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Project Overview

This Historic Resources Survey Report (Survey Report) has been completed for CRA/LA, a Designated Local Authority, for the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area. This project was undertaken from July 2018 to January 2020 by Architectural Resources Group (ARG), GPA Consulting (GPA), and Historic Resources Group (HRG).

This Survey Report provides a summary of the work completed, including a description of the Survey Area; an overview of the field methodology; a summary of relevant contexts, themes, and property types; recommendations for future study; and complete lists and maps of all designated and recorded resources. The report is intended to be used in conjunction with the SurveyLA Field Results Master Report (Master Report), which provides a detailed discussion of SurveyLA methodology and explains the terms used in this report and associated appendices. The Master Report, Survey Report, and appendices are available online at www.surveyla.org.

Survey Methodology Summary

While this project was not formally completed as part of SurveyLA, it utilized SurveyLA technology and methodology to ensure that the findings enumerated herein are consistent with those of the rest of the Hollywood Community Plan Area (CPA) and elsewhere within the City of Los Angeles. By using the SurveyLA technology and methodology, survey findings can also be easily integrated into the City’s GIS-based planning database (called the Zone Information and Map Access System, or ZIMAS) as well as the Historic Places LA online portal.

Below is a brief summary of the SurveyLA methodology that was utilized for this project. Refer to the Master Report discussed above for more information.

Field Survey Methods

- Properties surveyed are evaluated for eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, and for local designation as Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments (HCM) or Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ), commonly known as historic districts.

- Field surveyors cover the entire area within the boundaries of a Survey Area. However, only resources that have been identified as significant within the contexts developed for SurveyLA are recorded.

- Consultants making resource evaluations meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in Architectural History and/or History.

- Surveys focus on identifying significant resources dating from about 1850 to 1980.
• All surveys are completed from the public right-of-way (from vehicles or on foot as needed).
• Digital photographs are taken of all evaluated resources.

Resource Types

Consistent with SurveyLA methodology, this survey identifies individual resources, non-parcel resources, historic districts and district contributors and non-contributors. Each of these is described below. Appendices A, B, and C of this Survey Report are organized by resource type.

• **Individual Resources** are generally resources located within a single assessor parcel, such as a residence or duplex. However, a parcel may include more than one individual resource, if each appears to be significant.

• **Non-Parcel Resources** are not associated with Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) and generally do not have addresses. Examples may include street trees, street lights, landscaped medians, bridges, and signs.

• **Historic Districts** are areas that are related geographically and by theme. Historic districts may include single or multiple parcels depending on the resource. Examples of resources that may be recorded as historic districts include residential neighborhoods, garden apartments, commercial areas, large estates, school and hospital campuses, and industrial complexes.

• **District Contributors and Non-Contributors** are buildings, structures, objects, sites and other features located within historic districts (such as residences, schools, and parks). Generally, non-contributing resources are those that are extensively altered, are built outside the period of significance, or do not relate to historic contexts and themes defined for the district.

• **Planning Districts** are areas that are related geographically and by theme, but do not meet eligibility standards for designation. This is generally because the majority of the contributing features have been altered, resulting in a cumulative impact on the overall integrity of the area and making it ineligible as a Historic District. The Planning District determination, therefore, is used as a tool to inform new Community Plans being developed by the Department of City Planning. These areas have consistent planning concepts, such as height, massing, setbacks, and street trees, which may be considered in the local planning process.
Project Team

The survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area was conducted by a team comprising staff from Architectural Resources Group (ARG), GPA Consulting (GPA), and Historic Resources Group (HRG). ARG staff included Katie E. Horak, Principal, and Andrew Goodrich, AICP, Associate. GPA staff included Teresa Grimes, Principal Architectural Historian. HRG staff included Christine Lazzaretto, Managing Principal, Heather Goers, Architectural Historian, and Molly Iker-Johnson, Associate Architectural Historian/Staff Photographer Additional project support was provided by ARG interns Rafael Fontes and Kelsey Kaline.

Survey Area

Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area

The Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area was established in 1984 by the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA). The CRA was dissolved on February 6, 2012, and administration of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area has been transferred to the CRA/LA, a Designated Local Authority and successor to the CRA.

The Hollywood Redevelopment Project’s goals include “the retention, restoration and appropriate reuse of existing buildings, groupings of buildings, and other physical features especially those having significant historic and/or architectural value and ensure that new development is sensitive to these features through land use and development criteria.”

Policies and guidelines for the preservation, rehabilitation and retention of historic properties are discussed in Section 5.11 of the Redevelopment Plan.

As part of its responsibilities in implementing the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan, the CRA compiled historic survey data on properties within the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area. Property evaluations from historic surveys in 1986, 1997, and 2003 were compiled in a data table that was made available on the CRA website. A more recent intensive-level survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area was conducted in 2010. It provides relevant

---

1 Hollywood Community Plan, Section 3 [300.11], http://cityplanning.lacity.org/cpu/hollywood/HwdPlanUpdates.htm.
2 The CRA released draft Urban Design Guidelines for the Hollywood Boulevard District and Franklin Avenue Design District areas in the autumn of 2011 to guide development within the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan area. These guidelines “encourage preservation, restoration, and appropriate reuse of historically or architecturally significant structures.”
information regarding the status of properties within the redevelopment area and is used by agencies and the community to identify potential historic resources.4

Description of the Survey Area

The boundaries of the Survey Area correspond with those of the CRA’s Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area referenced above. The Survey Area is located within the Hollywood Community Plan Area (CPA). Located approximately six miles to the northwest of Downtown Los Angeles, the Survey Area encompasses 1,107 acres and is irregular in shape. Its boundaries are generally defined by Franklin Avenue on the north, Fountain Avenue and Santa Monica Boulevard on the south, Serrano Avenue on the east, and La Brea Avenue on the west.

Map of the Survey Area boundaries (CRA/LA).

The Survey Area is generally flat, but several of the streets along its north end exhibit some modest changes in elevation as they begin their ascent into the Hollywood Hills. Since the area is heavily urbanized, there are no natural features of note. Rather, the area is shaped and defined by human-made features. Notably, the area is bisected by the Hollywood Freeway/US 101, which generally runs north-south but charts a somewhat meandering course through the Survey Area, a result of its routing through previously established neighborhoods. The freeway includes a combination of above-grade and below-grade sections, and its associated overpasses, underpasses, and ramps create visual impacts on adjacent neighborhoods and a discernible division between east and west. The area is also served by the Red Line, a heavy rail subway that is operated by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA, or Metro). The Red Line operates entirely below ground. Infrastructure associated with its operation is found adjacent to the station stops at Hollywood/Western, Hollywood/Vine, and Hollywood/Highland.

Various land uses and associated property types are represented within the Survey Area. Very generally speaking, commercial development is concentrated in the center of the area and along major vehicular thoroughfares, while residential uses are located on the periphery. The majority of commercial development is located along the Hollywood and Sunset Boulevard corridors, and also along most of the major north-south streets that intersect them. Hollywood Boulevard has historically served as the community’s preeminent shopping and entertainment district, and a large portion of the boulevard, between Argyle and Sycamore avenues, is a National Register-designed historic district. There has also been a considerable amount of new, high-rise commercial development in the interstitial zone between Hollywood and Sunset boulevards, particularly along Selma Avenue and Vine Street, that has changed the overall scale and character of the community’s commercial core. Smaller, neighborhood-oriented commercial nodes are strung along Santa Monica Boulevard, Western Avenue, and other major streets that were historically serviced by streetcar routes in the first half of the twentieth century.

The blocks to the north of the Hollywood Boulevard commercial corridor are primarily developed with multi-family residences that were constructed at various points between the 1920s and the present-day. Given their adjacency to the affluent neighborhoods of the Hollywood Hills, many of these multi-family dwellings were developed for upper-middle-income households, and many are visually prominent edifices that are a testament to the glamour and allure of Hollywood during its heyday. The blocks to the south of Sunset Boulevard, and in the eastern section of the Survey Area, are also residential in character, but the dwellings in this area are generally smaller and more modestly appointed than those located to the north. These southern and eastern neighborhoods are developed with an eclectic mix of small, one-story bungalows; low-density multi-family properties including duplexes, fourplexes, bungalow courts, and courtyard apartments; the occasional multi-story apartment house; and a limited amount of post-World War II infill development. Four of these residential neighborhoods (Afton Square, Selma-La Baig, Serrano, Vista del Mar-Carlos) are listed in the California Register.
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Public and private institutional uses include churches, schools, and government facilities and are interspersed throughout the Survey Area. There is a locus of government buildings, including the Hollywood Community City Hall and police and fire services, near the intersection of Wilcox and Fountain avenues. Small pocket parks are located at various points throughout the Survey Area, but this area of Hollywood is very heavily urbanized and has a dearth of open space compared to other areas within the City of Los Angeles. There is also a very limited amount of industrial development in the Survey Area, which typically bear some association with the entertainment industry. Two large industrial properties that are used for motion picture, television, and radio production are located in the center of the Survey Area, along Sunset Boulevard (Sunset Bronson Studios, Sunset Gower Studios). A smattering of other industrial uses can also be found on, and adjacent to the Santa Monica Boulevard corridor, in an area that was historically developed with various back-of-house support facilities for the entertainment industry.

Circulation within the Survey Area generally adheres to the rectilinear grid along which the flat portions of Hollywood is oriented. However, there are some irregularities in the street grid across individual neighborhoods, a result of the patchwork of individual subdivisions that were platted and developed in the area over time. Some streets that once carried through traffic now abruptly terminate in cul-de-sacs where they meet the Hollywood Freeway. Yucca Street, once a through street, features traffic calming devices that impede the flow of through traffic.

Major east-west streets within the Survey Area are (from north to south): Franklin Avenue, Hollywood Boulevard, Sunset Boulevard, Fountain Avenue, and Santa Monica Boulevard. Major north-south streets within the Survey Area are (from east to west): Western Avenue, Wilton Place, Bronson Avenue, Gower Street, Vine Street, Cahuenga Boulevard, Highland Avenue, and La Brea Avenue.
Chronology map of the Survey Area, depicting development by decade (ARG).
Survey Methodology

The survey of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area was conducted using the methodology established by the Office of Historic Resources (OHR) for SurveyLA which includes the Los Angeles Citywide Historic Context Statement and customized mobile Field Guide Survey System (FiGSS).

The project team began by collecting and reviewing data from all previous historic surveys of Hollywood. Available inventory forms prepared as part of surveys completed in 1978, 1986, 1992, 1994, 1997, and 2003 were reviewed. Reports and inventory forms that were prepared as part of the most recent survey of the Project Area, completed in 2009, were also carefully reviewed. The project team also reviewed applicable sections of the Los Angeles Citywide Historic Context Statement; the California Historical Resources Inventory (HRI) database; landmark nominations; Section 106 documentation; and historic resource assessment reports.

Concurrent with the review of previous survey data, key members of the project team participated in a series of meetings with members of Hollywood Heritage. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss project goals, review methodology, and solicit input about properties of interest. Hollywood Heritage provided input about particular properties as well as populations of potential resources to be considered by the survey team. The first meeting, held in August 2018, was introductory; the following two meetings, held in October 2018 and December 2018, were focused on the survey team’s scope of work and properties to be considered.

The fieldwork was conducted in two phases: reconnaissance and documentation. The reconnaissance phase was conducted by key staff from ARG, GPA, and HRG, all of whom meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards. This phase involved a detailed and methodical review of each neighborhood, street, and individual property within the Survey Area. It was during this phase that decisions were made about which properties and districts should be documented, and how those properties should be evaluated. During this initial reconnaissance phase, surveyors reviewed properties that had been previously evaluated and those that had been brought to the attention of the project team by Hollywood Heritage; identified properties that might later be recorded as individually eligible resources, and concentrations of resources that might later be recorded as eligible historic districts and planning districts; and developed lists of pre-field research tasks. By making these decisions up front and as a team, this methodology ensures a more thoughtful approach to resource identification and evaluation, creates greater consensus among the survey teams, and produces more consistent survey results across other communities within the City of Los Angeles. This approach also substantially streamlines the next phase of field survey, enabling the survey teams to document large numbers of properties quickly and efficiently.

---

5 For more information about the SurveyLA methodology, see the SurveyLA Field Results Master Report.
During the first (reconnaissance) phase of fieldwork, ARG generated Geographic Information Systems (GIS) maps of the Survey Area to identify potentially significant properties.

Once the reconnaissance phase was completed, preliminary findings were internally peer reviewed by key members of the project team, reviewed by CRA personnel, and shared with Hollywood Heritage. The preliminary findings were delivered in both tabular (Excel) and graphic (GIS-based) formats. Key members of the project team met with Hollywood Heritage in March 2019 to solicit input about the preliminary findings. Subsequent to this meeting, in April 2019, Hollywood Heritage provided a detailed memorandum that affirmed the list of preliminary findings, and also provided a list of additional properties to be taken under consideration before field documentation began. The project team thoroughly reviewed each suggestion, conducted supplemental research about each property as needed, and those properties that met eligibility standards for designation were added to the recommended findings.

In April 2019, the second (documentation) phase of fieldwork began. During this phase, fieldwork was conducted by teams of two. Properties that were identified during the previous phase, along with those that had significant associative qualities identified in pre-loaded data in FIGSS, were recorded and evaluated for potential historic, cultural, or architectural significance. Documentation included a digital photograph, recordation of historic features and subsequent alterations, and the reason for a property’s potential significance. It was also during this phase that contexts and themes were applied and evaluation status codes were assigned.

Surveyed properties included residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial buildings and important landscape and infrastructure features such as designed landscapes and public art. All fieldwork was conducted from the public right-of-way. Following the completion of fieldwork, all survey data was reviewed in detail by key members of the project team to ensure accuracy and consistency throughout the data set.

Survey teams conducted research on individual properties and neighborhoods throughout the field survey process. When specific information was needed in order to complete an evaluation, additional research was conducted. Sources included building permits, historical newspapers and periodicals, Sanborn maps, tract maps, and city directories. Other sources include the collections of the Los Angeles Public Library; Online Archive of California; University of Southern California (USC); University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA); and the Library of Congress archives. Additional information was provided through ongoing consultation with members of Hollywood Heritage. This research helped with the identification of historic tract names and boundaries, names of tract sub-dividers, dates of subdivision, original building uses and footprints, and development patterns.
Designated Resources

Numerous properties within the Survey Area have already been designated and were not evaluated as part of this survey project. This includes the following:

- One National Register district:
  - Hollywood Boulevard Commercial and Entertainment District (listed 1985)
- Four California Register districts:
  - Afton Square District (listed 1995)
  - Selma-La Baig District (listed 1994)
  - Serrano District (listed 1994)
  - Vista del Mar-Carlos District (listed 1994)
- 22 properties individually listed in the National Register
- 12 properties individually listed in the California Register (in addition to properties listed in the National Register, which are automatically listed in the California Register)
- 52 properties individually listed as Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments (HCM)

A complete list of designated properties is included in Appendix D of this report. For the most up-to-date information on designated resources refer to ZIMAS.lacity.org and HistoricPlacesLA.org, or contact the Los Angeles Department of City Planning’s Office of Historic Resources.
Historic Context

Introduction

The Hollywood Redevelopment Project comprises a portion of the larger Hollywood Community Plan Area (CPA). It encompasses some of the earliest residential neighborhoods in Hollywood, as well as the Hollywood CPA’s commercial core, centered along Hollywood Boulevard.⁶

While it is generally acknowledged that Hollywood came of age with the dawn of motion pictures, the community was well established and flourishing prior to the establishment of its most famous industry. However, the arrival of several filmmakers who were entranced by Hollywood’s bucolic setting and pastoral character signaled the transformation of the town into a bustling hub of commercial and industrial activity which most of its original settlers would scarcely recognize. As film historian John Bengtson has observed, “Hollywood’s agricultural economy succumbed almost irresistibly to urban encroachment, hastened in part by the construction of [Charlie] Chaplin’s own studio upon a former lemon grove.”⁷

It was the construction of such studios that would eventually come to define the character of Hollywood as it is understood today. The motion picture industry played – and continues to play – a significant role in the economic and cultural development of Hollywood and Los Angeles. Indeed, it is difficult to overstate the impact of the industry’s advancement on the concurrent development of Hollywood. An examination of the contemporaneous development of towns in Southern California that were initially settled during the same period as Hollywood, illustrates that the establishment of the motion picture industry in this location played a critical role in the rise of Hollywood as a singular community, one with an identity that encompasses both a place and a concept.

As the birthplace of one of the most popular and widely disseminated forms of entertainment, Hollywood became more than the sum of its parts. It transcended the conventional identity of an industry town as a geographic concentration of similar physical facilities to become a tangible symbol of the collective cultural impact of entertainment. For many Americans, their first glimpse of Southern California came from the silver screen. Consequently, motion pictures – and even the publicity that surrounded them – played an influential role in shaping the American public’s perception of Southern California and in defining the character and identity of Hollywood and Los Angeles. With so many motion picture companies filming in Los Angeles,

⁶ The Redevelopment Project Area also includes the Hollywood Boulevard Commercial and Entertainment Industry National Register Historic District, listed in 1985.

and with each company producing such a high volume of pictures, Los Angeles soon became – as film historian Kevin Brownlow once declared – “the most photographed town in the world.”

The widespread exposure and favorable promotion the City received through its repeated appearances on film contributed to the growth of the local motion picture industry, to be sure, but it also contributed to the growth of Los Angeles as a whole. Indeed, for all the boosterism of the Los Angeles Times and the City’s Chamber of Commerce, there was no greater promoter of the city than the medium Hollywood had helped to create. Film succeeded where promotional pamphlets fell short, displaying the beauty of the Southern California landscape in all its natural glory to audiences all over the country. At the same time, the accompanying publicity surrounding the industry’s newfound stars and how they lived, worked, and played became synonymous with what it meant to live a successful “Hollywood” lifestyle, and symbolized what living in Los Angeles could be like if one were lucky enough to “make it big.” Audiences responded, and soon moviegoers and moviemakers alike were flocking to Los Angeles. The City’s economy, population, and tourism were all defined by its continued presence on the silver screen – which originated in Hollywood, right in the City’s own back yard.

In many ways and through many mediums, the development of the entertainment industry in Hollywood has contributed significantly to the development of Southern California, with both tangible and intangible results: to the built environment of Los Angeles, as well as to the perception of the City’s character and identity. Historian John Chase has described the relationship between “Hollywood, the concept, and Los Angeles, the place,” as a “symbiotic” one.9 “There is no such thing as a simple, direct cause-and-effect with regard to movies and Los Angeles,” Chase writes. “Rather the two are involved in a continuous dialogue in which each shapes the other.”10

Over the course of the twentieth century, other new forms of entertainment which were then in their infancy also found their footing in Hollywood and flourished; film, radio, television, and sound recording all evolved into major forms of nationwide communication and entertainment under the Southern California sun. In doing so, these endeavors transformed the landscape of Los Angeles, and Hollywood in particular, from a sea of citrus groves into a bustling hub of commercial and industrial activity related to the entertainment industry. These new mediums also transformed the identity of Southern California from that of a bucolic agricultural region set within the rugged environs of the “Wild Wild West” to that of an influential incubator of popular culture.

---

10 Chase, 74.
Early Development

The area that became Hollywood was originally part of two Spanish land grants: Rancho La Brea and Rancho Los Feliz. The ranchos were strategically oriented along the Cahuenga Pass to the north, and the growing city of Los Angeles to the south. The Cahuenga Pass, a major transportation corridor, encompassed part of the Camino Real del Rey, the principal coastal passageway, which had been used continuously as a trail facilitating commerce, livestock transport, and travel since the earliest Spanish exploration.

In 1886, real estate developer Harvey Henderson Wilcox combined acreage from four adjoining parcels to create a 120-acre tract that he subdivided into lots for agricultural, residential, and commercial development. The new community that Wilcox dubbed “Hollywood” is located within the Hollywood CRA area, and was bounded by present-day Sunset Boulevard to the south, Whitley Avenue to the west, Franklin Avenue and Hollywood Boulevard to the north, and Gower Street to the east. Wilcox and his wife, Daida, became prominent citizens of the fledgling community; Daida Wilcox was one of the driving forces of commercial and institutional development in Hollywood following Harvey Wilcox’s death in 1891.

Harvey Henderson Wilcox’s first pictorial map of Hollywood, circa 1887. The Hotel Hollywood (shown inset) was never constructed as depicted. Source: Los Angeles Public Library.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Hollywood was principally characterized by expansive fields and orchards, sporadically interrupted by large homes built by wealthy landowners, accessed by unpaved streets. Farmers, many of whom were European immigrants, experimented in cultivating a wide variety of exotic fruits, vegetables, and flowers. A freight rail line was first constructed in 1887-1888, linking Hollywood and the neighboring community of Colegrove to downtown Los Angeles. The Sackett Hotel, Hollywood’s first hotel, was constructed in 1888 at the southwest corner of Hollywood and Cahuenga Boulevards. In addition to eighteen hotel rooms on the second floor, the hotel also contained a ground-floor general store, parlor, and kitchen. The intersection would become an early Hollywood commercial center.12

In 1900, the Cahuenga Valley Improvement Association was established to guide real estate development in the area, just as the first electric train track was completed along Prospect Avenue (present-day Hollywood Boulevard). Other streetcar lines soon followed, including along La Brea Avenue, Santa Monica Boulevard, Highland Avenue, Vine Street, Western Avenue, and Fountain Avenue. Development during this period included the two-story George Hoover residence (1901; demolished) at the northwest corner of Hollywood Boulevard and Vine Street, and the H.J. Bartlett residence at the southeast corner of Argyle Avenue and Larquier Avenue (Yucca Street; demolished).

In 1901, Colonel Robert Northram purchased a grove of orange trees south of Hollywood Boulevard between Vine Street and Ivar Street, and constructed a Mission Revival-style home surrounded by extensive gardens (demolished). A Methodist Church (1903; demolished) was constructed on the southeast corner of Hollywood Boulevard and Vine Street.

In 1903, the City of Hollywood incorporated with a population of 700 people. In 1904, gas lines were laid, the streets were numbered, and a single track of the Los Angeles Pacific Railroad was placed perpendicular to the electric track already on Prospect Avenue. As the area became increasingly developed, churches, clubs, and schools were built in proximity to the grand single-family residences lining Hollywood Boulevard and nearby streets. By 1909, like many neighboring communities, Hollywood had experienced immense growth, and by 1909 the population had reached 4,000 people.

Though dwarfed by the neighboring city of Los Angeles, Hollywood quickly began to experience water shortages, drainage issues, and sewage problems due to its rapid growth. Additionally, the taxes required to support Hollywood’s public schools were much higher than those imposed on residents of Los Angeles. Less than ten years after incorporation, Hollywood

---

13 Williams, 29.
14 Williams, 35.
15 Hollywood Boulevard was originally named Prospect Avenue; Vine Street was originally Weyse Avenue. Weyse Avenue was rebranded during the first decade of the twentieth century as Vine Street, inspired by the grapevines then growing north of present-day Santa Monica Boulevard. Prospect Avenue did not become Hollywood Boulevard until after consolidation with Los Angeles in 1910.
16 Williams, 43.
18 “All Favored annexation,” Los Angeles Times, December 5, 1903.
reconsidered its status as an independent city.\textsuperscript{19} In February 1910, Hollywood was consolidated into the City of Los Angeles to take advantage the City’s established sewer system and the anticipated new water supply created by the Los Angeles Aqueduct, then under construction.\textsuperscript{20}

Consolidation with Los Angeles spurred modest growth, although Hollywood remained a relatively distant and sleepy outpost of the more urbanized Los Angeles. Overall, the area remained low-density, with much of the land undeveloped. Although now formally part of the City of Los Angeles, Hollywood continued to maintain its own identity, which would soon be inextricably linked to the growth of the motion picture industry. Hollywood was no longer a small independent city struggling to deal with infrastructural problems, but a thriving suburb with a rapidly growing population.

**Residential Development**

**Early Residential Development**

At the dawn of the twentieth century, Hollywood Boulevard remained a “quiet, country road with blocks of orchards, open vegetable fields, and an occasional clapboard cottage next to a garden.”\textsuperscript{21} However, over the next ten years the Boulevard slowly developed as a residential street lined with stately homes. One of the earliest residences along the Boulevard was the Janes residence at 6541 Hollywood Boulevard. Designed by prominent architects Dennis & Farwell in 1902, the home was purchased by the Janes family several years later. The house became known for the private kindergarten operated by the Janes sisters, and later, for the gas station their brother installed in front of the house. Today, the property represents the last Victorian-era residence on Hollywood Boulevard, and is designated as Historic-Cultural Monument No. 227.

Perhaps the most influential example of residential development along Hollywood Boulevard from this period was the residence constructed for French artist Paul de Longpré at the northwest corner of Hollywood and Cahuenga Boulevards (demolished). Daeida Wilcox Beveridge – she had since remarried following Harvey Wilcox’s death – was instrumental in bringing de Longpré to Hollywood and “proved the winning

\textsuperscript{19} Williams, 52-53.
\textsuperscript{20} The pre-consolidation area boundary is generally defined by the southernmost portion of the Hollywood Hills to the north, Fountain Avenue to the south, Crescent Heights Boulevard to the west, and Mariposa Street to the east.
\textsuperscript{21} Williams, 23.
promoter when, much to the gratitude of everyone, she established Hollywood's first celebrity draw."\(^{22}\) Born in France, Paul de Longpré was already a prominent painter who was well-known for his depiction of flowers by the time he relocated to Los Angeles with his wife and children in 1889. De Longpré met Daeida Wilcox Beveridge at an exhibition of his work and told her of his desire to move to Hollywood, where he found “the most exotic, year-round supply” of flowers.\(^{23}\) Mrs. Beveridge immediately recognized what the presence of an artist like de Longpré would mean for Hollywood’s reputation as a community and immediately offered up her own home site, which was located to the northwest of the intersection of present-day Hollywood and Cahuenga Boulevards. De Longpré constructed a home, studio, and guest house on the property in 1901, and traded three paintings to Mrs. Beveridge in exchange for an additional parcel a year later in order to expand his flower garden.

It was de Longpré’s flower gardens that transformed Hollywood into a tourist destination. Gregory Paul Williams describes de Longpré’s effect on the community:

Fawning articles flew out worldwide. Hollywood’s frostless belt became famous. Thousands of visitors came to tour his home and gardens, requiring a spur off track up Ivar Avenue to unload them. A tourist who missed seeing the gardens and gallery was said not to have done Southern California. Real estate salesmen could depend on de Longpré to be the first stop when showing prospective Midwesterners local land for sale.\(^{24}\)

---

\(^{22}\) Williams, 31.
\(^{23}\) Williams, 31.
\(^{24}\) Williams, 32.

---
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With its cachet of local talent and botanical wonders, Hollywood became a mecca for homeownership.\(^{25}\) It was not until 1915 that a home in Hollywood was first sold to an actor—or, as Williams recounts, “It was eccentric Dr. Schloesser who ultimately betrayed his old-guard neighbors.”\(^{26}\) Schloesser, who owned the distinctive Glengary Castle at the corner of Franklin and Argyle Avenues (demolished), sold the property to Japanese actor S. I. Hayakawa. It was Hayakawa’s acquisition that “opened a floodgate of movie people buying homes in Hollywood.”\(^{27}\) New residents included Francis X. Bushman, Thomas Ince, Samuel Goldwyn, Jesse Lasky, William Farnum, and Antonio Moreno; Lon Chaney and King Vidor also lived nearby.\(^{28}\) As Arthur Knight would later describe it, “the pioneers were turning into settlers.”\(^{29}\)

The arrival of the motion picture industry in Hollywood was swiftly followed by the arrival of the workers who supported it. With studios hiring hundreds of employees at every position and pay grade, a need arose for residential development at every price point. Although residents of Hollywood initially resisted the influx of newcomers who populated the newly-established studios, expressing skepticism over their seemingly transient lifestyles, “as time went on and the golden stream that flowed from the box offices of the world into the studios of Hollywood showed no signs of diminishing, at least some of those fears were allayed.”\(^{30}\) Pioneering real estate developer C. E. Toberman described the movie industry’s descent on Hollywood as “a mushrooming growth that almost overnight changed this community from the small, ‘countrylike place to live’...to a booming industrial city.”\(^{31}\) By 1917, six years after the opening of the first film studio in Hollywood, motion picture-making was Hollywood’s largest industry.\(^{32}\)

Early residential construction developed near the early studios in Hollywood was not necessarily promoted as such. This may have been due in part to the community’s reluctance to embrace or encourage picture people, who were so ostracized in early Hollywood society they “didn’t even mix with workers from other studios.”\(^{33}\) Alternatively, the demand may have been so great that promoting the obvious connection was unnecessary. In any case, the causal relationship is evident in the location and concentration of residential construction in areas surrounding studio properties, as well as the settlement of entertainment industry leaders in upscale residential communities.

As industry profits grew and community reception improved, the second half of the 1910s saw many entertainment industry leaders living “what the fan magazines called ‘the bungalow life-
style’ north and south of Hollywood Boulevard. Buying or renting homes, they began a continuous round of house parties, bringing nightlife to the area.”34 For the most part, according to historian Bruce Henstell, in the early twentieth century actors and actresses typically lived in modest residences.35

While many in the local community were initially disdainful of motion picture people, the overall success of the industry (and the money it generated) could not be denied. As film production exploded in the 1920s, so did the industry’s stars – and their salaries. If there is a single distinguishing factor between the homes acquired during the 1910s and those constructed during the 1920s, it is the influx of wealth that financed their development. The name “Hollywood” ultimately came to represent the motion picture industry as a whole, and the publicity the industry generated gave the geographic location of Hollywood a special glamour. However, “having endured the disdain of the original residents, movie people felt little loyalty to Hollywood”36 – a sentiment which was also due, in part, to how the explosive nature of development which had overtaken Hollywood in a few short years had taken its toll.

It seemed that all hell had broken loose as roads to Hollywood looked like amusement parks with giant barrels, cafés shaped like dogs, and Sphinx real estate offices. Empty lots, strewn with litter, now had advertising billboards. If the public expected stars to live like royalty, stars needed to get away Hollywood’s commercial district with its encroaching poverty, dirt, and commercial ugliness.37

With the relocation of stars like Mary Pickford and Douglas Fairbanks to Beverly Hills in 1919, as well as the opening of the Beverly Hills Hotel, the social epicenter of the entertainment industry began its inexorable migration westward. Although the residential neighborhoods within the survey area have seen a lot of change over time, numerous examples of the modest bungalows that once characterized the area remain scattered throughout the Redevelopment Project Area. Extant examples of grand residences from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are rare.

34 Williams, 77.
36 Williams, 132.
37 Williams, 132.
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Development in Hollywood had its heyday in the 1920s, when a large number of movie studios, theaters, and shopping centers filled Hollywood and Sunset Boulevards between Vine Street and Highland Avenue. Skyrocketing population growth in the Los Angeles region, along with the success of the motion picture industry then concentrated in and around Hollywood, spurred continuous development in the community. During the 1920s, Hollywood dramatically increased in density to meet the burgeoning demand for housing. At the same time, as Hollywood began to grow more commercial in nature, it began to lose its status as a prestigious address. The large parcels of land which were once occupied by a bucolic landscape of citrus groves and single-family residences were disappearing, replaced more and more frequently by dense urban development. Many of the mansions that lined Hollywood Boulevard were abandoned by 1925, as developments such as Hancock Park and Beverly Hills drew elite residents away from the area.38

Bungalow courts, duplexes, and multi-story apartment buildings replaced many of the single-family homes that had originally characterized the area. In the latter half of the 1920s, many luxury apartment buildings rising four stories and higher were constructed. Many of these operated as “apartment hotels” offering fully furnished suites, laundry, housekeeping, and in some cases food service. These properties catered to a more transient population in need of temporary housing and proved to be a useful option for creative talent imported west for work in the film industry. Most often designed in Period Revival architectural styles with an emphasis on Spanish and Mediterranean influences, much of this development was located in the sloping foothills north of Hollywood Boulevard.39

38 Williams, 132.
39 Williams, 142.
The bungalow court played an important role in the development of studio-adjacent housing, as large colonies of courts were constructed only blocks away from the studios in Hollywood. Bungalow courts in Hollywood were mostly constructed during the 1920s, when the studio era and its associated employment was reaching its peak. Extant examples include 1762-1770 Las Palmas Avenue (1922) and 1141-1143 N. Gordon Street (1928).

Other multiple-family property types, typically constructed as income properties and rented to studio workers, included boarding houses, duplexes, and apartment houses. The Garden Court Apartments (demolished), completed in 1917, was one of the preeminent apartment houses of early Hollywood. “Considered one of the most beautiful apartment building in California, the residential hotel was a marvel of craftsmanship and luxury...Many Hollywood stars, like John Gilbert, Tom Mix and, later, Marilyn Monroe, lived in the Garden Court. Saturday night dances in the full-sized basement ballroom rivaled the Hollywood Hotel.”

As movie studios, constricted by surrounding development, began to expand and relocate to larger properties to the west and north, workers who continued to reside in Hollywood and commuted to the outlying studios now faced challenges. This occurred at the same time that stars had started moving westward. As Arthur Knight observed, “For the glamour people, Hollywood was now a place to work but no longer the place to live.” However, while he acknowledged that “important movie people no longer lived along Hollywood Boulevard,” Gregory Paul Williams argued that the area still retained some degree of cache, and “the surrounding middle-class neighborhood still attracted famous people.”

---
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Post-World War II Residential Expansion

The overall character of the survey area had been established by the 1920s and 1930s, concurrent with the golden age of Hollywood and the establishment of major movie studios in the area. In the post-World War II era, the density of Hollywood increased significantly, as housing was constructed to accommodate the postwar population boom. Community and residential density continued to increase, as original single-family houses, bungalow courts, and smaller apartment buildings were replaced with larger multi-family residential complexes. In the Hollywood CRA area, this primarily manifested in the construction of inexpensive stucco-clad apartment buildings were in previously established residential neighborhoods. Because residential development from this period was primarily infill in previously established neighborhoods, eligible examples are typically excellent examples of a style or property type, and do not reflect significant development patterns in Hollywood from this period.

Development of Hollywood in the early twentieth century meant the development and expansion of local institutions to serve the growing population. Even before Hollywood incorporated in November 1903, officials began to address the need for local schools. The nascent City was several students shy of the twenty-four required to establish a new high school, so free rent for six months was offered to any family with children of high school age that would come to Hollywood to live. By September of 1903 the quota had been met and high school classes were offered for the first time in Hollywood. The school was located in an empty storage room in the Masonic Temple, located on Highland Avenue just north of Prospect Avenue (now Hollywood Boulevard). The space was divided into three rooms by temporary partitions; each room was occupied by one teacher and the only male teacher doubled as the principal.

As enrollment grew, the student body overflowed into an abandoned bakery shop next door to the Masonic Temple, and City officials began to discuss setting aside land to build a permanent high school. The creation of an area high school became a joint effort by the independent school districts of Cahuenga, Coldwater, Hollywood, Laurel, Lankershim, Los Feliz, and Pass. The school was named Hollywood Union High School, and in September 1904 the new school with an enrollment of 75 students opened. That same year the Los Angeles Pacific Electric Railroad granted half price fares to all Hollywood Union High School students and free transfers from the Colegrove line. At that time the school was still housed in temporary headquarters until a permanent school building could be constructed. At the same time plans were underway for a campus for Hollywood Union High School, the Hollywood school district hired architects Dennis & Farwell to design two elementary school buildings: Grant Grammar School (demolished), and Fremont Grammar School (6611 Selma Avenue, demolished).44

In 1904, a site was selected for the new school on the corner of Sunset Boulevard and Highland Avenue. Following a design competition, in April 1904 the school board selected the Los Angeles firm of Burnham and Bliesner as the architects for the project. On November 24, 1904, a ceremony led by the Masonic Grand Lodge of California was held to dedicate the cornerstone for the new building. At the ceremony, A. McCormick, president of Hollywood Union High School Board of Trustees proclaimed, “The name Hollywood Union will give us tone, dignity, and international reputation.” Total cost for the building was $67,000 which was funded through the sale of bonds. The two-story structure, topped with a dome, was completed in 1905.

Attendance increased rapidly over the next few years. By October 1909, the school had outgrown its original Beaux Arts-style building, and the board decided to raise $100,000 through bonds to expand the campus. With its multi-building complex, Hollywood Union High School was a model of innovative and modern secondary education. More additions, including an auditorium, as well as bonds to fund improvements, were planned by 1911.

By 1913, the planned additions to the campus were completed, and now the school included the original Administration Building, a Gymnasium, Auditorium, Mechanics Building, Science Building, and Household and Fine Arts Building. Despite these improvements, overcrowding continued to be a major issue. By 1915, there were so many freshmen that the school adopted a dual graduating system, in which one senior class would graduate in the winter and the other in the summer. The winter class held its ceremony in the Auditorium, while the summer class graduated in the Hollywood Bowl. In 1925, the school constructed a new Auditorium, replacing the original 1910 building, which was then converted to the Library. The new Auditorium was

---

46 “In the public schools,” Los Angeles Times, May 14, 1911.
constructed to accommodate the glut of local talent, and it became a social center for the community.47

On March 10, 1933, an earthquake, centered in Long Beach, hit the greater Los Angeles area. It damaged beyond repair forty of the Los Angeles Unified School District’s (LAUSD) unreinforced masonry buildings, including four buildings at Hollywood High: the Administration Building, the Gymnasium, the Science Building, and the Household and Fine Arts Building.

At Hollywood High, LAUSD set aside funding for the demolition, rehabilitation, and earthquake proofing of the school’s main structures. On May 14, 1934, the Hollywood High School administration selected the firm of Marsh, Smith and Powell to design new buildings for their campus. The first to be constructed was the Science Building (1935), followed by modifications to the Library (1935), and then the Liberal Arts and Arts Buildings, which were both completed in 1938. All four buildings exhibit the features of PWA Moderne architecture, resulting in a unified appearance of the campus as a whole. Marsh, Smith and Powell were responsible for the design of numerous school facilities during the 1930s and published several articles about current trends in classroom design and campus planning.

The campus also includes prominent examples of New Deal-era artwork. The Science Building features the work of sculptor Bartolomeo Mako, who created a bas-relief sculpture over the entry and a sculptured pylon in the forecourt. Muralist Haldane Douglas began a painting for the interior of the Library in the spring of 1934. Hollywood High School was listed in the National Register in 2012.

47 Williams, The Story of Hollywood, 147.
Development of Local and Trade Newspapers

The first local paper to be published in the Hollywood area did not launch until 1895, when the *Cahuenga Suburban*, a monthly paper covering the Cahuenga Valley, was established. In 1899, the *Suburban* ceased publication and was replaced the following year by the weekly *Cahuenga Valley Sentinel*. The *Sentinel*, which was established by A. A. Bynon and his son, Fred, was published on Saturdays and reached an audience of only 500 residents. Nevertheless, the *Sentinel* served as Hollywood's only paper of record for five years.

In 1905, the *Cahuenga Valley Sentinel* adopted a partisan – and, as a result, controversial – editorial stance over the real estate dealings of Hollywood’s founding matron, Daeida Wilcox Beveridge, and after a battle of words arose between the two factions, the editor of the *Sentinel* transferred the paper to another party and left town.48 In the wake of the scandal, pioneering Hollywood resident and physician Dr. Edwin O. Palmer stepped forward to establish an alternative newspaper. Palmer and his business associates assembled a group of almost fifty interested residents and took up a collection to establish the new paper, called the *Hollywood Citizen*. The first issue of the *Hollywood Citizen* appeared on April 23, 1905, with four six-column pages.49 Palmer, however, was soon overwhelmed by his multiple business interests and within a few years decided to sell the paper. Ironically, the rival *Cahuenga Valley Sentinel* was “ready to fade out anyway,” according to Gregory Paul Williams, and both the *Hollywood Citizen* and the *Cahuenga Valley Sentinel* were purchased by E. E. Brown, a publisher from Michigan, who merged the two papers and retired the *Cahuenga Valley Sentinel* name.50

It wasn’t long before Edwin Palmer began to regret his decision to sell the paper. Fortunately for Edwin Palmer, a family relation had recently relocated to Pasadena – and he happened to have experience running a newspaper. Harlan G. Palmer, Edwin Palmer’s second cousin, arrived in Hollywood in 1911 with an eye towards finding a business that he could operate while attending law school at the University of Southern California. Edwin Palmer persuaded his cousin to buy the newspaper, and Harlan Palmer assumed ownership of the *Hollywood Citizen* on April 1, 1911. Operations were initially located at a small storefront at 1640 Cahuenga Avenue, which the paper shared with an ice cream shop. Within several years Palmer expanded the operations of the paper and opened an ancillary stationery store, the first of its kind in the area. Such growth required relocation, and by 1914 the *Citizen* had moved to 6424-6426 Hollywood Boulevard, where the paper took over two storefronts. The biggest move for the *Hollywood Citizen*, however, came in 1920, when the paper moved its operations to a newly constructed building at 6362-6366 Hollywood Boulevard. That same year, Palmer made the decision to expand the *Citizen*’s coverage from weekly to daily publication. The *Hollywood Citizen* published its first daily edition on October 1, 1921, and appropriately changed its name to the *Hollywood Daily Citizen*.

48 Williams, 45.
50 Williams, 60; and “Hollywood,” *Los Angeles Times*, February 7, 1911.
The catalyst for the Citizen’s expansion came in the form of growing competition from relative newcomer to the Hollywood newspaper industry known as the Hollywood News, which would remain a constant competitor and neighbor of the Hollywood Citizen for the next ten years. The Hollywood News, a daily paper, was established by newspaperman F. W. Kellogg, who established a number of local papers in Southern California in the first half of the 1920s. The first issue of the Hollywood News was published on November 1, 1921 and was distributed as a local circular in Hollywood with the Los Angeles Evening Express. The paper was first published out of a storefront at 6379 Hollywood Boulevard, but by 1925 had outgrown the facility, and operations were relocated to a newly constructed plant for the paper located immediately to the east at 6363-6371 Hollywood Boulevard.

After several years of operation under Kellogg’s stewardship, the Hollywood News was acquired by politician and industrialist Ira C. Copley in 1928. At the time, Copley made it clear that his plans involved the “immediate expansion” of the Hollywood News, with his spokesman declaring, “We hope to give Hollywood a paper that will be a credit to that fast-growing center.” To that end, Copley filed building permits in 1930 for the construction of a new newspaper plant for the Hollywood News at 1545 North Wilcox Avenue. The move relocated the paper’s operations from 6363-6371 Hollywood Boulevard, where the Hollywood News had constructed a plant in 1924 – just across the street from its rival, the Hollywood Citizen. The Los Angeles Times noted that the new Wilcox Avenue building, which officially opened on July 1, 1931, represented the fourth such effort by Copley in just two years, with the publisher undertaking the construction of similar facilities in Santa Monica, Long Beach, and Alhambra. Despite the anticipated success of the newly-housed Hollywood News, Copley’s aggressive expansion of his Southern California newspaper holdings on the eve of the Great Depression proved to be ill-timed – and, as a result, short-lived. By 1931, Copley began to dissolve his holdings almost as swiftly as he had acquired them. The Hollywood News was one of the first papers to be sold, just months after its new headquarters were completed.

In 1931, Harlan G. Palmer purchased Ira Copley’s Hollywood News for $600,000 and merged the paper with his own Hollywood Citizen. Operations of both papers were consolidated at the News’s newly-constructed plant at 1545 North Wilcox Avenue, where the merger was physically embodied with the display of two signs: an engraved panel reading “Hollywood News Building,” and a new illuminated blade sign reading “Hollywood Citizen-News.” The first edition of the combined Hollywood Citizen-News was released on November 2, 1931.

---

In the years following World War II, the *Hollywood Citizen-News* continued to expand until it was the fourth-largest daily newspaper in Los Angeles.\(^5^6\) Upon Harlan G. Palmer’s death in 1956, his son, Harlan Palmer, Jr., assumed the position of publisher, and his brother, Ralph Judson Palmer, was eventually named editor. The paper remained in the Palmer family for another five years, but in 1961, Harlan Palmer, Jr. sold the *Hollywood Citizen-News* to David Heyler, publisher of the *Beverly Hills Citizen*.\(^5^7\) The paper changed hands again in 1964, when Heyler sold the *Citizen-News* to the then-publisher of the *Valley Times*, Lammot du Pont Copeland, Jr.\(^5^8\) However, after Copeland went into bankruptcy in 1970, the paper’s assets were seized by the Internal Revenue Service and the paper went into receivership. The last issue of the *Hollywood Citizen-News* was issued on August 28, 1970, after sixty-six years of continuous publication.

**Trade Publications**

As a result of Hollywood’s unique role as nexus of the motion picture industry, it also became a center for publishing specifically related to the industry trade. Although early newspapers in Hollywood often commented on events related to the film industry, it was not until 1930 that a newspaper was established that devoted itself solely to reportage of the film industry. The *Hollywood Reporter* launched on September 3, 1930, from a three-room office at 1606 North Highland Avenue (demolished) between Sunset and Hollywood Boulevards.\(^5^9\) The small newspaper office accommodated a miniscule staff who delivered commentary six days a week on developments in the film industry.

\(^5^6\) Statistic cited in Williams, 185. See also Torrence, 120.
The new trade newspaper format capitalized upon the establishment of motion pictures as one of the nation’s top ten industries and the interest generated by its celebrities and film moguls. The format was successful enough that, three years after the founding of the *Hollywood Reporter*, a rival trade newspaper was formed called the *Daily Variety*. *Variety* had originally been launched in 1905 as a weekly publication covering the New York City vaudeville scene, but a daily version with reporting from Los Angeles was added in September 1933 to compete with the *Hollywood Reporter*. The *Daily Variety* shared space in the weekly *Variety*’s Los Angeles offices at 6282 Hollywood Boulevard (Taft Building; Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument No. 666).

The trade newspapers soon established themselves as authoritative voices not only of deals and gossip, but also the inner workings of the studio system, and they became an important vehicle for creating public perceptions of labor relations between the studios and workers. When the studios announced that they would cut pay by fifty percent in 1933, the pages of the trades were soon filled with news of the workers’ unionization. By 1936, *The Hollywood Reporter* had sufficiently established itself as the voice for all events related to the film industry and the paper relocated to new, well-appointed offices at 6713 Sunset Boulevard (Historic-Cultural Monument No. 1151). Although established daily newspapers often had buildings designed specifically for the production of newspapers, such as the 1930 building in Hollywood for the *Hollywood News*, the new location for *The Hollywood Reporter* was neither designed for use as a newspaper building nor even dedicated solely to that function. The building was mixed in use with men’s haberdashery and barber shop on the ground floor when the *Hollywood Reporter* first opened its offices, although these retail and service spaces were soon vacated as the paper expanded.60

---

60 Littleton and Byrge, “A Paper Tale.”
Industrial Development

Until the 1910s, industrial development in Hollywood and neighboring Colegrove was largely confined to agriculture.61 In 1914, one of the first efforts at creating a concentrated industrial area in Hollywood occurred when Dr. Edwin O. Palmer purchased a group of lots along Hollywood Boulevard, near Whitley Avenue. Palmer constructed a lumberyard and sued to clear the tract’s commercial restrictions.62 As a result, Hollywood Boulevard was zoned for businesses from Cahuenga Boulevard east to Highland Avenue.

Between 1915 and 1930, Hollywood entered a period of rapidly accelerated growth, during which the area was transformed from a pastoral residential and farming community to a bustling business, entertainment, and residential zone. Although the entire Los Angeles region saw tremendous growth during this period, Hollywood was able to establish a distinctive identity largely in response to the success of the motion picture industry.

Motion Picture Industry

Film production began in Hollywood in 1911 when the Nestor Company leased a small roadhouse known as the Blondeau Tavern on the northwest corner of Sunset Boulevard and Gower Street. The property contained a barn, corral, twelve single-room structures, and a five-room bungalow, all of which were quickly adapted for filmmaking.

Other companies soon followed Nestor to Hollywood, including the Universal Film Manufacturing Company in 1912, which briefly used the Nestor site before relocating to a larger property.

The Jesse L. Lasky Feature Players Company established a base of operations in a barn at the corner of Selma and Vine Streets in Hollywood in 1913. Although Lasky’s Feature Players would later come to be known for the success of its officers – industry leaders Jesse Lasky, Samuel Goldfish (later known as Samuel Goldwyn), and Cecil B. DeMille – as well as its eventual merger

61 Oil wells had been banned by the city, eliminating one of the region’s most profitable enterprises of the day.
62 Williams, 72.
with Adolf Zukor’s Famous Players to form Paramount Pictures Corporation, at the time the Lasky Players were only one of a number of companies developing facilities in Hollywood.  

As the popularity of motion pictures grew, more physical facilities related to film production were constructed in Hollywood. Initially, film companies leased existing warehouses and storage facilities and filmed on outdoor platforms they called “stages.” Occasionally, these platforms were partially enclosed to provide for production in inclement weather. Several companies expanded on these somewhat primitive arrangements, building their own production facilities or “studios,” tailored to the myriad needs of the filmmaking process. These early studios were often not much more than a ramshackle collection of utilitarian buildings set on open land and surrounded by a high wall or fence. Some of the more sophisticated plants might be distinguished by “signature” main buildings or entrance gates designed in popular architectural styles of the day. Related industrial and commercial enterprises serving the motion picture industry – including film processing, sound technology and recording, make-up manufacturing, camera repair, property and costume storage – were quickly established adjacent to the early studio lots throughout Hollywood. Much of this development occurred within or immediately adjacent to previously established residential areas.

By 1926, the motion picture industry was the “United States’ fifth largest... grossing $1.5 billion a year and accounting for 90 percent of the world’s films.” As the film business became more competitive, smaller companies were subsumed into larger companies through mergers and acquisitions. By the end of the 1920s, the American film industry was dominated by eight companies. Of these, three were located within the survey area: Columbia Pictures, Warner Brothers, and Fox Studios (demolished).

Leading this group – which was called the “Big Eight” – were five companies that controlled the first-run market through corporate ownership of both production facilities and the premier American theater chains. These five “major” studios were Metro-Goldwyn Mayer (MGM), with

---

63 The original Lasky barn was relocated to the Paramount Pictures lot in 1926, where it was used for many years as a film set and a gymnasium. In 1976, the Fire Marshal required additional parking on the Paramount lot, so the barn was relocated to a vacant parcel on Vine Street. In 1982, Hollywood Heritage took on stewardship of the barn and it was moved to its current location at 2100 North Highland Avenue, on land leased from the Los Angeles County Parks and Recreation Department. Today the Lasky-DeMille Barn is listed in the National Register of Historic Places and as a California State Historic Landmark.

64 Kevin Starr, Material Dreams: Southern California through the 1920s (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 313.
production facilities located in Culver City; Paramount Pictures, located in Hollywood; Fox Studios (later Twentieth Century-Fox), located in Hollywood and West Los Angeles; Warner Brothers, located in Hollywood and Burbank; and RKO, the smallest of the five, also located in Hollywood. In addition to the five “majors” were three “minor” studios: Universal Pictures with production facilities in North Hollywood; Columbia Pictures in Hollywood; and United Artists, which functioned largely as a host studio for independent producers. For nearly two decades, the Big Eight controlled 95 percent of film revenues in the United States and set the standard for film production throughout the world. Their rise to dominance began what is now referred to as “The Studio Era” or Hollywood’s “Golden Age,” during which production and distribution (and, in the case of the major studios, exhibition) were integrated under a single corporate entity.

As profits from feature-length silent films grew, these corporations built more substantial physical facilities. Resembling large industrial plants, a typical studio property was several acres in size and enclosed by perimeter walls. Contained inside were facilities for all aspects of film production. In addition to the large, enclosed stage buildings, film studios included set and costume production shops, makeup and hairdressing facilities, dressing rooms, production and administration offices, screening rooms, storage facilities, and post-production areas.

---

A portion of an elaborate pictorial map designed by Don Boggs highlighting the most prominent studios in Hollywood in the 1920s and 1930s. Source: “Hollywood Starland: official moviegraph of the land of stars, where they live, where they work and where they play,” 1937, Library of Congress.
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Technological innovations also spurred the development of improved production facilities. In the early 1920s, film makers had begun to experiment with adding synchronized sound to motion pictures. Sound pictures required new technology for both producing films and their presentation in theaters. Every production facility needed to be soundproofed and fitted with recording equipment, and every theater in America had to be adapted for sound. Major investments were needed by the entire industry to keep its product viable. Major renovations took place on most studio lots beginning in 1928 following the advent of sound. In this phase of studio development, the studios retrofitted and expanded facilities to accommodate the new technology. Physical plants became more organized. The stages formed the heart of the production area, with set building, editing rooms, storage, and other technical facilities located close by. Support spaces, offices, dressing rooms, make-up, costume, and art departments were concentrated in areas further removed from the production facilities.

Major motion picture companies also became interested in the development of theaters during this period. In order to ensure outlets for their product, the most powerful studios bought, built, or gained control of first-run theater chains. These theater chains operated the largest and most prestigious theaters in all the major cities. The first-run market offered the greatest potential for profit because it attracted the largest audiences, charged the highest ticket prices, and provided direct access to the nation’s most important radio stations and print media.
While the Big Eight studios dominated the American motion picture industry, alternative production facilities also existed and even flourished. These venues could generally be divided into two broad categories: independent studios and rental plants. Independent studios were those smaller operations that had not joined the trend of mergers and acquisitions that resulted in the Big Eight and their business model of vertical integration. It is worth noting that in the late 1910s and the early 1920s, there was comparatively little difference between the operational model of most motion picture production companies. Many companies utilized the vertically integrated model of distribution, although their network of distribution might consist of only a handful of theaters. It was not until the late 1920s that the scale of mergers – often involving companies which had already previously expanded through other acquisitions – became much more significant. Indeed, the greatest distinction between the Big Eight studios and their independent counterparts was the size of their operations and the size of their distribution networks. However, during this period, motion picture production on the whole increased, in part due to the rise in popularity of a new programming format: the double feature. With the growing demand for new content to fill the schedule, independent producers flourished alongside their major studio competitors, and many independent production companies were established during this time. Some existed only fleetingly before being dissolved or acquired by a larger concern.

Rental plants functioned as motion picture production facilities which were not affiliated with a particular studio or company and did not produce or distribute films directly. Instead, profits were generated solely from the leasing of the plant’s equipment and facilities to other studios or independent producers. While films produced in the first half of the twentieth century are generally associated with the strict on-site control of the major studio era, rental plants nonetheless filled a distinct niche in the industry for several reasons. At the same time, as films continued to gain in popularity as an entertainment medium, even the most established studios experienced difficulty in meeting the demand for new product. While the climate and environment of Hollywood certainly lent itself to year-round production, finite studio facilities did not, and constructing additional facilities required investments that many studios did not wish to make. Major renovation or construction projects might also require existing facilities to be shut down for the duration. As a result, some studios leased space at rental plants for their overflow productions that could not be accommodated on their own studio lot. This allowed for studios to expand their production without straining their own resources, and also to improve their own facilities, if necessary, without losing filming time. More established filmmakers who wished to remain competitive with the major studios also leased space from rental studio plants, whose plant owners were motivated to invest in updated facilities and new technologies so they could command higher prices.

In terms of facilities, lesser operations like independent production companies eschewed form over function. Many independent production companies opted to secure whatever space was available, and some real estate developers were able to capitalize on this trend by constructing facilities which could be sold or leased to independent filmmakers who were not associated
with a major studio and, more often than not, were operating with very small budgets. Due to the concentration of such tenants in certain locations, over time these areas came to be known as “Poverty Rows.” The most famous of these was established at the southeast corner of Sunset Boulevard and Gower Street, a site which later became the headquarters for Columbia Pictures.

Despite serious financial troubles associated with the Great Depression, the film studios continued to grow and develop throughout the 1930s to become one of Southern California’s primary industries. Movie theaters provided an inexpensive escape from the struggle of economic hardship. Film attendance grew during World War II as films proved the perfect vehicle to boost civilian morale and cheer the Allied Forces to victory. The motion picture companies of the Studio Era hit their peak of profitability in 1946 when the five major studios posted profits that would not be matched again (in real dollar terms) until the 1970s. By this time, however, the Big Eight’s industry dominance had already begun to falter. There were several factors which accounted for the studios’ weakening grasp: In the late 1940s, the major studios were impacted by the House Un-American Activities Committee investigating questionable loyalties among the film community, which created divisions within the industry. At the same time, the widespread availability of television had already begun to threaten the studios’ monopoly on visual entertainment. With the advent of television, movie audiences decreased dramatically, forcing the motion picture studios to downsize substantially. To compete, the studios focused their efforts on making films as unlike television as possible, experimenting with wide-screen formats, improved sound systems and 3-D. By the 1950s, motion picture operations began to relocate to other areas, and the major industry in Hollywood shifted to tourism.

66 Gomery, 79.
Television first arrived in Hollywood in 1927, when Los Angeles inventor Philo T. Farnsworth developed the first electronic television system in his home laboratory on New Hampshire Street in East Hollywood.\(^6\) Don Lee, a Cadillac dealer who also helped pioneer the radio broadcast industry in Los Angeles, applied for a construction permit for the first television station on the West Coast in 1930.\(^6\) Lee engaged the services of 24-year-old Harry R. Lubcke, an electrical engineer who had worked with television inventor Philo T. Farnsworth, and gave him the title of Director of Television of the Don Lee Broadcasting Company.\(^7\) In December 1931, W6XAO-TV went on the air from the eighth-floor transmitter at the Don Lee Broadcasting System headquarters, at Seventh and Bixel Streets, atop Lee’s Cadillac dealership.\(^7\) Lee aired an hour of programming per day, which consisted mainly of filmed action sequences and closeups of movie stars.\(^7\) The station eventually built a small studio on the second floor so it could use performers, and broadcast poetry readings set to music.\(^7\) The 1930s marked a series of firsts for the television industry in Los Angeles: the first film ever shown on television, *The Crooked Circle* starring Zasu Pitts, was aired in 1933, and the first soap opera, *Vine Street*, was broadcast in 1938.\(^7\) Soon, Lee’s television operations required more studio space, and in 1939 Don Lee Broadcasting purchased a 20-acre site to the east of Cahuenga Peak in the Hollywood Hills and erected a studio and transmitter, which were completed in 1940. Lee – who had died in 1934 – and his early efforts were commemorated when the site was named Mount Lee in his honor.\(^7\)

At the time of Lee’s first broadcasts, there were only five television sets in the city.\(^7\) At the time, few people grasped the power and influence which television as a medium would eventually wield. One of the earliest adopters of the form was, perhaps surprisingly, Paramount Pictures. Realizing the potential competition that television might pose for motion pictures, in

---
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1939 Paramount filed permits to construct an experimental television station, W6XYZ-TV, next to their studio lot at Melrose and Bronson. W6XYZ-TV began broadcasting in 1942; in 1947 the station was converted to a commercial station and became the first such commercial television station west of Chicago. The manufacturing demands of World War II delayed the widespread advent of television; by 1946, it was estimated that there were only 400 television sets in the Los Angeles area. However, widespread advances in technology and manufacturing, as well as the postwar consumerism boom, contributed to the explosive growth of the television industry in the years following the war.

This period of industry growth was inaugurated in June 1946, when the FCC held hearings in Los Angeles to consider applicants for commercial television stations. There were eight applicants for the seven commercial channels allocated to Los Angeles. The applicant pool included experimental stations owned by Television Productions Inc., a subsidiary of Paramount Pictures; the Don Lee Broadcasting System; American Broadcasting Company (ABC); the National Broadcasting Company (NBC); Earle C. Anthony; Dorothy Schiff; the Times-Mirror Corporation. Another applicant, the Hughes Tool Company, later withdrew its application. All seven were granted licenses as well as construction permits. Paramount was the first to begin commercial broadcasting, with the launch of KTLA in 1947. The six other initial stations soon followed, launching in 1948 and 1949 following the completion of their facilities. In addition to KTLA, these stations included KTSL, KLAC, KFI, KTTV, KNBH, and KECA.

---
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Radio Broadcasting

The radio broadcasting industry came to Hollywood in the 1920s. Early stations established during this period include KNX, KFI, KHJ, and KFWB; of these, KNX and KFWB were located in the survey area. KNX was first developed in 1919 when Fred Christian, an ex-Marconi shipboard wireless operator, established a five-watt transmitter in his Hollywood home on Harold Way. Christian, initially granted the call sign 6 ADZ, began broadcasting on September 10, 1920, playing recorded music borrowed from area record stores in exchange for on-air acknowledgements. Broadcasting from his “studio,” (originally a back bedroom at his home) Christian became the city’s first disc jockey. The station changed frequencies and call signs several times before launching as KNX in May 1922. In 1924, KNX commenced regular broadcasting from the Studebaker Sales Building (6116 Hollywood Boulevard). In 1929, KNX became a 5,000-watt station, and in 1932, it was boosted to 10,000 watts under the ownership of the Western Broadcasting Company, which broadcast from the Paramount lot in Hollywood. Another power jump to 25,000 watts came in 1933, when KNX moved its studios to the Otto K. Olesen Building at Vine Street and Selma Avenue. In 1935, KNX moved to a new building at 5939 Sunset Boulevard.

In 1922, two notable developments, implemented by the United States Department of Commerce, spurred the expansion of the radio industry in Southern California. First, the Department divided the United States into three broadcast regions, making Los Angeles the principal broadcasting center in the West. Second, the department began issuing commercial broadcasting licenses, and a number of additional stations were established in Los Angeles. Along with KNX, two other prominent stations launched that year: KFI, owned by Earle C. Anthony; and KHJ, owned by C. R. Kierulf & Company. In 1925, another notable station was established with the launch of KFWB at Warner Brothers studio on Hollywood Boulevard.

---
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These four stations – and, in particular, KNX and KFWB – served as precursors to the subsequent development of Hollywood as a nexus of radio broadcasting activity. The foundation was laid for the industry’s growth in Hollywood in 1926 with the creation of the network system. Using telephone lines under a contract with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T), two new radio networks were created that year to link stations across the country. The first network to form was the National Broadcasting Company (NBC), founded by the Radio Corporation of America (RCA) in 1926. It was joined in 1927 by the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) network, and in 1934, by a third, smaller national network, the Mutual Network. The American Broadcasting Company (ABC) was established in 1944 as the result of an antitrust suit against NBC.

Hollywood stations quickly joined the developing networks. KFI joined the NBC network in 1927, and KHJ joined CBS in 1929. In 1933, KFI and KECA were established as NBC Red and Blue network affiliates at the RKO stages at Melrose and Gower, and in 1936, the Mutual network contracted with local station KHJ, which had previously been affiliated with CBS; CBS in turn made local station KNX an affiliate. KNX was the first Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) affiliate in Southern California. William Lescaze was hired by the head of CBS, William Paley, to design a new West Coast headquarters on Sunset Boulevard. On April 27, 1937 the groundbreaking ceremony for Paley’s new facility took place with a star-studded event. It was the first building to integrate broadcasting’s technological needs with the ability to include live audiences. KFI, also a part of a national radio broadcasting company, was the first station to broadcast from the Hollywood Bowl, and became part of NBC’s Red Network in 1927.79

---

Although Warner Brothers’ radio station KFWB did not join a network, it was still a major player in the industry, promoting young film stars and developing new radio talent. One element of the company’s strategy was to broadcast radio programs from movie theaters and invite the public free of charge. One of the locations Warner Brothers used for such radio broadcasts was the Warner Theater on Hollywood Boulevard, which was completed in 1928 and located just over a mile away from the station’s headquarters. In 1929, Warner Brothers installed radio towers on the roof of the building, and it appears that KFWB broadcast from both its original location as well as the theater throughout the 1930s.

After the “disorganized experimentation” of the early days, by the late 1920s the radio business was evolving into a “thriving entertainment industry controlled by some of the largest and most powerful corporations in America.”80 It is this period which is generally recognized as the “Golden Age” of radio broadcasting. Indeed, radio developed as a major medium of the entertainment industry after 1927, and radio became an important part of daily American life. After the stock market crash of 1929, the nation’s radio business not only survived, but increased its revenue as newspapers folded.81 President Roosevelt’s weekly “Fireside Chats,” which first aired in 1933, gave increased importance to radio broadcasting. News, weather reports, and concerts became radio staples in the 1930s, and airwaves were also used for police bulletins, college instruction, airport information, and ship-to-shore-communication.

Despite the growing presence of radio in Los Angeles, the establishment of Hollywood as a national radio center did not truly take hold until 1937, as the cost of producing and broadcasting radio programs directly from Hollywood was simply too high. Prior to 1937, AT&T, which controlled the phone lines responsible for the networking of radio stations, had a fee structure which effectively charged West Coast radio studios double the cost East Coast studios paid for transmission. After a series of high-level negotiations between AT&T and the new Federal Communications Commission, AT&T agreed to change its fee structure. The result was lower rates for transmission of radio programs originating on the West Coast. With the change in the rate system, the big networks began plans to build studios in Hollywood.

With the advent of talking film production in the 1920s, major music publishers found a lucrative new outlet; it was now possible to market individual songs from films through three different mediums: phonograph records, sheet music, and radio broadcasts.82 The ability to promote and hear music across a variety of different mediums created a successful symbiotic relationship between the three industries.

---
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**Historic Resources Survey Report**

Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area
This relationship continued throughout the 1930s, during the Golden Age of radio broadcasting. Radio stations often hired full orchestras to accompany their broadcasts, and eventually those ensembles became the focal point of the show. At the same time, live music was becoming a key feature of Hollywood nightlife. The Earl Carroll Theatre (Historic-Cultural Monument No. 1136) and the Florentine Gardens, both opened in 1938, featured dinner shows with musical entertainment, and upscale Hollywood hotels had rooms with a jazz or blues singer and a backup band.\(^{83}\) The Palladium, which opened in 1940 and featured a kidney-shaped dance floor, featured the Tommy Dorsey Orchestra on opening night.

World War II effectively ended the golden age of radio broadcasting. During the war, the ban on all non-essential electronic manufacturing resulted in a 50% decrease in the sale of radios from 1941 to 1943. After the war, radio’s appeal was further eclipsed with the growing popularity of television. By 1948, radio profits continued to decline as television lured away advertisers, and eventually local radio stations around the country began to refuse to renew their network affiliations, bringing an end to the once-powerful network system.

---
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Record Companies Come to Hollywood

The growing trend of broadcasting musical performances brought increased attention to singers, musicians, and bandleaders, who often became celebrities in their own right. Record companies arrived from New York, eager to capitalize on the already-established relationship between the radio and recording industries. Columbia, Decca, and Dot Records opened west coast branches on Vine Street.84

By 1942, music accounted for seventy-five percent of radio airtime.85 That year, Glen Wallichs and songwriters Johnny Mercer and Buddy DeSylva founded Capitol Records in Hollywood. From the start, Capitol strayed from typical recording company behavior by cooperating fully with radio disc jockeys, providing them with sample records of each release.86 Once a record-manufacturing ban was enacted during World War II, the company kept itself afloat with performances and broadcasts.87 In the years following the war, however, the industry’s presence in Los Angeles began to evolve.

Songwriters filled offices along Selma and Argyle Avenues, transforming the intersection into a west coast Tin Pan Alley. One enterprising composer, L. Wolfe Gilbert in the Cinemat Building, headed ASCAP (the American Society for Composers, Authors and Publishers), charging composer royalties for stations playing music over the air. “Wolfe” led a formidable organization that soon found a rival, BMI (Broadcast Music, Inc.), located on Selma Avenue.88 The identification of popular songs with mainstream artists increased sales of those songs and promoted the artists associated with them. Licensing agencies like the ASCAP and the MPPA (Music Publishers Protective Association) ensured that users paid a licensing fee for both performances and recorded music.

In the 1960s, the recording industry – and Hollywood – experienced a marked shift with the advent of rock ‘n’ roll music. “The area had enjoyed an active youth-oriented live music scene even before the rock era broke,“89 thanks to influential clubs like Cosmo Alley and the Ashgrove, which hosted folk musicians, and Soul’d Out on Sunset Boulevard. However, “when the Beatles came to the Colonies and rock plugged itself in, the Hollywood cultural scene became as electrified as Bob Dylan’s guitar.”90

These young musical talents attracted fresh audiences to the recording industry. “The record business, which had never pushed the sale of long-playing albums before, developed
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sophisticated new marketing techniques to exploit them.”

The result put to rest any skepticism the music industry establishment may have had about embracing this new sound. Hollywood evolved into a recording center. “The recording business was not a very affluent business until the Sixties – until rock hit the scene. Most [older] artists did not make a living from making phonograph records...the record business was sort of a sideline,” says Karp. But with the appearance of performers who did make most of their living as recording artists, the record companies wanted to be where their stars were.

By the mid-1960s, record labels had significantly increased their presence in Los Angeles. Prior to the early 1960s, only the four major record labels staffed offices on the west coast, and the music industry was still largely dictated by the east coast. Within a few years, however, “recorded music [had] formed the heart of Hollywood’s continuing entertainment business.” The conditions in Hollywood were ideal for a renaissance. Film production companies, once the industrial mainstay of the area, had begun to relocate their operations elsewhere or convert their existing facilities for other types of production. However, Hollywood still “had a name that was associated with entertainment,” and proved to be an attractive venue. “Hollywood had new office space and was building more, both in Hollywood proper and along the Sunset Strip. Support services were excellent; Los Angeles had the best concentration of studio musicians and production engineers, and a wealth of legal talent to serve the record community.” The fact that few major recording companies, aside from Capitol Records, were Hollywood fixtures before 1964 helped spur the recording boom in the area. Herb Alpert and Jerry Moss founded A&M Records in 1962, and in 1966 relocated their offices to Charlie Chaplin’s former film studio on La Brea. Independent record companies “lined Sunset. Liberty, Dot, Imperial, Crystal, and Specialty opened their doors to anyone auditioning original material.”

---
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As record companies began to establish themselves and gain power and influence, many began to expand and diversify their interests in the entertainment field – a move which “necessitated a move to Los Angeles.” As a result, an “accelerating migration” of producers and record companies from New York, Nashville, Chicago, and Detroit arrived in Los Angeles. Labels like Motown Records, Liberty (later known as United Artists), Polydor, and Elektra all established operations in Los Angeles. Independent producers did as well, sparking the development of independent recording studios, a business model which operated in much the same way rental motion picture plants had decades earlier. Most of these producers were already well-known in their field for their expertise and innovation in sound recording technology; among the most notable was Milton Tasker “Bill” Putnam, a pioneering record producer from Chicago who had already won acclaim for his use of innovative recording technologies, including the first use of tape repeat, the first multiple voice recording, and the first use of artificial reverb; he often crafted his own equipment when what was available did not achieve the effect he was looking for. Many of Putnam’s clients -- who were finding work in the burgeoning postwar recording industry in Los Angeles – encouraged him to open a recording facility on the West Coast.

Putnam was an early adopter; he relocated to Los Angeles in 1958 and established the Universal Recording Corporation that same year. He selected two properties for development: the Master Recorder facility on Fairfax Avenue was acquired, and the property at 6050 Sunset was leased. United Recording opened at 6050 Sunset in 1959 and soon hosted such acts as Nat King Cole, Dean Martin, Bing Crosby, Johnny Mathis, Jan and Dean, The Righteous Brothers, Bobby Darin, Sammy Davis, Jr., and Ray Charles. One of the most notable clients to come through the door was Frank Sinatra, whom Bill Putnam met in 1960. Sinatra, whose contract with Capitol Records that same year, formed his own record label, Reprise, and set up the company’s offices upstairs at 6050 Sunset. Sinatra became so enamored with Putnam’s expertise that from 1960 to 1964, Putnam was on retainer to Sinatra to handle virtually all of his recording sessions. His recordings at United’s Studio A were some of his most well-known, and included “That’s Life,” “Strangers in the Night,” and “September of My Years.”

Within two years of its opening United Recording at 6050 Sunset was operating at capacity. In 1961, United acquired a controlling interest in Western Recorders, Inc., which was located two buildings to the east at 6000 Sunset. The building was subsequently renovated and included three studio spaces designed by Bill Putnam: Studios One, Two, and Three. Both facilities now functioned as part of the United Recording complex; 6000 Sunset was distinguished from the original by the moniker “Western-United.” Throughout the 1960s, the United facilities would play host to some of the decade’s most iconic recordings, including The Mamas and the Papas’ “California Dreamin’” and “Monday, Monday,” as well as The Beach Boys’ album *Pet Sounds.*

---

99 Torrence, 256.
100 Torrence, 256.
By the 1970s, “the music of the street people had translated into plush corporate offices up and down Sunset Boulevard.”¹⁰¹ Rock music had transformed both a generation, and an industry. The genre’s popularity, however, led to a dramatic increase in bootleg recordings, which the recording industry claimed impacted their profits. In 1971, the United States Congress passed the Sound Recording Amendment to the 1909 Copyright Statute, making sound recordings worthy of copyright protection.

¹⁰¹ Torrence, 256.
Commercial Development

As the 1920s approached, it was clear to Hollywood’s leading land and business owners that there was a great deal of money to be made through real estate development. It was decided that Hollywood Boulevard would be reborn as a first-class shopping and business district. The local Hollywood Chamber of Commerce was formed, and quickly boasted 2,517 members. Activities focused on bringing major businesses including bank branches and upscale retailers to Hollywood.\textsuperscript{102} To further that goal, better street connections to the more established communities south of Hollywood were required. A group of Hollywood landowners and businessmen quickly formed the “Vine Street Improvement District” to widen, grade, and pave Vine Street between Hollywood and Wilshire Boulevards. Vine Street opened as a major avenue in 1922 and the intersection of Hollywood and Vine became a nexus of commercial development.\textsuperscript{103}

New development followed at a breathtaking pace as developers competed to maximize the potential of their property holdings. A 1905 ordinance (amended in 1911) prohibited the construction of buildings in Los Angeles taller than 150 feet, though an exception allowed for uninhabited rooftop elements. A single permitted variance for the construction of Los Angeles
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City Hall in 1926 ensured that 454-foot City Hall would dominate Los Angeles downtown skyline for decades. Hollywood developers competed to maximize the potential of their property holdings with building constructed to the allowable height. The result was collection of “limit-height” buildings punctuating central Hollywood, with a majority clustering at the intersection of Hollywood and Vine. Examples include the Security Trust and Savings Building (1921; National Register, Historic-Cultural Monument No. 334)) at the northeast corner of Hollywood and Cahuenga boulevards; the Knickerbocker Hotel (1923) on the east side of Ivar Avenue just north of Hollywood Boulevard; the Guaranty Building (1923; National Register) at the northeast corner of Hollywood Boulevard and Ivar Avenue; the Taft Building (1923; Historic-Cultural Monument No. 666) at the southeast corner of Hollywood Boulevard and Vine Street; the Hollywood Plaza Hotel (1924) on the west side of Vine Street south of Hollywood Boulevard; and the B.H. Dyas Department Store (later the Broadway Department Store; Historic-Cultural Monument No. 664) constructed in 1927 at the southwest corner of Hollywood and Vine.

By the mid-1920s, Hollywood Boulevard had transformed into a tightly developed commercial corridor with most blocks containing one- and two-story storefront buildings with taller, more impressive buildings located at corners. Two of the more distinctive and fanciful examples of construction along Hollywood Boulevard during this period include the Egyptian Theatre (6706-6712 Hollywood Boulevard, Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument No. 584), which opened in 1922, and the Chinese Theatre (6911-6927 Hollywood Boulevard, Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument No. 55), which opened in 1927. Both were developed by theater impresario Sid Grauman and represent excellent examples of the Exotic Revival styles of architecture which were popularized during the 1920s. 

*Postcard showing the forecourt of the Chinese Theatre, date unknown. Source: Los Angeles Public Library.*
By the end of the 1920s, Vine Street at its intersection with Hollywood Boulevard became concentrated with buildings constructed to the height limit. In 1929, the *Los Angeles Times* reported that, “Skyscraper construction at the Hollywood Boulevard-Vine Street intersection and immediately adjacent thereto, in the past five years, has exceeded that of any similar area in Los Angeles and has surpassed the limit-height building record of any district of its size outside of metropolitan areas in the United States.”¹⁰⁴ A road improvement project, championed by the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, was implemented for street upgrades in key locations to move traffic more efficiently throughout Hollywood. Dubbed the “Five-Finger Plan,” street improvements included widening, grading, and paving for key street locations, with an emphasis on further developing Vine Street. G.R. Dexter, President of the Bank of Hollywood, noted the “…completion of the street widening and opening involved in the project will develop Vine Street into the most heavily traveled thoroughfare in Los Angeles. With Yucca Street converted into a major artery leading into Cahuenga Avenue, the traffic between the San Fernando Valley cities and Los Angeles will be routed through Vine Street increasing the thoroughfare’s daily traffic to record figures.”¹⁰⁵

The focus on increasing traffic to Vine Street via Yucca Street spurred development interest in extending the commercial core of Hollywood and Vine north to include Yucca. The most impressive project that was realized was a height-limit office tower (today referred to as the Yucca-Vine Tower) constructed for Mountain States Life Insurance at the northwest corner of Yucca and Vine streets. Constructed in 1928, the Art Deco building was designed by architects H.L. Gogerty and Carl Jules Weyl, who were also responsible for designing the Hollywood Playhouse just south on Vine Street. Two modest commercial buildings, also designed by H.L. Gogerty in an Art Deco style, were constructed near Yucca and Vine. These were a two-story commercial building (1930), today referred to as the “Gogerty Building,” at the southeast corner of Yucca Street and Vine Street; and a two-story commercial building constructed in 1932 on the south side of Yucca Street between Vine Street and Ivar Avenue. By the time the

second building on Yucca Street was completed, however, the country was mired in an economic depression. Gogerty’s early 1930s designs marked the end of commercial expansion to Yucca as development in Hollywood slowed to a crawl.

During the Great Depression, the glamorous image of Hollywood as a national fashion and entertainment destination began to fade. This was compounded by a problem that first emerged in the 1920s: a lack of parking options. Between the 1920s and 1940, Hollywood’s commercial district experienced little in the way of physical growth, but much in the way of increased activity, reinforcing Hollywood’s role as a hub between Los Angeles and adjacent communities.

Although parking was an increasingly prescient problem, Hollywood was not entirely abandoned as a retail center. Retailers instead attempted to refashion the district into a more modern shopping district. As a result, many stores along Hollywood Boulevard were remodeled in the 1930s. However, as wealthy residents left the area, many of Hollywood’s upscale retail establishments followed.

In 1939, the east-west axis along portions of Sunset and Santa Monica Boulevards became increasingly important with the extension of Route 66 from downtown Los Angeles to the Pacific Ocean. With increased traffic came the potential for increased revenue, but only if the more parking could be provided. In 1940, the Chamber of Commerce introduced “The Hollywood Plan,” which proposed developing parking lots south of Hollywood Boulevard between Gower Street and Highland Avenue. Although the plan was published in *Architectural Record* and may have influenced parking schemes elsewhere, it was never implemented beyond its first phase, which allowed for three hours of free parking in any existing lot with a one-dollar purchase at any store on Hollywood Boulevard. The lack of parking became a major factor in the erosion of Hollywood’s economic vitality by the 1950s.

---

107 The non-implementation of the plan may perhaps be attributed to the fact that the nation soon entered World War II. See Longstreth, *City Center to Regional Mall*, 100.
The United States’ entry into World War II commenced following the bombing of Pearl Harbor in December 1941.¹⁰⁹ The country’s mobilization for World War II during the 1940s effectively ended the Great Depression but diverted all available funds to the war effort. Wartime austerity had a dramatic impact on the landscape of Los Angeles, and Hollywood was no exception. Residential construction was halted for the duration of the war, and existing businesses and manufacturing operations were converted for the production and distribution of materials essential to the war effort.

Since Los Angeles served as a major point of departure for combat in the Pacific, Hollywood became a hub of entertainment and tourism for GIs passing through town before leaving for the battlefront.¹¹⁰ Area hotels were fully booked, and the United Servicemen’s Organization (USO) opened three Hollywood outposts in 1941. The famed Hollywood Canteen opened in 1942, offering visiting servicemen an opportunity to be served by their favorite film stars. With travel during wartime restricted to essential business only, servicemen saved many Hollywood nightspots from going under during the war.¹¹¹

During the war, instead of wholesale new development, property and business owners largely focused on upgrading, modernizing and reusing their existing properties as needed to accommodate changing tenants and business needs. One noticeable trend was the conversion of vacant, underutilized, or substandard properties to surface parking. As central Hollywood became increasingly commercial and the automobile became the preferred mode of transportation, parcels mid-block between Hollywood Boulevard and Yucca Street were paved and used for surface parking.

¹¹⁰ Williams, 269.
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During the early 1950s, widespread automobile ownership coupled with the development of the freeway system pulled new development to previously outlying areas on Los Angeles’ Westside and in the San Fernando Valley. The opening of the Hollywood Freeway (U.S. Route 101) in 1954 made central Hollywood more accessible to a wider population, and the need for parking continued to grow.

Substantial new construction did not return to Hollywood until the mid-1950s, when a west coast headquarters building was constructed for Capitol Records on the east side of Vine Street mid-block between Hollywood Boulevard and Yucca Street. Capitol Records was founded in 1942 as the first West Coast based record label. The building was commissioned by British music conglomerate EMI after its acquisition of Capitol Records in 1955; the building was completed in April 1956. Designed by Louis Naidorf, a young architect working for the firm of Welton Becket and Associates, the Capitol Records Tower is considered the world's first circular office building. It was also the first large office building to be constructed in Hollywood in over two decades.

Los Angeles’ building height limit was removed in 1957 through a voter referendum, just one year after the Capitol Records Building was completed. Hollywood’s first post-height limit “skyscraper” was the 20-story Sunset and Vine Tower constructed at the southeast corner of Sunset and Vine in 1963. Rising over 290 feet in height, the Sunset and Vine Tower was almost twice the height of any height-limit era building in Hollywood. Designed in a Corporate Modern style, the rectangular steel-frame and glass curtain wall building presented a stark silhouette that radically altered the Hollywood skyline.
Additional high-rises on Sunset soon followed including a 185-foot office building constructed in 1968 at the southwest corner of Sunset Boulevard and Cahuenga Boulevard, and a 22-story office tower constructed in 1971 at the northwest corner of Sunset and Argyle.

In 1958, the “Hollywood Walk of Fame” was introduced to honor important entertainment industry figures, improve and beautify Hollywood streets, and engage tourists. Official groundbreaking commenced in 1960. The Walk of Fame is composed of sidewalks along Hollywood Boulevard from Gower Avenue to La Brea Avenue and along Vine Street between Yucca Street and Sunset Boulevard. The sidewalk’s pavement is imbedded with over 2,000 five-pointed stars featuring the names of people commemorated for their contributions to the entertainment industry.

By the 1980s, the Hollywood community was in a state of economic decline as commercial development became focused more intensely to the west at Century City, along the Wilshire corridor in Westwood, and in Downtown Los Angeles. The Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles established the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area in 1986 to encourage development in the area. Among the goals of the agency were to revitalize the historic core and preserve historically significant buildings.

At the dawn of the new millennium, Hollywood began to experience a resurgence that continues today. In June 1999, the Hollywood extension of the Los Angeles County Metro Rail Red Line subway connected Downtown Los Angeles to the San Fernando Valley, with stops along Hollywood Boulevard at Western Avenue, Vine Street, and Highland Avenue. Additionally, the establishment of the city’s Adaptive Reuse ordinance greatly facilitated the reuse of under-utilized historic buildings into new housing. New, large-scale mixed-use projects – Hollywood & Highland (including the Kodak Theater), the Renaissance Hotel, the W Hotel at Hollywood and Vine – along with the Red Line subway stations, have helped to revitalize Hollywood’s streets and its economy, bringing with it an influx of new residents and tourists, higher rents, and new development pressures. The fervor with which the area was developed in the 1920s has returned, as private enterprise and public planners flock to Hollywood to redevelop and revitalize the area.
Summary of Findings

The following discussion of Property Types, Contexts, and Themes relates to the resources identified and recorded as eligible for designation.

Summary of Property Types

In terms of land use, the Project Area is diverse and includes a variety of residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial properties. These properties date to multiple periods in Hollywood’s development history, though a majority were constructed prior to World War II. Accordingly, resources identified in this survey encompass an array of property types and span multiple periods of development. It bears mention that because many of the properties along Hollywood Boulevard – the community’s primary commercial corridor – are located within the boundaries of the National Register-listed Hollywood Boulevard Commercial and Entertainment District and were not re-evaluated, this survey identifies a lesser number of commercial resources relative to the total number of commercial properties in the area. Inversely, there are a relatively large number of residential properties identified in this survey because these properties are located in areas that are not already designated. Some institutional and industrial properties are also interspersed throughout the area. Following is a summary of the property types within the Survey Area that were documented and evaluated as significant.

Residential Properties

Off the main boulevards and away from the major studio plants, Hollywood is largely shaped and defined by its residential neighborhoods. Residential development in Hollywood is varied, eclectic, and historically catered to a multitude of household types and socioeconomic groups, and this sense of eclecticism is reflected in the variety of residential resources that were identified by the survey. Eligible residential property types include both individual resources and concentrations of resources (historic districts and planning districts).

Most of the residential properties identified as individually eligible resources are modest dwellings that were built between the turn-of-the-twentieth century and the 1920s, amid several formative periods of growth and development in Hollywood. These include detached single-family residences and various types of multi-family housing including duplexes, fourplexes, and apartment houses. Given their relatively early construction dates and increasing rarity in the immediate area, these resources were evaluated for representing early patterns of residential development and suburbanization in Hollywood. On occasion, these individually-eligible early residences were also evaluated as excellent examples of a particular architectural style or property type. This was particularly true of apartment houses, which on the whole are larger and more articulated than their lower-scale, lower-density counterparts.
Individually eligible residences can be found throughout the Survey Area, but there are particular concentrations of these resources in the neighborhoods to the north of Hollywood Boulevard and in the residentially zoned neighborhoods to the south of Sunset Boulevard.

Some of these individually eligible residences were constructed prior to Hollywood’s consolidation with the City of Los Angeles in 1910, and are vestiges of Hollywood’s early history as an independent city. These residences were evaluated under the “Pre-Consolidation Community of Los Angeles” context, whereas those that were constructed after 1910 were generally evaluated under the “Residential Development and Suburbanization” context.

The survey identified several examples of bungalow courts and courtyard apartments, both popular types of multi-family residential development dating from the early- to mid-twentieth century. The bungalow court has particular significance to Hollywood as many examples were constructed to provide affordable, yet high quality housing options for those employed in the entertainment industry. Because they often encompass two or more parcels and comprise multiple detached buildings and designed landscapes, bungalow courts and courtyard apartments were generally evaluated as districts to capture all of their requisite components.

Five residential historic districts were identified by the survey. Two of these historic districts are neighborhoods comprising small, modest single-family residences, most of which were built between the early twentieth century and the 1920s. These neighborhoods convey early patterns of subdivision and development and continue to adequately evince a sense of time and place from their primary period development in the early decades of the twentieth century. The other three historic districts consist of concentrations of multi-family properties, which have also played an important role in the development of Hollywood’s residential fabric. Some of the contributing buildings in these multi-family historic districts were also evaluated as individually eligible, typically as an excellent example of a particular property type or architectural style.

The survey also identified one residential planning district, which occupies several blocks to the immediate north of Hollywood Boulevard. This planning district features a notable concentration of multi-family properties but does not have enough contributing elements to constitute a historic district. Nonetheless, this area retains a distinctive character that may merit special consideration in local planning, and a number of individual properties within its boundaries were either evaluated as individually eligible or have already been designated under federal, state, and/or local programs.

**Commercial Properties**

As noted, much of the commercial development in the Survey Area is concentrated along Hollywood Boulevard. In 1985, a large swath of Hollywood Boulevard – between approximately Sycamore Avenue on the west and Gower Street on the east – was listed in the National
Register as the Hollywood Boulevard Commercial and Entertainment District. Many of the buildings along the boulevard have also been individually designated, either in the National Register, California Register, or as HCMs. Consistent with the SurveyLA methodology and scope of work for this project, designated resources were not re-evaluated, and as a result this survey identifies relatively few commercial resources along the Hollywood Boulevard corridor. Rather, the commercial resources identified in this survey are generally located on other major commercial thoroughfares that transect the Survey Area and in more peripheral areas along its edges.

Commercial properties identified in the survey were generally evaluated as individual resources. Consistent with early patterns of commercial development in Hollywood, which were oriented around historic streetcar lines, mixed-use commercial buildings account for a significant portion of these individually eligible commercial resources. These buildings generally consist of retail stores on the ground level, and either offices or small dwelling units above. Intact examples of streetcar commercial buildings were evaluated as rare, remnant examples of those patterns of commercial development that defined the trajectory of commercial activity in Hollywood during the community’s formative period of development. Typically, these buildings are utilitarian in nature; however there are a small number of examples that are also architecturally significant.

There is one example of a pre-consolidation era commercial building that was identified in the survey as individually eligible. Though it has been altered, it retains sufficient integrity to convey its association with the pre-consolidation era and is notable as the only known intact example of a commercial resource dating to this early period of development.

Multiple examples of lodging were identified as individually eligible commercial resources. Specifically, the survey identified several residential hotels that were constructed between the 1920s and 1940s and provided long-term accommodations in a hotel-like setting, and two examples of intact post-war motels that exhibit deference to the automobile and are excellent examples of the property type. One of the post-war motels features a flamboyant façade and distinctive signs that also render it an excellent example of Mid-Century Modern commercial architecture. The survey also identified one example of a post-war hotel that does not possess any architectural significance, but is notable for its association with the entertainment industry and was thrust into the public eye when singer-songwriter Janis Joplin died there in 1970.

Several examples of office buildings were also identified as individually eligible commercial resources. Though a few were built in the 1920s and ’30s, most post-date World War II, and represent the tendency among developers of this era to erect commercial buildings that were much larger and created greater density than their pre-war counterparts. Most of the individually eligible commercial office buildings are located on Sunset Boulevard and other major thoroughfares that can accommodate density. Some – like the former Radio Corporation of America (RCA) Building on Sunset Boulevard, and the former A&M Records Company
Building on La Brea Avenue – were built as the headquarters of major entertainment companies and served as their public face. Generally, the office buildings identified in this survey were evaluated as excellent examples of an architectural style. Commercial buildings that have a proven association with the entertainment industry were also evaluated under the relevant theme in the “Entertainment Industry” context.

Three examples of financial institutions were identified by the survey. One was built in 1930 and exhibits the austere Neoclassical style that was favored by banks at this time; the other two were constructed in the 1960s and employ more modern architectural vocabularies. One of these post-war banks, designed by noted architectural designer and muralist Millard Sheets, skillfully incorporates various works of art into its design. All of the financial institutions identified by the survey were evaluated as excellent examples of a particular architectural style.

The multiple ethnic and cultural contexts that have been developed as part of the SurveyLA citywide historic context statement shed light onto examples of commercial resources that are significant for their association with a certain ethnic or cultural group. These include two examples of hotels that were listed in the Green Book, a travel guide that helped steer African American motorists in the direction of nondiscriminatory businesses during the Jim Crow era; and a brick commercial building that once housed what is believed to have been Los Angeles’s first openly gay bar. None of these resources had been identified in previous surveys, likely because their significance is principally derived from factors that are not readily apparent.

Other examples of individually eligible commercial properties include a nightclub that historically served as a hotspot among celebrities; a former restaurant building that is notable for its architectural merit; the former location of a longstanding businesses important to the commercial identity of Hollywood; two theaters that were constructed in the 1920s and are associated with Hollywood’s early ascent as an entertainment hub; and two signs that are not otherwise associated with a significant building.

Finally, the survey identified two examples of commercial planning districts. Each contains a significant concentration of streetcar commercial buildings and typifies the neighborhood-oriented commercial development that coalesced alongside the routes of major streetcar lines during the early decades of the twentieth century. One of the planning districts is located on Cahuenga Boulevard; the second is oriented around the intersection of Santa Monica Boulevard and Western Avenue. Since a majority of the buildings within each district has been extensively altered, neither retains sufficient integrity to be eligible as historic districts. However, each area exudes a sense of time and place that may merit special consideration in local planning.

**Institutional Properties**

The survey identified some public and private institutional properties, which are not concentrated in a specific section of the Survey Area but are rather interspersed throughout its
boundaries. Eligible institutional property types were recorded both as individual resources and as districts, depending on the number of significant resources present at a given site.

Public institutional resources identified by the survey consist of two distributing stations operated by the Department of Water and Power (DWP). One was built prior to World War II, and the other was built in the post-war period. Both are demonstrative of how municipal services like those provided by DWP were expanded to keep pace with Hollywood’s population growth over the span of its development history. The pre-World War II distributing station was also evaluated for its architectural merit, as an excellent example of the Art Deco style.

Most of the institutional resources identified by the survey were constructed for, and used by private institutions. Churches and religious facilities represent the most common type of private institution in the Survey Area. The survey identified six examples of churches and religious campuses, which were constructed between the 1920s and ‘60s. Four are housed within single buildings and were evaluated as individually eligible resources; the other two are located on campuses with multiple buildings and were recorded as historic districts. Consistent with National Park Service guidance in National Register Criteria Consideration A, which enumerates guidelines related to the evaluation of religious properties, all of the churches identified by the survey were evaluated as excellent examples of their respective architectural style. Each church is designed in a different style: Neoclassical, Mediterranean Revival, Spanish Colonial Revival, Late Gothic Revival, Mid-Century Modern, and Byzantine. Several were designed by noted local architects.

The survey identified several resources associated with significant social clubs and organizations. These include a former lodge hall that was built by the Knights of Columbus, a service-oriented fraternal organization affiliated with the Catholic church; two buildings – including an administrative building and a playhouse – that were constructed by the Assistance League of Southern California, an influential woman-run philanthropic organization; and the Hollywood Athletic Club, an exclusive recreation facility and health club that was founded in the 1920s by film titans Charlie Chaplin, Rudolph Valentino, and Cecil B. DeMille. The latter is where many major stars trained and socialized amid the Golden Era of Hollywood, and is also notable as the site of the first annual Emmy Awards ceremony in 1949. In addition to their social significance, most of these resources were also evaluated on the merits of their architecture.

Other institutional resources identified by the survey include the former home of the Crippled Children’s Society, which was evaluated individually as an excellent example of Mid-Century Modern architecture; and one air raid siren that is associated with civil defense efforts during World War II and the Cold War. Since it is located in the public-right-of-way and does not occupy a legal parcel, the air raid siren was evaluated as a non-parcel resource.
Industrial Properties

Relative to residential, commercial, and institutional properties, industrial development accounts for a small proportion of land use within the Survey Area. Industrial development is generally confined to areas along the Survey Area’s southern edge, particularly along and around the Santa Monica Boulevard corridor.

Most industrial development in the Survey Area, and all of the industrial properties identified by the survey, are associated in some way with the entertainment industry, which has long been a linchpin of Hollywood’s economy. Industrial properties identified by the survey fall into one of two broad categories. The first includes the studio plants where motion pictures, radio and television programs, and records are produced. The second includes ancillary uses like prop shops, warehouses, and other uses that are associated with the support services sector of the entertainment industry and supported the daily operations of the major studios.

Both categories of industrial resources are reflected in the survey findings. Specifically, the survey identified several individual buildings that are significant for their role in broadcasting and the recording industry. It also identified a 17-acre campus (Sunset Gower Studios) that has been continuously used for film and television production since the 1920s. Generally, these resources lack architectural distinction and occupy simple, utilitarian buildings, reflecting their industrial character and prioritization of utility over aesthetics. However, one industrial building – the former Don Lee Mutual Broadcast Studio – was also evaluated for its architecture, as an excellent example of the Late Moderne style and as a notable work of architect Claud Beelman.

The survey also identified two significant examples of industrial properties that played an important supporting role in the entertainment business. These include a warehouse that was constructed as a costume shop, and an industrial campus that is home to one of the largest and oldest independent prop houses in Hollywood. The former was evaluated as an individual resource; the latter was evaluated as a historic district to capture all of its requisite components. Both of these resources are located along the Santa Monica Boulevard corridor.

Other Properties

The survey identified one allée of mature street trees along Lanewood Avenue. These Canary Island pine trees stand out as a notable streetscape feature and provide this stretch of Lanewood Avenue with cohesion and character. The trees are unique in the Survey Area, which is heavily urbanized and has a dearth of greenery and open space. Since these trees are located within the public-right-of-way, they were evaluated as a non-parcel resource.
Summary of Contexts and Themes

Many of the Contexts and Themes developed as part of the SurveyLA Citywide Historic Context Statement are represented in the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area. Following is a representative sampling of some of the more common Context/Theme combinations that were used in the Survey Area, as well as several combinations that are either particularly representative or unique components of the area’s developmental history. Each Context/Theme combination listed is illustrated with specific examples from the Survey Area.

Appendix A includes a complete list of all individual resources identified as meeting eligibility standards and criteria for the National Register, California Register, and/or HCM/HPOZ.

Appendix B includes a complete list of all non-parcel resources identified as meeting eligibility standards and criteria for the National Register, California Register, and/or HCM/HPOZ.

Appendix C includes a complete list of historic districts identified as meeting eligibility standards and criteria for the National Register, California Register, and/or HCM/HPOZ. This appendix also includes Planning Districts, which do not meet eligibility standards and criteria for listing but may warrant special consideration for local planning purposes.

Appendix D includes a complete list of all resources (including individual properties and historic districts) that are listed in the National Register, California Register, and/or as an HCM. There are currently no designated HPOZ within the Survey Area.

Appendix E includes maps of survey findings and designated resources within the Survey Area.
Context: Pre-Consolidation Communities of Los Angeles, 1850-1932
Theme: Hollywood, 1850-1910

Prior to 1910, Hollywood was its own, incorporated city, one of several “pre-consolidation” communities that existed as autonomous municipalities but later consolidated with Los Angeles to access its water supply and municipal services. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate extant, intact examples of properties that were constructed prior to 1910, in the pre-consolidation period, and are increasingly rare examples of development dating to this early period of settlement and growth. Most of the resources evaluated under this Context/Theme are modest single-family houses; however, there is one commercial building (bottom right) that, while altered, is a very rare remaining example of a commercial property from the pre-1910 period.

Address: 5526 Lexington Ave.
Date: 1907

Address: 6720 Sunset Blvd.
Date: 1901

Address: 5346 Virginia Ave.
Date: 1905

Address: 6422 Selma Ave.
Date: 1909
Context: Residential Development and Suburbanization, 1850-1980
Theme: Early Residential Development, 1880-1930
Sub-Theme: Early Single-Family Residential Development, 1880-1930

Like many communities in central Los Angeles, Hollywood witnessed a flurry of growth in the 1910s and ‘20s. Hollywood’s growth was fueled in large part by the advent of the motion picture industry, which brought scores of newcomers to the area in search of work in nearby studios. Numerous new residential subdivisions were platted and developed throughout the Survey Area at this time, particularly south of Sunset Boulevard. The dominant property type in these subdivisions was the modest, single-family house. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate highly intact examples of single-family houses that convey these early patterns of residential development. Once common, intact houses dating to the 1910s and early ‘20s have become increasingly rare due to alterations and redevelopment. Resources evaluated under this Context/Theme were built after Hollywood consolidated with the City of Los Angeles in 1910.

Address: 5817 Virginia Ave.
Date: ca. 1910

Address: 1754 N. El Cerrito Pl.
Date: 1910

Address: 1432 N. Gordon St.
Date: 1913

Address: 5422 La Mirada Ave.
Date: 1912
Context: Residential Development and Suburbanization, 1850-1980
Theme: Early Residential Development, 1880-1930
Sub-Theme: Early Multi-Family Residential Development, 1880-1930

Multi-family residential development was also an important component of Hollywood’s significant growth in the 1910s and ‘20s. Various types of multi-family properties including duplexes, fourplexes, bungalow courts, and apartment houses were often constructed on residential blocks alongside single-family dwellings, which helped meet the demand for housing and provided housing options for those with a range of economic means. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate highly intact examples of multi-family properties that convey these early patterns of residential development, which have become increasingly rare over time. Collectively, they convey the breadth of housing options that were common during this period of Hollywood’s history. In some instances, resources evaluated under this Context/Theme were also evaluated as excellent examples of their respective multi-family property type and/or architectural style.

Address: 5852 La Mirada Ave. (duplex)
Date: 1921

Address: 1546 N. Cassil Pl. (fourplex)
Date: 1917

Address: 6826 Leland Way (fourplex)
Date: 1925

Address: 5613 Lexington Ave. (apartment house)
Date: 1925
Context: Residential Development and Suburbanization, 1850-1980
Sub-Context: Multi-Family Residential Development, 1910-1980
Theme: Multi-Family Residential, 1910-1980
Sub-Theme: The Bungalow Court, 1910-1939

One of the most common variants of multi-family housing in Los Angeles between the 1910s and ‘30s was the bungalow court, in which multiple detached or semi-detached buildings were oriented around a central landscaped court. Bungalow courts combined the privacy, open space, and other features of the single-family dwelling with the convenience and affordability of apartment living. They took on particular significance in Hollywood, as many were constructed to accommodate those working in the burgeoning entertainment industry. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate bungalow courts that are intact and exhibit the distinguishing characteristics of the property type. Bungalow courts identified in this survey ascribe to the same essential blueprint but exhibit some variation with respect to scale, plan, and architectural style.

Address: 5414-5418 Fountain Ave.
Date: 1923

Address: 1351-1355 N. La Brea Ave.
Date: 1921

Address: 1141-1143 N. Gordon St.
Date: 1928

Address: 1762-1770 N. Las Palmas Ave.
Date: 1922
Context: Residential Development and Suburbanization, 1850-1980
Sub-Context: Multi-Family Residential Development, 1910-1980
Theme: Multi-Family Residential, 1910-1980
Sub-Theme: Courtyard Apartments, 1910-1980

The courtyard apartment evolved from the earlier development of the bungalow court. Like the bungalow court, courtyard apartments responded to Los Angeles’s temperate climate and were oriented around a central landscaped open space or patio; however, they were distinguished from their predecessors by their multi-story massing and greater density, which allowed developers to make more efficient use of land. Courtyard apartments were a relatively long-lived residential property type, coming of age in the 1920s and persisting into the postwar era. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate courtyard apartments that are intact and exhibit the distinguishing characteristics of the property type. In Hollywood, most examples of courtyard apartment were built in the 1930s and early ‘40s, at the height of the Depression era.

Address: 5405-5419 Fernwood Ave.
Designer: J.J. Rees
Date: 1939

Address: 1749 N. Sycamore Ave.
Designer: John E. Mackel
Date: 1939

Address: 1122-1132 N. Gower St.
Designer: J.J. Rees
Date: 1937-1938

Address: 1406 N. Mansfield Ave.
Designer: John E. Mackel
Date: 1939

Address: 1749 N. Sycamore Ave.
Architect: Edith Northman
Date: 1940
Context: Residential Development and Suburbanization, 1850-1980
Sub-Context: Multi-Family Residential Development, 1910-1980
Theme: Multi-Family Residential, 1910-1980
Sub-Theme: Apartment Houses, 1910-1980

Apartment houses represented a more quintessentially urban approach to multi-family living. Unlike courtyard housing, the typical apartment house was oriented toward the street; had a large, blocky footprint that extended to the edges of its respective lot; and seldom included land dedicated to open space. In the 1920s, many apartment houses were built in Hollywood to accommodate the droves of people who arrived here, many in association with the entertainment industry. They ranged from simple, lower-end tenements to opulent, well-appointed apartment towers that exuded the glamour of urban life. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate apartment houses that are excellent examples of the property type. Several were also evaluated as excellent examples of an architectural style and/or as the work of a noted architect.

Address: 1805 N. Wilcox Ave.
Architect: Leland A. Bryant
Date: 1926

Address: 1861 N. Whitley Ave.
Architect: Walker and Eisen
Date: 1924

Address: 1523 N. McCadden Pl.
Architect: Richard D. King
Date: 1928

Address: 5600 Fernwood Ave.
Architect: Edith Northman
Date: 1929
Address: 5406 Lexington Ave.
Architect: A.B. Rosenthal
Date: 1928

Address: 5400 Carlton Way
Architect: Edith Northman
Date: 1941

Address: 1759 N. Orchid Ave.
Architect: O.C. Williams
Date: 1927

Address: 1665 N. Sycamore Ave.
Architect: L.D. Carter
Date: 1926

Address: 1825 N. Cahuenga Blvd.
Architect: William Allen
Date: 1925

Address: 1851 N. Ivar Ave.
Architect: S.J. Pedersen
Date: 1930
Context: Residential Development and Suburbanization, 1850-1980
Theme: Streetcar Suburbanization, 1888-1933
Sub-Theme: Suburban Planning and Development, 1888-1933

In the early decades of the twentieth century, a number of new residential subdivisions were platted and developed, primarily with single-family residences, in the vicinity of Hollywood. The development of these early neighborhoods was facilitated by an expansive network of streetcars that connected these residential neighborhoods with major commercial and employment nodes. Over time, many of Hollywood’s early neighborhoods have witnessed infill development, but a few remain intact and continue to evince a sense of time and place. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate two residential districts that were developed in the early twentieth century. These neighborhoods’ scale, character, and planning features are reflective of broad patterns of residential development that gave impetus and shape to Hollywood’s neighborhoods.
Description: McCadden District Contributor
Address: 1414 N. Las Palmas Ave.
Date: 1907

Description: McCadden District Contributor
Address: 6685 De Longpre Ave.
Date: 1921

Description: De Longpre Park District Contributor
Address: 1311 N. Seward St.
Date: 1920

Description: De Longpre Park District Contributor
Address: 6622 De Longpre Ave.
Date: 1906

Description: De Longpre Park District Contributor
Address: 6527 Homewood Ave.
Date: 1920

Description: De Longpre Park District Contributor
Address: 6575 Homewood Ave.
Date: 1920
In response to the heightened demand for new housing beginning in the 1920s, some neighborhoods in Hollywood were developed almost entirely with multi-family residences. This resulted in several notable concentrations of multi-family dwellings throughout Hollywood, each comprising multiple types of compatible multi-family properties. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate three historic districts and one planning district that contain significant concentrations of multi-family properties. Each district evinces a sense of time and place and reflects patterns of residential development that shaped Hollywood between the early and mid-twentieth century. Some of the contributors within these districts were also evaluated individually, typically as excellent examples of their respective property type or architectural style.
Historic Resources Survey Report
Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area

**Description:** Grace-Yucca-Wilcox District Contributor
**Address:** 1824 N. Grace Ave.
**Date:** 1924

**Description:** Grace-Yucca-Wilcox District Contributor
**Address:** 1813 N. Grace Ave.
**Date:** 1924

**Description:** Ivar Hill District Contributor
**Address:** 6330 Franklin Ave.
**Date:** 1923

**Description:** Ivar Hill District Contributor
**Address:** 1810 N. Ivar Ave.
**Date:** 1921

**Description:** Fountain Avenue District Contributor
**Address:** 5712 Fountain Ave.
**Date:** 1922

**Description:** Fountain Avenue District Contributor
**Address:** 5718 Fountain Ave.
**Date:** 1922
Context: Commercial Development, 1850-1980  
Theme: Streetcar Commercial Development, 1873-1934  

In the early decades of the twentieth century, before the car reigned supreme, commercial development was concentrated along an expansive network of streetcars that once ran down most of Hollywood’s major thoroughfares. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate rare, remnant examples of early commercial development along the routes of former streetcar lines. The typical streetcar commercial building is constructed of brick, rises one or two stories in height, is set flush with the street, and is often mixed use, with retail storefronts on the ground level and residential units or offices up above. Since much of Hollywood Boulevard – the area’s preeminent commercial corridor – is already listed in the National Register, the resources evaluated under this Context/Theme are generally located off the main boulevard. These resources include both individual buildings (top row) and two planning districts (bottom row), all of which convey early patterns of commercial development and the primacy of the streetcar.

Address: 1501 N. Cahuenga Blvd.  
Architect: Frank Meline  
Date: 1914  

District: Cahuenga Boulevard Planning District  
Period of Significance: 1914-1932  

Address: 1300 N. Wilton Pl.  
Architect: Harry H. Whiteley  
Date: 1928  

District: Santa Monica-Western Planning District  
Period of Significance: 1920-1937  

Historic Resources Survey Report  
Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area
Context: Commercial Development, 1850-1980  
Theme: Hotels, 1880-1980

Hollywood is home to a number of residential hotels, which were evaluated under this Context/Theme combination. Primarily developed before World War II, residential hotels struck a balance between apartment houses and hotels; generally, they provided accommodations in a traditional hotel-like setting, with common spaces and services like housekeeping. They provided a less-permanent form of multi-family housing that catered to those employed in the entertainment industry, which often required frequent travel. Properties evaluated under this Context/Theme were evaluated as excellent examples of residential hotels. On their face, these properties often resemble apartment houses, but permit records and other archival sources indicate that they were constructed to provide temporary accommodations similar to a hotel.

Name: Palomar Hotel  
Address: 5473 Santa Monica Blvd.  
Architect: A. Kneeling  
Date: 1925

Name: St. Francis Hotel/The Gershwin  
Address: 5533 Hollywood Blvd.  
Architect: L.A. Smith  
Date: 1927

Name:  
Address: 1782 N. Orchid Ave.  
Architect: J.J. Rees (engineer)  
Date: 1941

Name:  
Address: 1772 N. Orchid Ave.  
Architect: W.C. Pennell  
Date: 1948
Context: Commercial Development, 1850-1980
Theme: Motels, 1925-1970

In the period after World War II, motels were constructed alongside some of Hollywood’s most heavily traveled vehicular corridors. These properties include some common characteristics including low-slung plans, ample on-site parking, eye catching signage, and other features that are explicitly oriented toward passing motorists. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate two intact examples of motels within the Survey Area that are excellent examples of the property type. They both include distinctive features that are highly characteristic of this type of commercial property, and also demonstrate the primacy of the car and car culture at this time.

Name: Coral Isle Motel/Hollywood Downtowner Motel
Address: 5601 Hollywood Blvd.
Date: 1956

Name: Hollywood Premiere Motel
Address: 5333 Hollywood Blvd.
Date: 1960
**Context: Commercial Development, 1850-1980**
**Theme: Commercial Signs, 1906-1980**

Hollywood is notable for its unparalleled collection of bold, eye-catching signs, all of which were designed to draw the attention of passersby and evoke the commercial ethos of the era in which they were constructed. These signs are expressed in various forms: some are affixed to freestanding poles or stations, while others are mounted to the roof of a building. There are also examples of blade signs, which are mounted perpendicular to the flow of traffic on a building’s primary façade. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate two significant examples of commercial signage including a combination rooftop/blade sign (left) and a freestanding pole sign (right). Both are emblazoned with neon, and feature bold geometric forms that solicit attention. The Arby’s sign assumes the form of a ten-gallon hat, per the company’s brand image.

Consistent with project methodology, this Context/Theme combination was used only to evaluate examples of signs that are not associated with an eligible or designated building. In those instances where a historic sign accompanies an eligible historic building, the sign is noted as a character-defining feature of the building with which it is associated. Moreover, there are several examples of designated historic buildings that feature historic signs, but designated resources – and their attributes, including signs – were not re-evaluated as part of this survey. A comprehensive study of historic signs in the Hollywood area may be recommended in the future.

**Description:** Gilbert Hotel Sign (rooftop sign, blade sign)
**Address:** 1550 N. Wilcox Ave.
**Date:** ca. 1940

**Description:** Arby’s Roast Beef Sign (pole sign)
**Address:** 5914 Sunset Blvd.
**Date:** 1968
Theme: Social Clubs and Organizations, 1850-1980

Hollywood is home to a number of properties that were built for – and in some cases, are still occupied by – longstanding fraternal organizations and social clubs. Over time, these organizations have played an important role in weaving together the threads of the community’s social and cultural fabric. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate resources that are associated with organizations significant to Hollywood’s social history. These include the facilities of the exclusive Hollywood Athletic Club (top left); a former lodge hall for the service-oriented, Catholic-affiliated Knights of Columbus (top right); and two buildings associated with the Assistance League of Southern California (bottom), an influential woman-run institution. Most of these resources were also evaluated as excellent examples of their respective architectural style.

Name: Hollywood Athletic Club  
Address: 6525 Sunset Blvd.  
Architect: Meyer and Holler, Inc.  
Date: 1923

Name: Knights of Columbus Clubhouse  
Address: 1441 N. McCadden Pl.  
Architect: L. Mulgreen  
Date: 1927

Name: Assistance League of Southern California  
Address: 5530 De Longpre Ave.  
Architect: Paul R. Williams  
Date: 1963

Name: Nine O’Clock Playhouse  
Address: 1367 N. St. Andrews Pl.  
Architect: Not determined  
Date: 1939
Hollywood sustained multiple periods of steady population growth during the first several decades of the twentieth century. With each wave of population growth came heightened demand for municipal services, particularly those provided by the City of Los Angeles’s Department of Water and Power (DWP). This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate two examples of DWP distributing stations; one was constructed at the cusp of the Great Depression, following a period of intensive growth in the 1910s and ‘20s, and the other was built amid another period of punctuated growth after World War II. Both are demonstrative of broad patterns of institutional development associated with the growth and expansion of greater Los Angeles. The former was also evaluated as an excellent example of the Art Deco style.

Name: DWP Distributing Station No. 10
Address: 6776 Hawthorn Ave.
Date: 1932

Name: DWP Distributing Station No. 10
Address: 1821 N. Argyle Ave.
Date: 1958
Context: Architecture and Engineering, 1850-1980
Theme: Mediterranean and Indigenous Revival Architecture, 1887-1952
Sub-Theme: Mission Revival, 1887-1942

The Mission Revival style was most popular in the decades immediately before and after the turn of the twentieth century. Inspired by the architecture of California’s missions, the style represented a desire among some architects to develop a regionally appropriate architecture for Southern California. The style was defined by its red clay tile roofs, solid white exterior walls, and arcades; it was distinguished from other derivatives of Spanish and Mediterranean Revival architecture by its frequent use of curved/scalloped parapets (also known as espadañas) and domed roofs. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate two excellent examples of Mission Revival architecture in Hollywood, notable for their high quality design. Since the style peaked in popularity when Hollywood was still a fledgling community, examples of Mission Revival buildings are relatively rare within the Survey Area and generally date to its earliest period of development.

Address: 6831 De Longpre Ave.
Date: 1905

Address: 1782 N. Orange Dr.
Date: 1905
Context: Architecture and Engineering, 1850-1980
Theme: Mediterranean and Indigenous Revival Architecture, 1887-1952
Sub-Theme: Spanish Colonial Revival, 1915-1942
Sub-Theme: Churrigueresque, 1915-1942

The Spanish Colonial Revival style reached its zenith after World War I, at the same time that Hollywood witnessed a period of considerable growth. Made popular by the Panama-California Exposition of 1915, the style celebrated and adapted the architecture of Spain, and was seen as appropriately suited to Southern California and its Spanish and Mexican roots. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate several excellent examples of Spanish Colonial Revival architecture. Reflective of the style’s versatility, residential, commercial, and institutional resources were evaluated under this Context/Theme. Several are designed in an exceptionally florid variety of the style known as Churrigueresque (top right).

Address: 6536 Sunset Blvd.
Architect: Gogerty and Weyl
Date: 1927

Address: 6600 Sunset Blvd.
Architect: Gogerty and Weyl
Date: 1928

Address: 1323 N. Mansfield Ave.
Builder: Johnson and Wolfe
Date: 1931

Address: 5410 La Mirada Ave.
Builder: Pacific Construction Finance Co.
Date: 1932
Context: Architecture and Engineering, 1850-1980
Theme: Mediterranean and Indigenous Revival Architecture, 1887-1952
Sub-Theme: Mediterranean Revival, 1887-1942

The Mediterranean Revival style is a synthesis of architectural elements, loosely derived from various cultures around the Mediterranean region including Italy, Spain, northern Africa, and the south of France. While it is related to the Spanish Colonial Revival and Mission Revival styles, especially in its prolific use of clay tile roofs and smooth stucco exterior walls, Mediterranean Revival architecture draws upon a more eclectic architectural catalog and tends to be more formal with respect to its composition and appearance. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate several excellent examples of the Mediterranean Revival style. In Hollywood, the style was most often expressed in commercial (top row) and institutional (bottom row) contexts.

**Description:** Streetcar Commercial Building
**Address:** 5540 Hollywood Blvd.
**Architect:** Frank Meline
**Date:** 1921

**Name:** Hollywood Chamber of Commerce
**Address:** 6520 Sunset Blvd.
**Architect:** Morgan, Walls and Clements
**Date:** 1926

**Name:** Church of the Blessed Sacrament (Sanctuary)
**Address:** 6657 Sunset Blvd.
**Architect:** Thomas Franklin Power
**Date:** 1927

**Name:** Church of the Blessed Sacrament (Convent)
**Address:** 6636 Selma Ave.
**Architect:** Thomas Franklin Power
**Date:** 1937
Context: Architecture and Engineering, 1850-1980
Theme: Period Revival, 1919-1950
Sub-Theme: Late Gothic Revival, 1919-1939

Popular in the interwar period, the Late Gothic Revival style utilized features like buttresses, steeply pitched roofs, finials and spires, and pointed arched openings to emphasize verticality and create prominence for buildings in the horizontally-oriented environment of Los Angeles. The style was favored by churches and schools, both of which sought to assert a sense of prominence and legitimacy in a particular community. Buildings designed in the style were often replete with ornament and assumed a dramatic, theatrical quality. In Hollywood, the style was less common than other Period Revival styles, particularly those that were rooted in Spanish and Mediterranean precedents. However, this Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate one prominent and significant example of the Late Gothic Revival style as applied to a church campus.

Name: First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood
Address: 1760 N. Gower St.
Architect: H.M. Patterson
Date: 1923
Context: Architecture and Engineering, 1850-1980
Theme: Late 19th and Early 20th Century Architecture, 1865-1950
Sub-Theme: Neoclassical, 1885-1927

Hollywood contains some notable examples of the Neoclassical style. Dignified, severe, and monumental, this style of architecture was most often applied to banks and churches, since these institutions sought to evince a sense of permanence and stability that dovetailed with Neoclassicism’s formal aesthetic. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate two excellent examples of the Neoclassical style in the Survey Area, including a building that was built as a branch bank (left) and a religious campus (right). Both are distinguished by their rigid and monumental composition, large columns, and formal arrangement of Classically derived details.

Name: Security Pacific Bank  
Address: 5701 Hollywood Blvd.  
Architect: Morgan, Walls and Clements  
Date: 1930

Name: First Baptist Church of Hollywood  
Address: 6678 Selma Ave.  
Architect: Marsh and Howard  
Date: 1936
Context: Architecture and Engineering, 1850-1980
Theme: Exotic Revivals, 1900-1980

In the 1920s, several loosely related architectural styles emerged that were flamboyant, often outlandish, and made literal reference to the cultures from which they were derived. Collectively, these styles are called Exotic Revival. The Exotic Revival movement was driven by multiple factors including archaeological discovery, popular media, the accessibility of civilian travel, and the creative energy of the budding motion picture industry. Though their popularity dwindled by the end of the 1920s, these exotic styles persisted into the postwar period. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate two Egyptian Revival apartment houses that are very rare examples of the style (top row), and a Byzantine Revival church (bottom left) that is notable for its articulated, domed central tower that resembles a Mesopotamian ziggurat.

Name: Ahmed Apartments
Address: 5616 Lexington Ave.
Builder: J.M. Close
Date: 1926

Name: Karnak Apartments
Address: 5617 La Mirada Ave.
Builder: J.M. Close
Date: 1925

Name: Church of the Holy Transfiguration
Address: 5432 Fernwood Ave.
Date: 1962
Starting in the Depression era and continuing into the post-World War II period, a family of loosely related architectural styles took root in Los Angeles that aspired to be new, fresh, and modern, but also incorporated enough familiar elements to remain relatable to the general public. These include the richly embellished Art Deco style and its more chaste and windswept cousins (PWA, Streamline, and Late Moderne), which are collectively referred to as the Moderne family. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate properties that are excellent examples of these styles, including several examples of Art Deco buildings (top row), a Streamline Moderne style commercial building (bottom left), and a Late Moderne style broadcasting studio (bottom right). The latter was also evaluated for its association with the entertainment industry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Mountain States Life Building (Art Deco)</th>
<th>Name: Bryn Carlton Apartments (Art Deco)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: 6305 Yucca St.</td>
<td>Address: 5611 Carlton Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect: Henry L. Gogerty</td>
<td>Architect: O. Schiller, E.J. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 1929</td>
<td>Date: 1930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Palms Grill/Salvation Army (Streamline Moderne)</th>
<th>Name: Don Lee Mutual Broadcast Building (Late Moderne)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: 5939 Hollywood Blvd.</td>
<td>Address: 1313 N. Vine St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect: Gordon B. Kaufmann</td>
<td>Architect: Claud Beelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 1936</td>
<td>Date: 1948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Context: Architecture and Engineering, 1850-1980
Theme: Post-War Modernism, 1946-1976

Since Hollywood was a well-established community by World War II, post-war Modernism had a somewhat lesser impact on its built environment than it did elsewhere in Los Angeles. Nonetheless, there are some excellent examples of post-World War II Modern architectural styles in the Survey Area, which were evaluated under these Context/Theme combinations. In conjunction, these resources demonstrate the breadth and diversity of architectural styles that developed within the broader Modern movement. They include the simple geometries and structural expression associated with the Mid-Century Modern style (top row); a more expressionistic variant of Mid-Century Modernism that was most often applied to churches (bottom left); and the abstracted Classicism that defined the New Formalist style (bottom right).

Name: Crippled Children’s Society
Address: 7120 Franklin Ave.
Architect: Ladd and Kelsey
Date: 1968

Name: Hollywood Biltmore
Address: 1745 N. Orange Dr.
Architect: Kenneth N. Lind
Date: 1958

Name: Hollywood Seventh Day Adventist Church
Address: 1711 N. Van Ness Ave.
Architect: Robert J. Burman
Date: 1961

Name: Home Savings and Loan/Chase
Address: 1500 N. Vine St.
Designer: Millard Sheets
Date: 1967
Context: Entertainment Industry, 1908-1980
Theme: Commercial Properties Associated with the Entertainment Industry, 1908-1980

Hollywood is the epicenter of Southern California’s multi-billion-dollar entertainment industry, and so there are many important examples of resources associated with this industry and its development within the Survey Area. This Context/Theme combination was used to evaluate significant examples of commercial properties associated with the entertainment industry. These include a nightclub that was historically a popular venue for celebrities to socialize and make public appearances (top left); a hotel that has long been a favorite place for celebrities to sojourn out of the public eye (top right); and office buildings that housed the headquarters of major entertainment outfits and served as these companies’ public faces (bottom row). The latter two properties were also evaluated as excellent examples of their respective architectural styles.

Name: Florentine Gardens
Address: 5939 Hollywood Blvd.
Date: 1936

Name: Highland Gardens Hotel
Address: 7047 Franklin Ave.
Date: 1956

Name: Radio Corporation of America (RCA) Building
Address: 6363 Sunset Blvd.
Architect: Albert C. Martin
Date: 1963

Name: A&M Record Company
Address: 1336 N. La Brea Ave.
Architect: Harry Newman
Date: 1977
Context: Entertainment Industry, 1908-1980
Theme: Industrial Properties Associated with the Entertainment Industry, 1908-1980

Also within the Survey Area are important examples of industrial resources associated with the Hollywood entertainment industry, which were evaluated under this Context/Theme combination. These include a variety of property types including the campus of Sunset Gower Studios, an active studio lot (top left); a property that has long served as a prop house for nearby motion picture studios, and has played an important supporting role in the industry (top right); and several active and former recording studios that demonstrate the ascent of the recording industry and popular music in Hollywood, particularly in the post-World War II era (bottom row). One of these recording studios (bottom right) was owned by noted African American singer, songwriter, and record producer Marvin Gaye for several years in the 1970s.

Name: Sunset Gower Studios
Address: 1438 N. Gower St.
Period of Significance: 1920-present

Name: Cinema Mercantile Company/Omega Cinema Props
Address: 5857 Santa Monica Blvd.
Period of Significance: 1920-present

Name: United Western Recorders
Address: 6050 Sunset Blvd.
Period of Significance: 1958-present

Name: Marvin’s Room Studio
Address: 6555 Sunset Blvd.
Period of Significance: 1975-1979
**Context: Other Context, 1850-1980**  
**Theme: Event or Series of Events, 1850-1980**

This Context/Theme was used to evaluate resources that are significant for their association with Hollywood’s ethnic and cultural history. Properties evaluated under this Context/Theme were identified through the ethnic and cultural contexts developed as part of the SurveyLA Citywide Historic Context Statement. They include two hotels that were listed in the Green Book, an annual guidebook for African American motorists during the Jim Crow era (top row); a residence that was once the home of Frank T. Aiso, an early advocate for Japanese American civil rights (bottom left); and the former home of what is believed to be Los Angeles’s first openly gay bar (bottom right).

**Name:** Hotel Wilcox  
**Address:** 6500 Selma Ave.  
**Date:** 1926

**Name:** Hotel Mark Twain  
**Address:** 1622 N. Wilcox Ave.  
**Date:** 1923

**Name:** Frank T. Aiso Residence  
**Address:** 1408 N. Tamarind Ave.  
**Date:** 1911

**Name:** Jimmy’s Backyard  
**Address:** 1608 N. Cosmo St.  
**Date:** 1926
Recommendations for Further Study

The following is a list of recommendations related to continued research and evaluation of historic resources within the Survey Area. These recommendations identify some additional areas of opportunity to be considered by CRA/LA or its successor agency, as time and resources permit. The recommendations listed herein are based on the observations of the project team over the course of this survey, and consultation with Hollywood Heritage.

- Complete an update of the National Register-listed Hollywood Boulevard Commercial and Entertainment District. This district was listed in the National Register in 1985, and a number of changes have occurred within the district boundaries since that time. An update to the district may include: analysis of existing district boundaries; confirmation of the period of significance, with the possibility of extending the period of significance into the post-World War II period; re-evaluation of each element within the district boundaries to determine contributor/non-contributor status; and preparation of all requisite documentation.

- Commission a separate survey tailored to the evaluation of historic signs. Hollywood has a rich and varied collection of historic signs that are significant to the community’s commercial history. In 1997, the City of Los Angeles established the “Historic Hollywood Neon Sign District,” which comprised 35 examples of historic neon signs in and around Hollywood, but this collection of signs, as recognized by the City, has not been recorded as part of any subsequent historic survey. There also appear to be additional examples of important signs that are not reflected in the Historic Hollywood Neon Sign District.

Historic signs were identified as part of this survey; however, many signs are associated with a designated building and/or are located within the Hollywood Boulevard National Register district, which were not re-evaluated as part of this study. Moreover, several of the signs that are identified as contributing to the Historic Hollywood Neon Sign District are located outside of the CRA’s Hollywood Development Project Area and, in some instances, outside of the Hollywood Community Plan Area (CPA). Therefore, a separate historic survey dedicated specifically to commercial signs would create the appropriate framework for systematically evaluating Hollywood’s population of signage.

- Perform survey updates every five years, in accordance with guidance enumerated by the California Office of Historic Preservation.
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