of the residents is enhanced.

Typically the homes have narrow setbacks on the sides (six feet on one side, ten on the other) with walkways extending to the rear of the building. Vertical-grooved redwood plywood siding covers the side exterior walls, and similar siding comprises fencing that lines the lot lines on each side. Typically one window is set on each side (approximately four by four feet on the bedroom side, floor-to-ceiling glass on the living room side).

The rear of the homes feature floor-to-ceiling glass and a sliding-glass door that together, in most cases, extend the width of the building. Above the glass is an approximately three-foot overhang, below a paved concrete patio.

The following description of the interior of the homes is based on the inspection of a single house, 372 Parkside Drive, which with the exception of a kitchen remodel and a single-level, one-room addition attached to the bedroom wing, still exhibits original design integrity and condition. No other interiors were inspected, and undoubtedly many of them have been modified from their original appearance. Because other homes were not inspected, this report cannot state when they may have been modified. The design emphasizes privacy for the residents. No windows face the street but extensive areas of floor-to-ceiling glass along the rear elevation open up the house to the outdoor, private patio area.

Characterized by openness and informality, the home's post-and-beam structural system, coupled with the expansive glass, minimizes the transitions between indoor and outdoor spaces. The house separates the traffic of the active living areas from that of the passive sleeping areas. The pivot of the living spaces is the simple, efficient galley kitchen, which in the original models featured a kitchen counter top that dropped down to table height, extending itself beyond the kitchen to become a convenient dining table.

The kitchen is separated from the living room by a screen wall approximately six feet high. It also affords a backing for the living room sofa, facing the masonry fireplace that is a part of the exterior glass wall. On the other side of the kitchen, and giving access to the attached garage, is an all-purpose room, which features a sliding-glass door that leads to an outdoor wood deck in the side yard.

The bedroom wing consists of three bedrooms and two baths, one of which is compartmented to serve the master bedroom as a suite and closed off from the hallway traffic when desired. The other bath has space for a washer and dryer, and features a door to the outside for access to the clothesline. One of the most popular features of the bedroom wing is that the master suite extends beyond the glass line of the living area in order to share the view and have sliding-door access to the backyard patio.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 3

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

Original materials and finishes were selected for simplicity, low maintenance, durability, availability at the time, and cost. The underside of two-inch by eight-inch tongue-and-groove redwood roof decking is the ceiling. The walls are original deep-toned Philippine mahogany veneer paneling. Floor coverings (respecting the requirements of the radiant heat system) were originally cork in the living areas and asphalt tile elsewhere. They since have been replaced by other tile and carpet.

Backyards of residences were not surveyed, and consequently any pools and other backyard buildings, structures, and objects were not included in the count of the district.

Six sample Greenmeadow interior floor plans (JE-14 through JE-19), all of them designed by Jones & Emmons, are attached to this section. The source of these plans was an original Eichler Homes sales brochure for the development.

Based on front elevation views from the street, there are six distinct Eichler models present in Greenmeadow. In addition, the front elevations of several residences were classified "unable to determine" because they were not readily classifiable in any one of the six types. The six distinct model types were:

Model One. Consists of a garage and bedroom wing visible from the front, flanking the living/dining area toward the back. The bedroom wing side of house is recessed from street. This model has an eight-foot dead-level roof in front, covering the garage side of the elevation, with some overhang to the bedroom-wing side. The garage roof overhang covers the front entry area. The garage forms one side of the entry, while a corner post supporting the roof forms the other. The front door is recessed and flush with the bedroom-wing of the house. A second, ten-foot dead-level roof in back covers the garage, providing some overlap to the garage. Clerestory windows in the gap between these two roofs provide diffused light to the kitchen/dining area. The garage on one side and corner and post on the other flank the front entry, and all beams are oriented front to back.

Model Two. Consists of an eight-foot-high dead-level roof in the front. One ten-foot-high dead-level roof in back covers the living room area, on the garage side. Again, clerestory (transom) windows between the eight-foot and ten-foot ceilings bring diffuse light into the back of the house. The garage on one side and corner and post on the other flank the front entry, and all beams are oriented front to back.

Model Three. Consists of a roof with an articulated pitch which starts with a shed roof over the garage. The shed roof is eight-foot-high on one side, ten-foot-high on the other, and features beams oriented right to left. The higher end of the shed roof points toward the center of the house. The entry is on the garage side of house. A heater room is next to and flush with the garage and toward the center of the house. The door to the heater room, camouflaged with the same siding, is visible from the front. The front entry, at the center of the front elevation, features one small eye-level vertical window. The bedroom wing side of the home, opposite the garage, is eight feet high. The sideways facing gap between the two roof pitches, again, provides space for clerestory windows to bring light into the house. Beams over the bedroom wing are oriented front to back.

Model Four. Like models One through Three, this one has a garage on one side and a bedroom wing on the other. However, it features a single, folded-pitch roof, flat on either side and with a slight pitch in the center. The slight pitch tops a central recessed entry that's wider than in other models. The entry does not recess as far as it does in models One through Three. This central recessed entry features standard eye-level kitchen windows in the very center topped by trapezoidal windows up to the roofline. A front door is to one side of the windows, close to the bedroom wing. On the garage side, the beams are oriented right to left. The garage side roof has no overhang. The center section roof does overhang, but with the fascia flush with the garage side of the house.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 4

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

Model Five. This is the most common model in Greenmeadow. A single, low center-pitch roof runs the entire width of the front of the house. It features the garage on one side and a concrete block wall on other, and the entrance to the home is on the concrete-block-wall side. Trapezoidal clerestory glass fills triangular gaps up to the roofline. Beams may be oriented either right to left or front to back.

Model Six. This model has three main elements: a garage and bedroom wing on opposite sides that flank the central, recessed entry. The central element, recessed approximately four feet, features standard eye-level windows topped by trapezoidal windows up to the roofline. The central entry is similar to model four, except that the front door is farther away from the kitchen windows than on four, and is on the bedroom wing side. The front door also features a side strip window on the garage side. A single shed roof covers the garage and center section. The roof is eight feet high on the garage side, and ten feet high on the bedroom wing side, with side clerestories facing the bedroom wing. A flat roof tops the bedroom wing. All beams on this model are oriented front to back.

Community Center

Among the features contributing to Greenmeadow's unique character is its community center complex. The center is 2.9 acres of centrally located common area which Eichler Homes, in conjunction with the City of Palo Alto and architects Jones and Emmons, carved from small increments of space from each residential parcel. Eichler's original center design, which remains intact and continues to function today, consisted of a multi-purpose building, a pool services building, an outdoor swimming pool, a park, and ample off-street parking. Barely visible from the street, and set back to accommodate necessary off-street parking, Greenmeadow's community center is an unobtrusive feature of its collective streetscape. Architecturally identical to the surrounding houses, it seems to naturally blend into its site and surroundings.

Conceived as a vital and integral part of community life, the center functions as a space for meetings, parties, dance and exercise classes, and other related activities, as well as a care facility for pre-school children of working parents. In recent years, the need for a cooperative day school has diminished, and the building is currently under lease to a full-time Montessori school. The multi-purpose building accommodates regular meetings of the Greenmeadow Community Association, whose membership of local homeowners own the facilities, having purchased them from Eichler nearly 50 years ago.

For the center's multi-purpose building, Eichler provided a kitchen, public-style toilets, offices, a spacious meeting and recreation room, and storage space. The ambience inside is that of a large Eichler house with its radiant-heated concrete flooring, open post-and-beam construction, exposed tongue-and-groove ceiling/roof deck, and floor-to-ceiling sliding-glass doors. Concrete masonry units comprise the exterior walls, and round steel columns support the building's wide overhangs. Infill walls are wood studs with exterior redwood siding and interior mahogany paneling; or, alternatively, they are concrete masonry units, exposed and painted on the interior. Roofs are flat with 2-by-6-inch, V-groove tongue-and-groove redwood decking with tar-and-gravel roofing. Ceilings are exposed, and stained on the under side of the wood decking. Windows are steel-framed units—horizontal-sliding for large sizes, vertical-sliding at small units. Exterior doors are Arcadia brand: steel-framed, glass-faced, screened, horizontal-sliding units.

Outside the building, one is led through an almost formally symmetrical arrangement of walkways, trees, and lawns. A generous breezeway provides a sheltered connection between the multi-purpose building on one side and the swimming pool services building on the other. A pool office is strategically located inside, at the pool building's entrance. The pool facilities include shower, locker, and toilet rooms, as well as an office and equipment storage for

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 5

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

administrators and lifeguards. The pool, which ranges in depth from three to eight feet, combines three separate and distinct areas of aquatic activity. The walls of dressing/shower rooms are concrete masonry units, painted white. Completing the pool building, which covers the entire length of the pool, is the pump and filter room.

The adjoining park features asphalt-paved, meandering walkways that lead to a central greensward and past benches and picnicking alcoves under redwood tree families. The original landscaping of redwood trees was designed by Thomas Church, the esteemed Bay Area landscape architect who was recipient of the 1953 Gold Medal award from the Architect's League of New York. Church also created variation between the residential lots with differing driveways, and grass and planting forms at the street.

The two buildings—the multi-purpose building and pool services building—are both considered to be “contributing.” The pool is “non-contributing” as it has been significantly enlarged from its original design. They are listed as such in the “List of Street Addresses and Changes” at 303 Parkside Drive.

Summary of Evaluation Methods

The Eichler ‘Historic Quest’ committee members walked the streets of the Greenmeadow subdivision to evaluate each house. Points were entered onto the spreadsheet if a house has been altered from its original appearance. Some of the items on the checklist were a single point value, while for others two or three point values could be selected. Higher point values indicated a more severe change. The points for each house were totaled and entered on the spreadsheet. A total of 12 points or more classified the house as “non-contributing”; 11 points or less classified the house as “contributing.”

Example 1: a house had shingles applied to half of the front elevation (not original siding material) but not including the garage, and the garage door had been converted to a metal rollup door (original doors were faced with the same siding as the house). This justified a penalty of 8 points for the siding change and 8 points for the garage door change for a total of 16, which made it “non-contributing”.

Example 2: a house had a small section of brick applied to the front elevation (4 points), a small window added on the front (4 points) and a traditional-style carriage lamp by the front door (2 points) for a total of 10. The house was classified as “contributing”.

Example 3: a house had a six foot high atrium cover added that was clearly visible from the street (8 points) and the front door had been changed to a traditional style with applied molding and inset glass (4 points) for a total of 12 points, making it “non-contributing”.

On the spreadsheets, each house was marked as either “Contributing” or “Non-contributing” and the total numbers for each page were entered into the “Total Contributing” and “Total Non-contributing” boxes at the bottom. The number of “Contributing” and “Non-contributing” houses for the entire subdivision was calculated as well as the percentages.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 6

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

SUBDIVISION EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. OVERALL (PROPORTIONS OF THE HOUSE)

Contributing: Single story, horizontal emphasis, solid planar surfaces contrasting with large panes of glass (though typically not on the front elevation), post-and-beam construction, and simple forms and details. Fencing, when original, is integrated with the front elevation.

Non-contributing:

- Second-story (unless original)
- Room additions that significantly alter the front elevation.
- Additions such as false pillars and beams with no purpose other than decoration.

2. ROOF

Contributing: Flat, shallow pitch, or combination of flat and central gable roof, often with extensive overhangs, with exposed beams that are squared-off and unornamented.

Non-contributing:

- Readily visible air conditioning or heating ducts
- Atrium covers that significantly alter the roofline
- Large and obtrusive satellite dishes
- Noticeable changes of pitch to the original roofline
- Modified beam shapes, for example beams cut so they are not rectangular

3. FRONT ELEVATION & TRIM

Contributing: Siding is consistent with the general modernist design and incorporates vertical or horizontal lines in the original orientation. Some homes originally had concrete block walls occupying part of the front elevation. Exterior lighting is consistent with modernist principles.

Non-contributing:

- Any siding without lines consistent with that used in the subdivision
- Shingles
- Stucco
- Plaster
- Brick
- Aluminum and vinyl siding
- Applied exterior trim in non-modernist style
- Exterior lights that are obtrusive and not consistent with modernist principles

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 7

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

4. DOORS & WINDOWS

Contributing: Garage doors use the same siding and finish as the rest of the house. Front doors are flat and unadorned. The use of clear glass is minimized along the front elevation.

Non-contributing:

- Conventional ranch-style or aluminum roll-up garage doors
- Any pattern other than lines that match the original siding
- Windows inset in the garage door
- Entry features not integrated with roofline
- Front door with applied decoration
- Added street-facing windows inconsistent with the original style of the house
- Carport glass changed to something other than simple translucent (uncolored)
- Window trim that clashes with the design


United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet


Section number 7 Page 8

Santa Clara County, California

Plan JE-14



Plan JE-15



National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Santa Clara County, California

[illegible]


United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet


Section number 7 Page 10

Santa Clara County, California

Plan JE-18



Plan JE-19



United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 11

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

List of Street Addresses and Changes

ADDRESS	MODEL TYPE	STATUS	BUILDING CONDITION
3885 Nelson Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but exterior front elevation lights non-modern.
3895 Nelson Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but exterior front elevation lights non-modern.
3901 Nelson Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
3907 Nelson Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but front door has applied decoration.
3912 Nelson Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
3913 Nelson Drive	Unable to determine	Non- contributor	Significantly modified front elevation, roof, front door with applied decoration.
3917 Nelson Drive	2	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but front door has applied decoration.
3921 Nelson Drive	2	Non- contributor	Significantly modified roof line.
3925 Nelson Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
3929 Nelson Drive	2	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
3933 Nelson Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
3934 Nelson Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but conventional garage door.
3938 Nelson Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
3939 Nelson Drive	6	Contributor	Acceptable integrity, but front door and front elevation has applied decoration.
3942 Nelson Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but front door has applied decoration, conventional garage door.
3945 Nelson Drive	2	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
3946 Nelson Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4010 Nelson Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4022 Nelson Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but exterior front elevation lights non-modern.
4046 Nelson Drive	6	Non- contributor	Inconsistent siding, applied exterior trim, inconsistent exterior lights, conventional garage door.
4060 Nelson Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4082 Nelson Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but exterior front elevation lights non-modern, front door with applied decoration.
4094 Nelson Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but front door has applied decoration.
455 El Capitan Place	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but entry features not integrated with roof line.
460 El Capitan Place	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but non-compatible garage door.
465 El Capitan Place	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but entry features not integrated with roof line
470 El Capitan	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but exterior lights not compatible

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 2

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

Place			
475 El Capitan Place	1	Contributor	Acceptable integrity, but windows added to front and front door has applied decoration.
482 El Capitan Place	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
485 El Capitan Place	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
490 El Capitan Place	1	Non-contributor	Garage remodeled and Car Port added.
495 El Capitan Place	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
496 El Capitan Place	2	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
501 El Capitan Place	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but front door has applied decoration.
504 El Capitan Place	1	Non-contributor	Windows and Front Door replaced.
513 El Capitan Place	5	Non-contributor	Front elevation features non-compatible shingles and front door has applied decoration.
520 El Capitan Place	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but front door has applied decoration.
521 El Capitan Place	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
3948 Nelson Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
3950 Nelson Court	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
3952 Nelson Court	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
3954 Nelson Court	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
3956 Nelson Court	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but extra window trim clashes with design.
3958 Nelson Court	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but exterior lights not compatible
3960 Nelson Court	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
3962 Nelson Court	Unable to determine	Non-contributor	Total rebuild.
3964 Nelson Court	2	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but front door has applied decoration.
410 Adobe Place	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
411 Adobe Place	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but exterior lights not compatible
420 Adobe Place	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible exterior lights.
421 Adobe Place	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
430 Adobe Place	1	Contributor	Acceptable integrity, but has incompatible atrium cover.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 13

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

431 Adobe Place	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
440 Adobe Place	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
441 Adobe Place	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
450 Adobe Place	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible windows inset in garage.
451 Adobe Place	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
164 Creekside Drive	6	Non-contributor	Modified Windows.
173 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible exterior lights.
183 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
193 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has front yard fencing.
201 Creekside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
209 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
216 Creekside Drive	2	Non-contributor	Under re-construction
217 Creekside Drive	5	Contributor	Acceptable integrity, but has incompatible additional windows.
225 Creekside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
226 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible shingled siding.
233 Creekside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible plaster exterior.
234 Creekside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
241 Creekside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
242 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Non-contributor	Modified front elevation.
251 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible shingled siding.
252 Creekside Drive	3	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
261 Creekside Drive	5	Non-contributor	Shingled exterior.
262 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible windows inset in garage and front door with applied decoration.
271 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 14

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

272 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but conventional garage door.
281 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
288 Creekside Drive	3	Contributor	Acceptable integrity, but has incompatible additional windows.
291 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
296 Creekside Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but front door has applied decoration.
299 Creekside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
303 Creekside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible garage door and exterior lights.
316 Creekside Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
317 Creekside Drive	1	Non-contributor	Incompatible siding.
330 Creekside Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible exterior lights.
331 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
344 Creekside Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
345 Creekside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
358 Creekside Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
359 Creekside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but exterior lights not compatible
372 Creekside Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but front door has applied decoration.
377 Creekside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
386 Creekside Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but exterior lights not compatible
391 Creekside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
398 Creekside Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but front door has applied decoration.
401 Creekside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
410 Creekside Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but front door has applied decoration.
411 Creekside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 15

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

425 Creekside Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but front door has applied decoration.
182 Greenmeadow Way	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
185 Greenmeadow Way	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
224 Greenmeadow Way	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
225 Greenmeadow Way	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
234 Greenmeadow Way	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but conventional garage door.
235 Greenmeadow Way	3	Non-contributor	Non-compatible garage door, windows on garage door, exterior lights
244 Greenmeadow Way	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
245 Greenmeadow Way	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible additional windows.
165 Parkside Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
170 Parkside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
180 Parkside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
190 Parkside Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
202 Parkside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
208 Parkside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but conventional garage door.
220 Parkside Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
221 Parkside Drive	Unable to determine	Non-contributor	Non-compatible room addition, added window trim, carport glass.
230 Parkside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
231 Parkside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
240 Parkside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
241 Parkside Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
250 Parkside Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
251 Parkside Drive	3	Non-contributor	Incompatible room addition.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 6

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

260 Parkside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
261 Parkside Drive	5	Non-contributor	Modified Windows, Modified Roofline and Slate Exterior Siding.
270 Parkside Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but conventional garage door.
271 Parkside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but incompatible exterior lights.
280 Parkside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
281 Parkside Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
290 Parkside Drive	2	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but front door has applied decoration.
291 Parkside Drive	Unable to determine	Non-contributor	Incompatible roofline addition.
303 Parkside Drive	unique building	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
318 Parkside Drive	Unable to determine	Non-contributor	Significant roof alteration
330 Parkside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible exterior lights.
335 Parkside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
342 Parkside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
345 Parkside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
352 Parkside Drive	1	Contributor	Acceptable integrity, but front features added incompatible windows and front door with applied decoration.
355 Parkside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
362 Parkside Drive	Unable to determine	Non-contributor	Non-compatible garage door, additional windows, added window trim.
365 Parkside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
372 Parkside Drive	2	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
375 Parkside Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
382 Parkside Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible exterior lights.
385 Parkside Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
304 Tioga Court	6	Contributor	Acceptable integrity, but entry features modified and applied decoration on front door.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 17

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

305 Tioga Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
318 Tioga Court	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
319 Tioga Court	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
332 Tioga Court	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
333 Tioga Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but non-compatible garage door.
346 Tioga Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
347 Tioga Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
360 Tioga Court	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible additional windows and exterior lights.
361 Tioga Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but has incompatible additional windows.
374 Tioga Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but non-compatible garage door.
375 Tioga Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
306 Diablo Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
307 Diablo Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but incompatible front fencing.
320 Diablo Court	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
321 Diablo Court	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but incompatible exterior lights.
334 Diablo Court	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
335 Diablo Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
348 Diablo Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
349 Diablo Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
362 Diablo Court	5	Non-contributor	Room addition visible from street.
363 Diablo Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
376 Diablo Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
377 Diablo Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
317 Shasta Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
331 Shasta Drive	4	Non-contributor	Overall poor integrity.
343 Shasta Drive	5	Non-contributor	Non-compatible garage door, added windows, windows in garage door.
360 Shasta Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
363 Shasta Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
370 Shasta Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
373 Shasta Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
396 Shasta Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4003 Scripps Avenue	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 18

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

4012 Scripps Avenue	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity,
4015 Scripps Avenue	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4027 Scripps Avenue	4	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4039 Scripps Avenue	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4044 Scripps Avenue	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4051 Scripps Avenue	4	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4052 Scripps Avenue	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4063 Scripps Avenue	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4072 Scripps Avenue	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4075 Scripps Avenue	4	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but applied trim to exterior.
4084 Scripps Avenue	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but incompatible exterior lights, applied decoration to front door.
4087 Scripps Avenue	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but applied trim to exterior.
4097 Scripps Avenue	4	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but incompatible exterior lights.
4103 Scripps Avenue	5	Non-contributor	Shingles added to front elevation.
4104 Scripps Avenue	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but applied decoration to front door.
222 Scripps Court	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but applied decoration on front door.
236 Scripps Court	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but applied decoration on front door.
237 Scripps Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
250 Scripps Court	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but incompatible garage door.
251 Scripps Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
264 Scripps Court	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but incompatible front yard fencing.
265 Scripps Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but incompatible exterior lights.
278 Scripps Court	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but incompatible garage door and applied decoration to front door.
279 Scripps Court	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4005 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity,
4006 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but incompatible exterior lights.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 9

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

4009 Ben Lomond Drive	1	Contributor Overall good integrity, but applied decoration on front door.
4010 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4013 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4014 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4017 Ben Lomond Drive	1	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4018 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity, but added windows.
4021 Ben Lomond Drive	1	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4022 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4025 Ben Lomond Drive	6	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4026 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4030 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity, but non-compatible garage door.
4034 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4038 Ben Lomond Drive	6	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4042 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4043 Ben Lomond Drive	1	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4045 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4046 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4050 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity, but non-compatible garage door.
4051 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4054 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4055 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity, but has incompatible exterior window trim.
4058 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor Overall good integrity.
4062 Ben Lomond Drive	6	Contributor Overall good integrity.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 7 Page 20

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

4066 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4070 Ben Lomond Drive	6	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4073 Ben Lomond Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Acceptable integrity, but non-compatible garage door, applied decoration to front door, window trim
4074 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4077 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4078 Ben Lomond Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but applied decoration on front door.
4081 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4082 Ben Lomond Drive	1	Non-contributor	Incompatible exterior lights, added windows, applied decoration on front door.
4085 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4086 Ben Lomond Drive	Unable to determine	Non-contributor	Change of roofline, non-compatible garage door, applied decoration to front door.
4089 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity, but non-compatible garage door.
4090 Ben Lomond Drive	Unable to determine	Contributor	Acceptable integrity, but non-compatible garage door, applied decoration on front door.
4093 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4094 Ben Lomond Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4100 Mackay Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4101 Mackay Drive	1	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
4102 Mackay Drive	5	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
540 E. Charleston Road	Unable to determine	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
303 Parkside Multi-purpose building	unique building	Contributor	Overall good integrity.
303 Parkside Center pool	structure	Non-contributor	Overall good integrity.
303 Parkside Pool services building	unique building	Contributor	Overall good integrity.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 1

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

Narrative Statement of Significance – Greenmeadow

The Greenmeadow development, 243 single-family homes and one community center complex of two buildings and one pool, was built by merchant builder Joseph Eichler and his Eichler Homes, Inc. in 1954 and 1955 in Palo Alto, California. Greenmeadow is significant for architecture in the context of post-World War II merchant building. When compared to the dozens of other Eichler developments, Greenmeadow stands today as a prime example of the company's mid-century modern design and its best-preserved development built in the 1950s. The commercial and critical success and widespread publicity that resulted from the Greenmeadow project contributed to the development of merchant builder Joseph Eichler's reputation as the pre-eminent developer in the modern style, building quality-designed homes targeted at middle-income families. The Greenmeadow development represents Eichler homes during the most fertile period of design, exhibiting design sophistication that surpassed his previous efforts. Greenmeadow's architects, A. Quincy Jones and Frederick Emmons, whose Jones & Emmons firm became internationally renowned during their 18-year partnership (1950-'68), were affiliated with Eichler Homes throughout the building company's life, designing approximately 5,000 of Eichler's 11,000 California homes. In a larger sense, the Greenmeadow development reflects Eichler's professional and personal beliefs, which remained consistent throughout his career as a builder: that his homes should always be of the best modern design possible; that they be priced moderately; and that they be available to any buyer, without discrimination. In fact, Eichler was also the most prominent homebuilder in the country during the 1950s to practice a nondiscrimination policy. This policy distinguished him from nearly all his contemporaries.

Joseph Eichler's penchant for modern design was deeply rooted in his psyche, but it was not until the second half of his life that he revealed his feelings and fully developed his interest in it. Born in New York City in 1900 to an Austrian-Jewish father and a German-Jewish mother, he was raised amid traditional circumstances. Although his family was politically liberal (they were devoted supporters of Franklin Roosevelt), Eichler's interest in Modern design emerged gradually. At first he showed a desire for the material advantages of modernity—dressing elegantly although conservatively (Eichler's model for clothing styles, according to his son Ned, was Fred Astaire) and later, encouraged by his wife Lillian's mutual enthusiasm, he became captivated by modern architecture.

When Joe met Lillian, he found a kindred spirit who was perhaps more demonstrative than he in embracing modern life. Their relationship eventually helped fuel Joe's confidence in his own creative pursuits. Lillian was also a product of traditional European heritage, a first-generation American, the daughter of Polish Jews. However, she took after her somewhat rebellious mother, who had been so eager for liberation from the constraints of her culture that soon after her arrival in New York she had taken off the wig that she wore according to religious tradition and, in a dramatic act of defiance, threw it into the Hudson River. Joe and Lillian's marriage was an unusual one for European Jews. Not only were their nationalities different, but Lillian's family was wealthy while Joe's was not—a reversal of the commonly expected roles of Eastern and Western European Jewish backgrounds. Ned would eventually write that the couple's common bond was "a zealous commitment to modernity."

Eichler's education was pragmatic. A business degree from New York University and a career start on Wall Street helped prepare Joe for a mainstream career. A competitive man by nature and cultivated in the tough-minded atmosphere of America's financial capital, he was primed for business yet found his early career as a financial officer in his wife's family business dissatisfying. Some of Joe's reticence for this work may have been inherited. Ned pointed out that his

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 2

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

own grandparents did not conform to the stereotypical German-Jewish immigrants and were not ambitious about wealth. Joe's father owned a small toy store in Manhattan but apparently was happiest when he was playing his violin. It was Joe's in-laws who succeeded on a grand scale, building a large and successful wholesale food business called Nye and Nisson, Inc.

In 1925, Joe and Lillian Eichler moved to the Bay Area, where the company was the largest independent butter-and-egg wholesaler in the region. Joe assumed the position of chief financial officer for their business on the West Coast. For 20 years Eichler excelled in his job, and the family that eventually included two sons, Richard and Edward, or "Ned," thrived, despite the nationwide depression and the approaching World War II. Eichler, however, harbored a repressed resentment for his work; its predictability and the requirement to work for others undermined his sense of personal fulfillment.

Then, in 1943, Eichler spotted a rare opportunity for his family when he rented one of Frank Lloyd Wright's so-called Usonians in Hillsborough, the Bazett residence. Two years of living in the Bazett House may very well have loosened Joe Eichler's spirit enough to allow him to feel his own internal stirrings for creative self-expression. "I began to dream," he said, "of building homes for sale that would incorporate some of the same advantages I enjoyed in my own house." Eichler learned by this experience what others have since concluded—that Frank Lloyd Wright's genius for design often achieved its most profound effect in his small residences, where his singular attention to function and detail were so complete and so deftly handled as to transform everyday life into art. Wright's attention to the intimacies of everyday life sprung from his strongly populist philosophy, and he designed his Usonians specifically for middle-class homeowners. As the architectural writer Herbert Muschamp said, "Frank Lloyd Wright was a Mr. Everybody. . . . He was a genius of the conventional, a supreme artist of everyday living. . . ." Eichler said, "I admired Wright's rich design, with its wooden walls and beamed ceiling, and I asked myself if such houses could be built for ordinary people." Joe and Lillian Eichler left the house as "devotees of contemporary architecture."

At the close of World War II in 1945 some ten million veterans returned home from overseas. These servicemen and women began building families that would require new housing on an unprecedented scale. Among the regions with the greatest need was California, where the population grew at a greater rate than any other state. Many veterans had shipped out of California ports, and upon their return elected to stay in the state. Add to this an influx of new residents that moved west because California offered one of the strongest postwar economies in the nation. A great many independent builders sought to capitalize on the early postwar need for new housing. While their production soon fulfilled the basic requirements for new families, these builders produced a quality of construction that was often poor, and innovative design was rare. Eichler's company would become an exception, responding to the challenges with ingenuity and style.

Eichler began his development career cautiously, pursuing mostly conventional techniques, while schooling himself in the home-building business. In 1947, Eichler launched a company providing prefabricated homes to owners who purchased their own lots. Even these tentative first steps, however, reflected Eichler's modern taste. The "pre-fabs" he chose featured a contemporary look, with rectangular massing and long bands of windows. Over the next two years, his operation expanded to the building of small housing tracts. In 1949, Eichler hired a draftsman who produced more stylish but less overtly modern designs for two new subdivisions, in Palo Alto and Menlo Park. Eichler explained later that he put off a wholehearted plunge into original architectural designs until he acquired sufficient "experience and know-how" to manage a process that involved top-flight architects and full-fledged modern building techniques. Within a few years, Eichler became a merchant builder by the classic definition, his company functioning to oversee every aspect of selling housing to consumers without middle men. This included land acquisition and development, construction, financing, and marketing. One obvious element that separated him from the rest of the pack was his choice of product: architect-designed modern houses.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 3

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

As his business became established, Eichler defined an individualistic approach that in many ways challenged conventional practice. Not infrequently, building and planning authorities withheld support for his designs. The Federal Housing Authority, set up to ensure home mortgages, made it possible for families just entering the middle class to afford homes in Eichler's price range. However, the agency imposed a number of restrictive design guidelines that compromised the assistance they could give. As architectural historian Gwendolyn Wright described it, "FHA evaluators were instructed to lower the rating score of houses with conspicuously modern designs because they were not considered to be a good investment. An agency pamphlet expressed doubt whether the modern style of flat roofs and plain asymmetrical facades would prove to be more than a fad." When this policy threatened to exclude the market for Eichler Homes, Eichler, with company co-founder James San Jule as his negotiating partner, went to Washington to lobby the FHA for changes to their guidelines. Apart from overcoming the objections of the authorities, Eichler's company would need to appeal to buyers largely unfamiliar with modern architecture. The pure, modern look of his homes limited market appeal. Despite these obstacles, Eichler embraced modern design, appealing to the authorities when necessary and marketing aggressively.

Working with architects set Eichler apart from most builders. Most builders in the postwar, needing to control the designs for economic and aesthetic reasons, preferred not to hire architectural firms as independent consultants. Further, according to Gwendolyn Wright, "most architects looked down on the average builder's aesthetic taste, as well as his cost controls; and they scorned the cautious, conservative Federal Housing Association (FHA) design guidelines as well." For these reasons, as well as the limited market appeal of modernist residential architecture, Eichler's first architect-designed developments, designed by the emerging San Francisco-based firm of Anshen and Allen and built in Sunnyvale, California in 1949, were considered a gamble.

Generally homebuilders preferred to control design themselves. East Coast-based Levitt and Sons, the most successful of the postwar merchant builders, was a more typical example of merchant builder practice. Despite their company's large-scale production, the family members directed much of the design work themselves. William Levitt acted as spokesman and president, while his brother Alfred helped develop the house plans and their father Abraham oversaw the landscape design. One of the Bay Area's most successful homebuilders during the early postwar was Earl Smith, who built 2,700 moderately priced new homes in 1953 in over 14 different Bay Area cities. Similar to the Levitt's in-house process, Smith designed the homes himself.

This trend began to shift by the mid-1950s. The market for new homes softened after 1953, and competition among builders for more demanding buyers led some to commission architects to raise the standards of their products. Mackay Homes was one Bay Area company that began to employ architects, including for a brief period Anshen and Allen. Mackay, however, exhibited the typical builder's concerns about modern aesthetics, and hedged on their designs, building homes that were contemporary in plan, but clad on the outside in more familiar vernacular styles. Eichler's work remained distinctive among Bay Area builders for his consistent use of modern aesthetics. By 1954, when Greenmeadow was underway, Eichler Homes' headquarters in Palo Alto – which would be home to 3,000 Eichler homes over the next 20 years – served as the hub of its peninsula operation. By the mid-1950s, the company had built approximately 1,800 modern houses on the peninsula, and the popular press regularly acknowledged Eichler's achievements.

Eichler's architecturally designed subdivisions led to widespread critical acclaim. When Eichler built his first subdivision of architecturally designed homes, observers perceived his efforts as daring. Even the professional journals of the architectural press that had been touting the advantages of modernism for middle-class American homes since before the end of the war seemed surprised with Eichler's boldness. *Architectural Forum*, the most elite of the nation's

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 4

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

professional journals during the postwar, in April 1950 called architects Anshen and Allen's first Eichler Homes subdivision a "gamble in modern." In the December issue that year, the publication collectively named four Eichler projects in Palo Alto (El Centro Gardens, Green Gables, and Greer Park) and Redwood City (Atherwood) "Subdivision of the Year."

Arts + Architecture, the premier west coast trade journal devoted to modern design and distributed internationally, published several features on Eichler Homes in the early 1950s. Notable was a pair of articles featuring the Ladera subdivision in Portola Valley, designed by Jones and Emmons. The first, in 1950, described the designs. Then, in the November 1951 issue, an article documented the completed first phase of the development, citing the "enormous value of real cooperation between the architect and builder." It concluded that the results assured a "better way of living at a much more reasonable cost."

Popular "shelter magazines" aimed at the consumer market also featured Eichler Homes during the 1950s. *House and Home*, published by McGraw Hill, who also produced *Architecture Record*, the establishment architectural journal, became a consistent supporter of Eichler Homes. The magazine's editor, Perry Prentice, an influential advocate for improved residential design who hosted numerous symposia at the annual conventions for the American Institute of Architects and the National Association of Homebuilders, came to champion Eichler's work. Writing in 1955, the year after the completion of the first phase of Greenmeadow, the editors praised Eichler for recognizing the benefits of modern architecture. His architects, they noted, "designed better living into houses," enabling buyers to "live the way they really wanted today."

Eichler's architects brought knowledge of modern building techniques and their skills with California Modern design. Robert Anshen, of the San Francisco-based firm of Anshen and Allen, had worked for the National Housing Authority in Vallejo during the War. In 1945, realizing the need for inexpensive, quick-to-build houses, he drew upon his experiences to write a series of papers proposing much-needed home building industry reforms. A. Quincy Jones, with his partner Frederick Emmons, was the designer most responsible for the first two phases of the Greenmeadow subdivision. Jones was a leader in California modernism; an educator and a celebrated practitioner, Jones taught at the architecture school at the University of Southern California for more than 20 years, ascending to the deanship in the 1970s. The architect of the experimental steel-framed X-100 Eichler-built house, Case Study House 24, three other steel houses of note, Jones won numerous awards for design in several building types, yet he remained committed to the improvement of single-family house design. His practice matured and Jones was commissioned for prestigious institutional buildings. While many offices that ascend to this level decline to participate in residential work, Jones pursued single-family house designs throughout his career.

A. Quincy Jones garnered national attention early in his career with designs for postwar housing. In 1946, a year after his discharge from the Navy, Jones collaborated on the Mutual Homes development in the Santa Monica Mountains, above Los Angeles, where his designs for post-and-beam houses – featuring redwood siding, concrete masonry, floor-to-ceiling glazing, and sweeping roof forms – gained wide recognition. In 1948, Jones designed a prototype for Southern California builder A.C. Hvistendahl that earned him an American Institute of Architects First Honor Award in 1950.

Jones committed his early career to improving the affordable single-family house. His successes in this field include work for several developers apart from Eichler Homes. Like Robert Anshen, Jones devoted a great deal of thought, and a significant portion of his career, to the issue of suburban speculative development. In addition to his contributions to home design, Jones was a consistent advocate for planning reform. He was among the first architects to call for greater density in suburban planning, preceding popular acceptance of that idea by at least 15 years. Jones formulated the

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number 8 Page 5

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

planning scheme at Greenmeadow, helping Eichler gain zoning exceptions to reduce the minimum lot size and trading the remainder for a shared community center and park.

Jones brought his experience and status to Eichler Homes, putting his recognized talents to work on the design of individual house models as well as site design and community planning. His addition to the design team helped to establish the Eichler Homes developments as a high-design product. Specific contributions credited to Jones and Emmons included refining Eichler's construction methods – integrating an economy of means with architectural expression. Jones's designs were distinctive because of his use of pronounced roof profiles, which despite their lofty shape were free of expensive trusses or redundant framing typically used in builders' so-called "cathedral ceilings." Another example of Jones's economical, yet expressive methods was his carport designs, sheltered under an extension of the living room roof shape. This feature was represented in models at Greenmeadow. Jones's interior planning was known for its free-flowing dining/living areas and clearly zoned public and private areas, both products of his early postwar developer designs as well as his numerous experiments with his own personal dwellings.

The style of the Eichler homes is endemically Californian. The look may seem in some ways almost generically 1950s, but that is partly because during the postwar period the fashion in residential architecture often resembled work originated in California. California modernism was a social and aesthetic movement that derived ideas and practices from the modern movement in Europe. Many of the innovators of postwar American residential design, particularly designs suited to moderate-income buyers, were California architects. William Wurster, a Dean of the College of Environmental Design at U.C. Berkeley, Joseph Esherick, John Funk, Gordon Drake, and many other lesser-known practitioners constituted a loose-knit but consistent school of designers that helped define a Californian aesthetic. This style emphasized modest-scaled homes with informal open plans and indoor-outdoor relationships, and often employed post-and-beam structures and natural finished wood inside and out.

Eichler and his architects brought California modernism to a middle-class mass market. Eichler initially looked to Anshen and Allen for a construction system that would be efficient to build but inherently flexible enough to provide opportunities for individual designs. Anshen recommended employing post-and-beam construction, which had the twin benefits of speedy erection time and plan flexibility. The Eichler architects' design strategy of post-and-beam structure and exposed redwood or mahogany-veneer plywood panels was a simple one that, nonetheless, imbued their mass-produced product with a custom-designed feeling.

Architects overcame difficulties that Eichler Homes encountered as a result of their desire for innovation. Hiring architects proved valuable in terms of construction and cost efficiencies. Anshen and Allen planned the buildings on a four-foot module, and their clearly delineated drawings simplified Eichler's materials purchasing and construction management. Before working with the architects, Eichler recalled in a December 1950 interview in *Architectural Forum* that "we were always running into bugs . . . we'd have to revise as we went along"; this caused costly delays. Further, the architects standardized the building components. A kit-of-parts system, similar in some ways to Frank Lloyd Wright's Usonian concept, enabled multiple variations of the same basic plan. In Palo Alto's Green Gables Eichler development, a single plan type was used to compose four variations, allowing the design to adapt to different lot orientations. This strategy gave Eichler Homes a competitive edge in the market because the company was able to provide greater variety than other developers at comparable cost.

By the time Eichler broke ground at Greenmeadow in 1953, he already had built hundreds of architect-designed homes in more than a dozen individual subdivisions on the San Francisco peninsula. After a string of successes in Sunnyvale, Menlo Park, Redwood City, and Palo Alto, Eichler made a decision to move up the market and leave the lower, mid-range pricing that typified most of his earlier developments. In the higher, \$16-\$22,000 price bracket, as Eichler pointed

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number 8 Page 6

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

out in a 1955 interview, he found that “people are more interested in better living than in terms.” By 1953, the postwar housing shortage had eased, and Americans were growing increasingly prosperous while becoming more demanding consumers. They wanted larger houses with new levels of amenities, and Eichler knew he had to meet their expectations in the highly competitive housing market. The Greenmeadow development, which met this demand by introducing a fourth bedroom or an all-purpose room to its models, was Eichler’s first significant step in this direction.

The architects’ contributions at Greenmeadow established hallmark features of the Eichler Homes design. These new four-bedroom layouts featured large, double-car garages instead of carports; a multipurpose room separate from the adult living area, allowing privacy; kitchens with built-in appliances instead of freestanding units; compartmentalized baths; laundry areas inside the house for increased convenience; and light-toned ceilings that made the rooms seem bigger. These plans were based on a consistent set of principles, including a clear separation of functions, rigorous geometric proportions, and private living areas that expanded to the outdoors. Here, the architects further developed the planning relationships introduced into the earlier subdivisions, refining the elements that defined Eichler’s approach to family living, including the central multi-purpose room and the second bath for children with its own exterior entrance.

The homes in Greenmeadow are larger than those of the previous developments, show more complex planning, much more articulated building massing, and a sophisticated blending of natural and machined building materials. Perhaps most importantly, the new models advanced the theme, initiated in Eichler’s earliest architecturally design models, of indoor-outdoor living, enabling owners to more fully experience the benefits of the region’s hospitable climate. Finally, in terms of the neighborhood layout, Jones and Emmons were able to realize their concept of “total community.” Using creative variances from the local planning regulations, the Eichler company carved out space at the center of the subdivision for shared public amenities.

The architectural achievements in the Greenmeadow homes are based upon advances in internal planning. A key example of this advance is found in a series of Jones and Emmons-initiated ‘T-shaped’ plan types. In these models the bedroom wing and living areas are defined as separate volumes, lending a distinct feel to each realm. The kitchen occupied its usual central position, but greater transparency of the living area walls meant the user, usually a wife and mother, was able to see both internal spaces and right through to the garden beyond. The front entry is ideally located between the garage and kitchen, overcoming the need for a back door connection (common to most tract homes) that so often reduces the owner’s entry experience to a service-like feeling. Of particular significance and a very important achievement for homes of this class was the addition of a second bath. This enabled the planning of a master suite. The children’s bath was provided with an independent door to the side yard. This would minimize children tracking dirt through the living areas. These advances led Eichler’s competitors to follow suit, advancing the quality of an entire class of speculative homes.

The T-shaped plan layout enabled building massing that defined multiple outdoor spaces, increasing and enriching the living spaces throughout the house. First, placing the garage separately from the house defined a protected court off the kitchen, advertised in Eichler’s sales literature as an “outdoor dining nook.” The bedroom wing was positioned such that the master bedroom projects beyond the living room volume, defining a rear-yard terrace. Sliding-glass doors in full-height glass walls offer access to this patio from both rooms. Front-yard courts are enclosed with a street-side concrete masonry wall bounded on two other sides by the bedroom wing and the garage. This feature alludes to the atrium, a later innovation that might not have emerged without this precedent.

The theme of integrating building and landscape was further advanced with the use of varied materials. Street-side concrete masonry walls built up to the eave height enriched the texture of the buildings while blurring the distinction between landscape and building. Low-pitched roof forms alluded to more traditional imagery of forms while also

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 7

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

enabling more day lighting through clerestories beneath the eaves. Finally, the massing of the houses, derived from the separate volumes for bedrooms and living areas, enhanced this interplay of exterior and interior spaces.

At the level of community planning, Jones and Emmons built upon innovative Eichler street layouts such as Anshen and Allen's earlier concentric ring layout for nearby Fairmeadow, giving the Greenmeadow form more social meaning. Eichler's concern for social equality translated into a holistic attitude towards design, an ideal supported by his architects, particularly Quincy Jones. This philosophy meant the company typically pursued layouts that extended to community planning. Site plans with centralized recreation facilities and organized along looping roads that discouraged through traffic made for safe and attractive places for family life. Greenmeadow is exemplary of this strategy. There a park, multi-purpose building, pool services building, and pool provide a focus for community activities, and the inwardly turned street pattern provides security and abundant opportunities for the kinds of informal meetings between neighbors and neighborhood children that more typical suburban contexts rarely encourage. At the time Greenmeadow was conceived, it was not customary for developers to provide community facilities for the use of owners of tract homes. However, Eichler was an innovator and the City of Palo Alto at that time was quite receptive to new ideas. Consequently, Eichler gained a variance from the planning restrictions in Palo Alto that produced a community plan more desirable than one the existing restrictions would have permitted. The city had imposed a minimum of 8,500 square feet for each residential lot. Working with Eichler, his architects made a plan that retained the desired density but incorporated only 8,000 square feet per lot. The leftover 500 square feet from each lot size was combined to form a four-acre complex of common facilities.

The architects' attention to design extended to site planning. The Eichler architects typically paid close attention to the siting of the houses, and Greenmeadow was exemplary. Using paper cutouts of the many varied models, the designers placed homes in ways they felt best fit individual lots, provided the best solar orientation possible, and ensured privacy for neighboring residents. In this way the architects made Eichler's houses feel like custom homes. Landscape architects were hired to finish exterior spaces. It was another example of the improved design quality. For Greenmeadow, Eichler's models included landscaping designed by well-known local landscape architect Thomas Church. His additions to the development's community center – walks, concrete terraces, planter boxes, benches, fences, and sometimes children's sand piles and paved play areas – added considerably to the sales costs for each Greenmeadow owner.

Eichler's continued work until the mid-sixties left a legacy of design integrity, and set new standards for developer housing, which remain unparalleled in the history of American building. A year after Greenmeadow, Eichler made a big step, expanding his operation away from his peninsula hub, into Marin county (the Terra Linda development of San Rafael), the East Bay (Rancho San Miguel in Walnut Creek), and even Sacramento (South Land Park). In all, by 1974, he would build nearly 11,000 tract houses and hundreds of custom homes in scores of developments in 32 Northern and Southern California towns.

In 1961, Eichler Homes became a public stock company, and that changed things for Joe Eichler. He disliked being beholden to the stockholders. Having to put sales goals ahead of his intuitive schemes and continual tinkering with designs frustrated Eichler's creative ambitions and contributed to a brooding dissatisfaction. Loath to have any control wrested from him, he was skeptical of financial advisors and mistrustful of those who counseled for more cautious strategies for the company. Eichler resisted even his own son Ned's counsel when he pleaded with his father to take fewer risks. Eventually, Eichler's continual quest to pursue progressive ideas overwhelmed the company's ability to remain profitable. Construction in the urban core of San Francisco was more expensive, and conditions far more complicated, than those the company had faced in the suburbs. Several of Eichler Homes' urban projects were in transitional neighborhoods in which Eichler gambled that his developments could turn conditions around. In addition, Eichler made what some saw as fundamental marketing mistakes. While the suburban projects continued to do well, the

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 8

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

difficulties with the urban projects began to jeopardize the operations as a whole, and Eichler Homes began to lose money. In 1966, Eichler's company was taken over when two southern California investors bought a controlling share of the company's stock, perhaps not realizing that the firm's worth was almost completely depleted from the over-ambitious projects of the by-then glamorous, but doomed, Eichler Homes. Eichler continued to build housing through a series of reincarnations of his original company until his death in 1974. However, none of these subsequent efforts matched the earlier projects in their enthusiasm for new design ideas or social aspirations.

During its five decades, Greenmeadow's modern architecture has continued to maintain a strong contemporary feel and has been remarkably well preserved overall. Its excellent condition can be attributed to the efforts of Greenmeadow's neighborhood architectural review committee and the homeowners' strong sense of community pride. Ninety-two percent of the nominated structures still retain their original style and character, with only two homes having been significantly altered along the front elevation.

The volunteer Eichler 'Historic Quest' committee selected the Greenmeadow development for this submission after an involved evaluation process. Based on the extensive Eichler Homes records maintained by the Eichler Network, the committee identified and located all of the Eichler Homes subdivisions and many of the custom Eichler houses built between 1950 (the first architect designs) and 1959. Homes built in 1960 or later were not considered for nomination, as it was felt that they were built too recently. All the homes surveyed were located in the Bay Area of Northern California, except for one subdivision in Sacramento. The Eichler Homes context study ("Statement of Significance") was written drawing on material from the book by committee members Paul Adamson and Marty Arbunich. The study provided a basis for the research and discussions that followed, as described below.

The committee developed a set of evaluation criteria based on the distinctive features of the mid-century modern architectural style employed by Eichler Homes as described in the "Statement of Significance" and following the guidelines specified in Criterion C. The following categories were considered for incorporation into the criteria: overall proportions (as viewed from the street or other public areas), roofline, exposed beams, exterior siding and trim, garage door, entry area and front door, windows (including atrium/carport wall glass), ornamentation (such as exterior lights, house numbers, etc.), paint color, landscaping and fencing. All were included in the final criteria that were used for the survey except for paint color and landscaping.

Teams consisting of two committee members each were assigned to do preliminary surveys of the subdivisions and the best-known custom homes. Without evaluating each home in detail, they noted the overall condition of the structures and the boundaries of the subdivisions, including street names. They were then ranked as to which of three categories they fell under: "Strong candidate for contributing," "Maybe contributing, should reappraise," and "Non-contributing." Meeting as a group, the committee created a "short list" of nine subdivisions and two custom homes that were felt to be possible candidates for nomination to the National Register.

At that point, the committee as a whole toured the short-listed candidates. The candidates were again evaluated for their state of architectural preservation, historic integrity, social significance, and how well they represented the Eichler style. It was decided that, while all the candidates on the short list had the potential to be accepted to the National Register, the committee lacked the resources to develop the documentation to nominate all eleven. Greenmeadow was one of two final subdivision candidates selected by the committee.

With the candidates determined, procedures were developed for detailed, house-by-house surveys of the subdivisions. Maps covering the areas of each subdivision were acquired from county or city agencies. Spreadsheet templates were

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 9

Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

then created of the subdivision evaluation criteria. Working from the maps, committee members entered street names and house numbers in the spreadsheet template printouts.

The boundaries of the subdivisions were readily determined by relying on the distinctive architectural style of Eichler homes. In some cases, non-Eichler residences would be found next to or across the street from Eichler houses, and that indicated the boundary of the subdivision.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 9 Page 1 Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

Bibliography - Greenmeadow

- Arts & Architecture, The Entenza Years, ed. Barbara Goldstein, MIT Press, Boston, 1990.
- C. Wright Mills, White Collar: The American Middle Classes, New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Clarence Stein, Toward New Towns for America (Cambridge, The MIT Press, 1989 edition).
- D.J. Waldie, Holy Land, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1996).
- Emily H. Haines and Esther Ostwalt, Incomes and Expenditures of Salaried Workers in the San Francisco Bay Area in 1950 (UC, Berkeley Press, 1957).
- Esther McCoy, Case Study Houses 1945-1962, Second Edition (Los Angeles, Hennesy & Ingalls, 1977).
- Esther McCoy, Five California Architects (Los Angeles, Hennesy and Ingalls, Inc., 1987).
- Esther McCoy, The Second Generation (Salt Lake City Gibbs M. Smith, Inc., Peregrine Smith Books, 1984).
- Frank Lloyd Wright: Writings and Buildings, ed. Edgar Kaufman and Ben Raeburn, (New York: Meridian, 1960).
- Gilbert Herbert, The Dream of the Factory Built House, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1984).
- Gwendolyn Wright, Building the Dream: A Social History of Housing in America, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983).
- Gwendolyn Wright, "A Little Respect, Please, for the Dream House," The New York Times, 7 Feb, 1999.
- Jerry Ditto, Eichler Homes: Design for Living (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1995).
- Joan Ockman, Architecture of The Everyday (New York, Princeton Architectural Press, 1998).
- John Sergeant, Frank Lloyd Wright's Usonian Houses: Designs for Moderate Cost One-Family Homes, New York 1976 Whitney Library of Design - Paperback edition published 1984.
- Kenneth Frampton, Modern Architecture, A Critical History (New York, Thames & Hudson, 1992 edition).
- Lewis Mumford, Roots of Contemporary American Architecture, (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1959).
- Neil Jackson, The Modern Steel House, John Wiley & Sons, 1997
- Paul Adamson, Eichler: Modernism Rebuilds the American Dream (Gibbs Smith, 2002)
- Pereira, Steele and Jenkins, Pierre Koenig, New York Phaedon, 1999.
- R. Thomas Hille, Inside the Large Small House (New York, Princeton Architectural Press, 1994).
- Sandy Isestadt, "Nuera and the Psychology of Architetural Consumption," Anxious Modernisms: Experimentation in Postwar Architectural Culture, ed. Saraha Williams Goldhagen and Rejean Legault (Centre Canadien d'Architecture and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2000).
- Thomas Hine, "The Search for the Postwar House," Blueprints for Modern Living: History and Legacy of the Case Study Houses, ed. Elizabeth A. T. Smith (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 9 Page 2 Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

"Biggest New City in the U.S.," *House and Home*, Dec. 1952, p. 89.

"Built-In Merchandising Lifts California Builder Joe Eichler into the Big Time," *House and Home*, July 1955. p. 128

"House and Garden in One Finished Package," *House and Home*, January, 1954.

"Patios Helped Sell These Builders' Houses," *House and Home*, Dec. 1954. P. 104.

"Subdivision of The Year," *Architectural Forum*, December 1950, p. 80.

"The Biggst New City in The US," *House and Home*, December 1952, p. 88.

"6 Ranch Houses for Modern Living," *Architecture Record*, (April, 1947), pp. 82-7.

"How to Judge Modern," *House Beautiful*, (February, 1944) p. 51.

Eichler, Ned "Joseph Eichler: A Man and His House," unpublished manuscript, October, 1988.

Elaine K. Sewell Jones, "A Quincy Jones: The Oneness of Architecture," *Process: Architecture* No. 41, Process Architecture publishing Co, Ltd, Tokyo October 1983.

Francis Violich, "The Planning Pioneers," *San Francisco Chronicle California Living Magazine* (Feb 26, 1978) p. 29.

"Gamble in Modern," *Architectural Forum*. April 1950.

Gilbert Burck and Sanford S. Parker, "The Changing Market for Housing," *House and Home*, March 1954. p. 133

Gwendolyn Wright, "A Little Respect Please for the Dream House," *New York Times* (1999), February 7. 37.

D.J. Waldie, "Do the voters really hate sprawl," *New York Times*, March 2000.

Howard Vermilya, "Will You Miss Out on the Wonders of the Future Because of Your Building Code?" *House Beautiful*, Feb, 1944, p. 58.

J.B. Jackson, "The Many Guises of Suburbia," *Selected Writings of J. B. Jackson*, 114-115.

Robert Muschamp. "Recalling How Wright's Genius Turned Everyday Life into Art." *The New York Times*, February 18, 1994.

Susan Hall Harrison, Post World War II Tract Houses: The Subdivision Developments of Joseph L. Eichler 1949 – 1956, Master's Thesis, School of Architecture, The University of Virginia, May 1980.

T. H. Robsjohn-Gibbings, "Postwar Dream or Reality," *House Beautiful*, Feb. 1944, p. 48.

William Wyatt, "Postwar Housing," *American magazine*, (May, 1944).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number 9 Page 3 Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

Conversations with Elaine K. Sewell Jones, 1996-2001

Conversations with Jim San Jule, 1997-99

Conversations with Ned Eichler, 1998-2001.

Joan Ockman lecture given at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, November 1995.

JoAnne Stewart Wetzel interview with Steve Allen appendix to Anshen and Allen: Their Contribution to the Development of the Eichler House, 1980.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 10 Page 1 Greenmeadow, Santa Clara County, CA

Verbal Boundary Description

The Greenmeadow subdivision, built in 1954-55, consists of 243 homes and one community center complex and park, located in Palo Alto, California. The subdivision is bounded on the north by Charleston Road, on the east by Nelson Dr., on the southeast by Ben Lomond and Shasta Dr., and on the southwest by Alma St. The subdivision is surrounded by other developments built at different times, and along some boundaries there is no sharp demarcation between Greenmeadow and the surrounding community. For a detailed address listing, see the Narrative Description.

Boundary Justification

Based on a survey of the neighborhood, the boundaries described above include all the homes built by Eichler in the Greenmeadow subdivision in 1954-55 time period. A later addition of a much smaller number of homes to the south was built in the early 1960's and is not included in this nomination as the homes were built separately and are based on different floor plans and architecture.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number Page ____ ____ Santa Clara County, CA

Greenmeadow Photographs

Information common to all photos:

1. Greenmeadow
2. Santa Clara County, CA
3. Wally Fields
4. Oct. 12, 2002 and May 1, 2005
5. Wally Fields, 6286 Unit #L, Joaquin Murieta Ave. Newark, CA 94560

Photos 1 – 12, 21-23 completely labeled on back of photo. Notes below are for photos 13 – 20.

6. West, dining area showing mahogany paneling, exposed beam ceiling.
7. #13

6. East, showing living room looking out into backyard, note how exterior siding material is carried into the interior wall.
7. #14

6. South, "All-purpose" room (family room) showing clearstory windows in street-facing wall.
7. #15


6. South, bathroom, all fixtures original.
7. #16

6. West, bedroom showing mahogany paneling, exposed beam ceiling.
7. #17

6. North, entry area and rear wall of kitchen, note how that wall does not extend to the ceiling.
7. #18

6. Southwest, kitchen showing "galley" layout, original cabinetry.
7. #19

6. South, living/dining area showing rear wall of glass.
7. #20



Greenmeadow Subdivision

Palo Alto, CA
Santa Clara County

Non-contributing homes



DISTRICT: GREENMEADOW

COUNTY: SANTA CLARA, CA

PHOTOGRAPHER: WALLY FIELDS

DATE: 10/12/02

NEGATIVE LOCATION: WALLY FIELDS

DESCRIPTION: 3913 NELSON DR

FACING NE

NON-CONTRIBUTING

PHOTO #: 1 OF 12



DISTRICT: GREENMEADOW

COUNTY: SANTA CLARA, CA

PHOTOGRAPHER: WALLY FIELDS

DATE: 10/12/02

NEGATIVE LOCATION: WALLY FIELDS

DESCRIPTION: 261 CREEKSIDE DR.

FACING N

NON-CONTRIBUTING

PHOTO#: 2 OF 12



221

DISTRICT: GREEN MEADOW

COUNTY: SANTA CLARA, CA

PHOTOGRAPHER: WALLY FIELDS

DATE: 10/12/02

NEGATIVE LOCATION: WALLY FIELDS

DESCRIPTION: 221 PARKSIDE DR.

FACING NW

NON-CONTRIBUTING

PHOTO #: 3 OF 12



DISTRICT: GREENMEADOW

COUNTY: SANTA CLARA, CA

PHOTOGRAPHER: WALLY FIELDS

DATE: 10/12/02

NEGATIVE LOCATION: WALLY FIELDS

DESCRIPTION: 332 TIOGA CT

FACING SE

CONTRIBUTING

PHOTO#: 4 OF 12



DISTRICT: GREENMEADOW

COUNTY: SANTA CLARA, CA

PHOTOGRAPHER: WALLY FIELDS

DATE: 10/2/02

NEGATIVE LOCATION: WALLY FIELDS

DESCRIPTION: 321 DIABLO CT

FACING W/NW

CONTRIBUTING

PHOTO#: 5 OF 12



DISTRICT: GREEN MEADOW

COUNTY: SANTA CLARA, CA

PHOTOGRAPHER: WALLY FIELDS

DATE: 10/12/02

NEGATIVE LOCATION: WALLY FIELDS

DESCRIPTION: 331 SHASTA DR
FACING W

NON-CONTRIBUTING

PHOTO #: 6 OF 12



DISTRICT: GREENMEADOW

COUNTY: SANTA CLARA, CA

PHOTOGRAPHER: WALLY FIELDS

DATE: 10/12/02

NEGATIVE LOCATION: WALLY FIELDS

DESCRIPTION: 375 PARKSIDE DR

FACING NW

CONTRIBUTING

PHOTO#: 7 OF 12



DISTRICT: GREENMEADOW

COUNTY: SANTA CLARA, CA

PHOTOGRAPHER: WALLY FIELDS

DATE: 10/12/02

NEGATIVE LOCATION: WALLY FIELDS

DESCRIPTION: 4021 BEN LOMOND DR

FACING SE

CONTRIBUTING

PHOTO#: 8 OF 12



281

281

281

281

DISTRICT: GREENMEADOW

COUNTY: SANTA CLARA, CA

PHOTOGRAPHER: WALLY FIELDS

DATE: 10/12/02

NEGATIVE LOCATION: WALLY FIELDS

DESCRIPTION: 281 CREEKSIDE DR
FACING NW
CONTRIBUTING

PHOTO # : 9 OF 12



DISTRICT: GREEN MEADOW

COUNTY: SANTA CLARA, CA

PHOTOGRAPHER: WALLY FIELDS

DATE: 10/12/02

NEGATIVE LOCATION: WALLY FIELD

DESCRIPTION: 4052 SCRIPPS AVE

FACING SW

CONTRIBUTING

PHOTO #: 10 OF 12



SCOTT'S
PARKSIDE

290

DISTRICT: GREENMEADOW

COUNTY: SANTA CLARA, CA

WALL FIELDS

PHOTOGRAPHER: ~~WALL FIELDS~~

DATE: 5/1/05

WALL FIELDS

NEGATIVE LOCATION: 1

DESCRIPTION: 290 PARKSIDE

FACING WEST

CONTRIBUTING

PHOTO #: 11 OF 12



DISTRICT: GREENMEADOW
COUNTY: SANTA CLARA, CA
PHOTOGRAPHER: WALLY FIELDS

DATE 5/1/05

NEGATIVE LOCATION: WALLY FIELDS

DESCRIPTION: 342 PARKSIDE
FACING WEST
CONTRIBUTING

PHOTO #: 12 OF 12



1. Grearmeadow

2. Santa Clara, CA



1. Greenmeadow

2. Santa Clara, CA



1. Greenmeadow
2. Santa Clara, CA



1. Greenmeadow
2. Santa Clara County, CA
3. Barry Brisco
4. Feb. 2003
5. 1547 Tarrytown, San Mateo, CA
6. Batirux South
7. tlt #6



↳ Greenmound
2. Santa Clara, CA



1. Greenn Meadows
2. Santa Clara, CA



1. Green meadow
2. Santa Clara, CA



1. Greasmeadow

2. Santa Clara, CA