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This collection of twenty-five middle-priced houses for typical client-families forms our second special issue devoted to exceptionally fine, recent domestic architecture. Due to the enthusiastic reception by architectural profession of last year’s Record Houses of 1956, it was felt that our service aim of seeking out and recording the best possible houses was a genuinely worthwhile one. As with last year’s collection, this one is available through bookstores.

Our search for houses again included all possible leads and sources, across each of the United States. We present them with the sincere conviction that they are representative of the best being built.

While the book was in the final stages of preparation, we were enormously gratified to learn that a number of the houses that we had selected were winning local and regional prizes throughout the country, and that the following ones won honors in this year’s national awards made by the American Institute of Architects: the house by Eliot Noyes on page 124; the George Matsumoto house on page 184; and the experimental house by Jones and Emmons on page 148. (The personal homes of both Jones and Emmons, which were in last year’s collection were also award winners.)

The first of the book’s four sections is a highly discerning and amusing article by Russell Lynes. He brings to light some very interesting truths about how we live and how we build our houses.

Following this, we present this year’s group of houses in two ways. First as a general coverage, stressing the most important ideas brought forward in each house. Then, in a separate section, comparison of the various parts and elements that add up to make these truly good houses. Inevitably, these houses also include a large portion of the newer trends and concepts of house design. They range from budget houses to the moderately expensive, and of sizes and types to suit all kinds of families.

The final section (which runs throughout the front and back parts of the book) covers the latest materials, products and booklets for planning and building a house. Thus, the book is generally organized as a house is designed — from broad concepts to the details.
THE AMERICAN AT HOME—1957

BY RUSSELL LYNES *

"I WONDER," a friend said to me recently, "if the modern house, so open, so transparent, so free from dark corners and hiding places and secrets doesn't reflect the influence of psychiatry on our generation."

I was reminded by this of what one of the most articulate of all American writers on architecture, Andrew Jackson Downing, said a little more than a century ago as he looked about him at the houses that his contemporaries were building in the 1840s. "Much of the character of everyman," he wrote, "may be read in his house."

I have just been thumbing through the preliminary paste-ups of the pages of houses of which this issue of the Architectural Record is principally made, and I have been trying to read the character of "everyman" in them. Even in their freshness they are full of echoes from Mr. Downing's day and before; the character of the frontier American speaks through them just as clearly as the character of the "organization man." The desire for individuality that so puzzled visitors to America in the 1830s because it was so vocal and yet so coupled with belief in conformity is still here. But in many ways it is apparent that the American family has changed and that its aspirations are not what they once were.

Another nineteenth century man who, like Downing, wrote about architecture was the phrenologist O. S. Fowler, who started the cult for the octagonal house. "Beautiful birds build tasty nests," he said. "...a fancy man will build a fancy cottage, a practical man, a convenient house; a substantial man, a solid edifice; a weak man, an illy arranged house; an aspiring man a high house, and a superior man, a superb villa."

I do not intend to practice phrenology on the individual houses that are reproduced here. They are all in their different ways "tasty nests." But I should like to try to draw from their characteristics some generalizations about how America is changing and how

---

* Mr. Lynes is Managing Editor of Harper's Magazine and is author of such books as The Tastemakers; Snobs; Guests; A Surfeit of Honey; and Highbrow, Lowbrow, Middlebrow.
it stays the same.

The most striking, and possibly the most obvious, generalization that one can draw is that one of the traditions of American domestic architecture has disappeared. We have given up what was once a strong desire of many American families to build for permanence, to establish a family seat which might serve a succession of generations. Several years ago I laughed when the artist Robert Osborn told me that he had engaged a young architect to build a studio for him in Salisbury, Connecticut, and had told him he wanted it made of brick. The young architect refused. "Brick is too permanent," he said. It sounds odd, but it is a reflection of a state of mind that we cannot dismiss. He had a valid point, even if Mr. Osborn hired another architect. The client, after all, has a right to think brick is pretty.

The other most important characteristic revealed by the houses in this issue, as I see it, is one that you may quarrel with. We are returning to a basic kind of American architecture that one would have thought we had discarded. The new architecture is a frontier architecture, an architecture built as much to move out of as to move into. The American house has become a stepping stone. It has become a stop on an incessant journey. Indeed some of the houses in this issue of the RECORD seem to be in motion themselves, hovering just above the ground, not on it, as though they might flap their wings and migrate at any moment.

Just before I thumbed through the paste-ups I visited for a weekend in Richmond and I spent a good many hours looking at the great plantation houses built on the banks of the James River. I was lucky enough to have lunch at Westover, but I arrived there early, too soon to ring the doorbell, and I spent an hour wandering through the gardens where snow was on the box bushes and cardinals and bluebirds (this was in January) perched in naked fruit trees. I looked at the house from the river side, its true façade but not the one one sees first, a house of tremendous elegance — perhaps, I thought, the most splendid piece of domestic architecture in America. I looked at the barns and outbuildings built, like the main house, of brick and at the circular privy with a fireplace and windows and facilities for a family of five. This, I thought, must have been the origin of "togetherness" which we seem to have rediscovered in another context. Americans were, to be sure, less prudish in the eighteenth century than they are now.

Westover represents the vanishing idea of the house built for the great grandchildren. "I have settled here," it seems to say, "and I mean to stay here. I am not just a building, I am the monument to a permanent philosophy of the good life." The way of life that Colonel William Byrd II built into his splendid Georgian mansion, a rather despotic life but one in which culture
and education and a knowledge of the world were insisted upon, lasted from about 1730 until the Civil War, when the library wing was burned. (The library happily had been removed and the wing has been adequately if not perfectly replaced.) The echo of the way of life is still there, and one cannot help but hear it. But it is an echo from Europe, not only architecturally but in its sureness that a permanent class structure could be taken for granted, that there would always be a landed gentry and a cultured upper class of limited size but almost unlimited power. Indeed one still hears talk of this sort in Virginia, but it is filled with nostalgia and lacks the ring of conviction.

The Civil War by no means did away with the concept of building for future generations; it merely shifted the location from the South to the North, and from an agricultural aristocracy to a new industrial and financial society. The splendid house set in thousands of acres of cultivated land lingered, but in poverty, and the great princely palace from which its overseer sailed forth into the world of financial conflict became the new family seat. Colonel Colt, who invented the revolver that bears his name, elected to build himself a villa in Hartford, part Italian and part Turkish, with towers and minarets and glass domes. A little later, when Richard Morris Hunt became America’s foremost domestic architect, he built massive chateaux for the Vanderbilts and marble palaces (which were called “cottages”) for the Goelets and the Astors and still more Vanderbilts at Newport. They were constructed to stand as their prototypes in Europe had already stood for centuries, and the dates of their erection were carved over the doorways for future centuries to look upon with awe.

And now they are gone, most of them. Gone, that is, as houses. Some, like “The Breakers” at Newport and “Biltmore” in Asheville, are museums open to the public — many others are now schools or convents or recreation centers for the employes of large corporations.

The fact is that America’s several conscientious efforts to establish permanent domestic architecture have failed, and if this is a matter of small moment to us today, the reasons for it explain a great deal about why we live in the kinds of houses we do and why domestic architecture today goes in the directions it does.

We were trying to superimpose on a highly mobile society the architecture of a comparably static society. In Europe, where there had long been (and still is) a rigid class structure, a man and his family “knew its place” and for the most part was content to remain within its class. The principal building material was stone, and a house built in the fourteenth century was still, with renovations, habitable in the twentieth. Families stayed put, for the most part, in the village or city in which their forebears had lived; continuity
was important, possibly because there was nowhere to
go but overseas, and those who went to the colonies
(unless they migrated permanently) always considered
the place they had come from as the place they would
ultimately go back to. "It’s a Long, Long Way to Tip-
perary," was the British song of World War I. Ours was
"How You Gonna Keep ‘em Down on the Farm, after
they’ve seen Paree?"

The American’s attitude towards his home was quite
different. Home, so long as he was on his native soil,
was where he was as much as where he had come from;
no home was so dear to his heart that he hesitated to
leave if he could discover one he thought would be
better. The society in which he lived and the American
dream which guided his ambition were, he believed,
always beckoning him forward. It did not occur to him
that he was stuck in any special social class, and that
if he were ingenious enough, lucky enough, and adven-
turous enough he could not escape from his surroundings
into more palatable ones. Some men believed they could
better their lot with their backs in the wilderness,
some that they could push forward with their brains
in the universities, or with their wits in the market
place, but however many resigned themselves to staying
put, there were always spectacular examples of those
who moved on, some to catastrophe and some to aston-
ing success.

How do you house such a mobile society? You house
it in temporary buildings, or buildings, anyway, that
you would like to think will not become slums . . .
buildings that should be, even if they are not, torn down
after a generation.

It seems to me interesting, now that there are no
more real physical frontiers in America, that it should
be the architecture of impermanence that has won out.
The architecture of the economic, spiritual and social
frontier has replaced the architecture of the physical
frontier.

Look for example at what happens to the typical
family. The chronological sequence from matrimony
to retirement goes something like this — the new family
starts life in an urban housing development or possibly
in a small flat in a remodelled brownstone house or an
apartment over a store. But soon there are children
and the itch comes to get into one of the less expensive,
mass-produced suburbs, a Levittown of some sort, and
the young family buys a house. It doesn’t, however,
do so with any intention of staying there. It is merely
a stepping stone to another kind of suburban community
where the houses are less like cubes taken from the
same box of sugar, a development in which the ranch
houses are set somewhat differently on the land and
painted in different colors. But this, too, is only a step
towards another kind of community with more land
and more trees and a bigger house even less like its
neighbor, perhaps in one of the "older and better
established” suburbs. By now what was our young couple may be in their fifties and one would think that they had settled down. But no, the children have grown up, married and set up households of their own; the couple no longer need as much room as they once did and they hope soon to retire, to give up the commuter’s life and the rigors of competition, and buy a nice little house somewhere where it is warm all year, in California, perhaps, or Arizona or Florida. In the course of their marriage, then, they have lived in half a dozen places, each one a stop on the way to some place else. They have been continually on the economic, spiritual, and social frontier.

We are, taken as a whole, more used to change than to permanence. When we build a house or buy one the least of our concerns is whether the next generation of our family will want to make it their home. We don’t expect anyone to make a family seat out of a Hardoy chair. But changes come so fast in American life that we are scarcely aware of how far reaching they are. It would take a book (indeed I recently took a book) to outline the changes in our society in the last decade, but look with me for a moment at a few of the changes in our manners and customs that are, or will be, reflected in our houses.

The young marry younger than they used to a few decades ago, and they have more children (oblivious of the fact that the growth of our population is one of the greatest headaches that their generation is going to have to face). Many young marriages now are consummated in college, and universities are having to provide housing facilities for young couples. Teenagers, traditionally promiscuous, are becoming monogamous. The convention of “going steady” threatens to change the sexual mores of the nation, and there are those who believe that going steady will result in an alarming increase in the divorce rate which has already become alarming because of so many immature marriages. Women are assuming jobs and responsibilities that we have long thought were the prerogatives of men, and men are in their turn taking on a good many chores that a generation ago would have seemed preposterous as man’s work. Shorter working hours mean that more Americans are at home more of the time than they used to be. On the other hand mother is out of the house a great deal more than her mother was. She is on the road to the supermarket, the station, the school, the church, the PTA, and in many cases she is at her office from nine to five.

This is only a small part of the picture of change. With the shortage of domestic servants life has become more informal. With the reversal in the cultural (with a small “c”) trade winds (they now blow from California to the east) Americans everywhere have taken to the out of doors, to the barbecue pit and the patio, and to dressing themselves in perpetual variations on beachwear. The suburbs where the outdoor life is pursued have assumed a place in our national pattern of living that has not only antiquated our transportation systems and local governments, but has threatened to become a brand new kind of social simplex (as opposed to complex) in which, as I have suggested, there is no place to rise; the only way up is out. Soon it will be a question of where one can go that is out. Cities are no longer self-contained units dotted on the map; they run from one into another. As Christopher Tunnard of Yale has noted, the strip down the eastern coast from Maine to the District of Columbia is one unbroken urban area.

As our lives become more cluttered and our neighbors closer we hear a great deal about “mass”-this and “mass”-that—about mass-culture and mass-communications and mass-media and mass-housing and, of course, about mass-production. We hear less about the struggle for individuality, which goes on as usual, and about the non-conformists who are, I suspect, around in just about the same ratio as they have always been. They are neither so noticeable nor so vocal in periods of prosperity as they are when there is dissatisfaction, but those who raise their voices are looked upon with just about as much suspicion by conformists as they have been since the beginning of the Christian era. They may be pilloried, some of them, but at least we don’t remove their skins or break them on wheels or feed them to lions.

If we did, the houses illustrated in this issue of the Architectural Record would not, of course, have been built. They are surely not conformist to mass-production standards of taste, and they are (there is no reason not to admit) outlandish to a great many good and useful people. They are a new kind of frontier architecture.

But against this background of change, conformity, and revolt that I have barely sketched, what, in Mr. Downing’s words, can we read of the character of everyman in his house?

From the point of view of even a casual observer of the idiosyncracies of social behavior like myself nothing is more useful than a group of brand-new houses that do not slavishly conform to traditional patterns. They epitomize, without the curtains of tradition to obscure them, the most up-to-date aspirations of the family and the ways in which it believes these aspirations for the good life can be practically realized. In a very real sense every good architect is a practicing social scientist. He measures, gauges, and reduces to a formula the social unit for which he is designing, and the formula that he produces (sometimes more “elegant,” in the scientist’s meaning of the word, than at other times) is a building. What generalities can we discover by applying his formulas to the American at home in 1957?

First, let’s look at the children, for this takes us back to the beginning of this essay and the friend who
wondered about the influence of psychiatry on the modern home. There is a tendency in the modern house to return to the nineteenth-century practice of isolating the children from the rest of the house, to establish in effect what was once thought of in large mansions as the children's wing. But the children no longer have bedrooms which are also playrooms; they have pigeon holes for sleeping and a play area which someday, it is hoped, they will use for teenage riotous living off there somewhere out of earshot. They are given a place where they can make a mess that will not make a mess of the rest of the house, where they can "express" themselves to their little hearts' content. They are, you might say, provided for, but as Lewis Mumford has written, "the numerous nooks and hiding places, dear to children ... nooks that gave the young places for quiet dreaming and mischievous eavesdropping on their elders," have gone. Such a statement seems rather sentimental and old-fashioned when we look at the modern house, but it is a fact nonetheless and a reflection of our attitude towards the psyche of the child. We believe in the open mind, in the open plan, in the importance of the facts of life and not of the myths of childhood. In some respects we have given Freud a long white beard and a red cap and made him into Santa Claus. If we are good, he will bring us adjustment for Christmas.

I would not say that this was not healthy. What we are doing instead of turning the children over to Nanny to discipline and amuse and produce at the children's hour, is to provide them with safe isolation where, at the same time, they can be observed. Now that we are returning to the nineteenth-century ideal of the large family we have to provide a place for the children that is not directly underfoot. It is interesting in this context that while the size of the family increases so do the complaints of many young housewives that there are too many demands on their time. It would, I suppose, be unfair to say that they create the demands so that they can make the complaints, but it sometimes seems that way.

The nineteenth century keeps coming to mind as one considers the houses in this issue. The "family room" has in many houses taken the place of the living room, and it seems to mean that the kitchen has become the center of life as it once was in the farmhouse. The kitchen has in some cases grown in space and in function; in other cases it is an adjunct of the living room in order, presumably, that mother does not have to suffer from isolation. This, apparently, indicates that mother again wants to cook and not merely to heat up frozen or canned foods. Cooking has regained its place as a creative function, an opportunity for self-expression, and an exercise in "togetherness." It hints at the reversal of a trend: women are becoming more womanly, which will be a relief to a great many men.
In this connection one cannot but be impressed with the smallness of bedrooms in comparison to "family rooms." The bedroom is now precisely that and nothing more. (Dorothy Parker once said of a tiny office that she was sharing with Robert Benchley, "If this room were six inches smaller in any dimension this would be adultery."

The function of the bedroom has been recognized for what it is rather than what it was in the days when it was a place to loll, a place where a woman could write at her desk in her nightie, or sit by the window and sew, a place to paddle around with hair down and face covered with cold cream without the sense, as one must have in the family room, that one is facing the world. The boudoir is gone. Too bad. When the kitchen and the bedroom become adjuncts of the family room something has been lost even if something has been gained.

But let's turn our attention to the house as a whole for a minute. Downing wrote in The Architecture of Country Houses, "Verandas, piazzas, bay-windows, balconies, etc., are the most valuable general truths of Domestic Architecture." They were all important in the mid-nineteenth-century house, but when we got involved in adaptations of French chateaux and cute little Dutch houses and revivals of colonial homes and "salt boxes," as we did in the earlier part of this century, they all but disappeared. We are now recognizing again the general truths that Mr. Downing thought so important. We have substituted the screened porch and the patio for the verandas and piazzas, sheltered places to sit out of doors, and we have introduced the indoor garden for the glassed-in solarium. The bay window is now a glass wall that gives us the same sense of being indoors and out at the same time. Balconies are now standard equipment of new apartment houses, and though rural or suburban houses no longer have them very often, roofs are not infrequently made into sun decks which serve the same purpose.

But if Mr. Downing's ideas persist, there are others evident in the houses in this issue that would surprise him, and that would tell him how America has changed. The façade, for example, is disappearing and the house, instead of being an interruption in the landscape or an accent in it, has become merely a piece of landscape enclosed for purposes of shelter. The denial of the façade could be interpreted as unneighborly, a turning of the back, but only in the sense that it flouts a convention that most people respect. In some cases, of course, the modern house simply excludes the neighbors with a high stonewall, and in these cases the architect, as I interpret it, is attempting to provide the kind of privacy that once could be achieved only by a house on many acres of land. If a house is going to be transparent, then its privacy must be protected, though once you are permitted inside the wall, the house is an open book... a gesture of friendliness almost beyond
the call of duty. In some other respects the house behind the wall is very like the nineteenth-century manor house set at the end of a long driveway. It bespeaks not only desire for privacy but for social exclusiveness.

The concern with cluttering the outdoors within walls and with gardens inside the house, speaks, of course, of the urbanization of our society. In the days when men worked out of doors, houses were built to shut away the elements, to keep nature in its place, sometimes enemy, sometimes friend, but always something that had to be coped with. In the modern house nature is a permanent guest. It is also, of course, a substitute for architectural ornament, a means of achieving variety without having to invent it, of softening without seeming to be a softy, of stopping the eye as it slides over a smooth surface without violating any architectural doctrines. It often seems to be an answer to the house rather than an extension of it, just as a "playful use of materials" seems to be a way around the problem of dullness rather than a head-on assault on how to provide delight for the eye.

I think that you will discover, if you will look at the plans and photographs of the houses in this issue, that convenience has in some cases been sacrificed to appearance. You will find that it is occasionally necessary to go out of doors to get from bedroom to living room, for example. You will find space, as we've noted, cut to the minimum in the bedroom in order to provide a more spacious effect somewhere else. You will find a great many plants to be watered and leaves to be wiped. You will even find a hint that the "parlor," so long in the doldrums, is being revived. Perhaps nothing about these houses tells us more about the families for whom they were built than this.

It tells us that they are not trying to live entirely rational lives in entirely rational surroundings. It means that they are no longer the creatures of functionalism and that they are aware that there are conveniences of the flesh that are worth foregoing for pleasures of the spirit. It means that they have struck a blow for eccentricity and experiment, by trying to reorder their lives in such a manner that the machinery of life does not dictate and circumscribe the fun of life. A good thing.

But it is well to remember that the people who have paid for these houses are relatively free spirits or they would not have invested their hearts and their bank accounts in this particular kind of frontier architecture — an architecture on a new kind of frontier, a frontier of leisure, the rapidly expanding void of time that threatens to engulf us. The twenty-eight-hour week and the three-day weekend. There is almost no one who doesn't think it would be good to have more leisure time, but there is an increasing number of thoughtful people who wonder what it will do to family life, to our culture, to education and to peace of mind. What can be done to make leisure productive? (This is the Puritan point of view.) What can be done to make it satisfying and not stultifying? What will it do to our highways, our national parks, our public beaches? What will it do to our houses?

One of the answers, I believe, is to be found in this issue of the Record. It will change the looks of our houses, as these buildings are already changed from traditional patterns that date back to the sixty-hour week. It will make the house into a new kind of recreation center in which the needs of every member of the family are reconsidered in the light of the new leisure. It will be housing for the intentionally party-time unemployed in a country crowded with people who do their own domestic work, who live on relatively small pieces of land in areas that are far more urban than rural, who want to be private but at the same time identified with the community, who want the sun and light by day and protection from the dark by night.

I would not, since I am no more crystal-gazer than phrenologist, attempt to forecast what the new leisure will do to the design of houses, any more than I am willing to guess what it will do to the shape and flavor of the typical American family. But we can glimpse, I believe, what may happen by looking at houses designed by those architects who are trying to cope with the first hints of this problem, with its obvious benefits as well as with its more subtle threats.

The architecture of mass leisure, if I read the clues correctly, will have a kind of adaptability that assures privacy when it is wanted, congregation in "family rooms" and segregation when the members of the family get to be too much for one another. It will be flexible so that some rooms will come and go as needed, just as the outdoors will come and go. The kitchen may become a place that mother will be happy to retire to, if she has her husband around so much of the time, or it may become the center of family activity. In other words, the house of the new era of leisure will attempt to do in a small space what the great house of the eighteenth century, like Westover, or the villa of the nineteenth century, accomplished by the use of lavish space: provide a relaxed setting for a life of busy leisure.

But of one thing I think we may be reasonably sure. The American architecture of leisure will have no illusions of permanence. However tasty the nests, the horizon will always beckon and the beautiful birds will be forever in search of some new and unsuspected frontier.
"Americans have taken... to the barbeque pits and the patios."

"Home from the Brook," Currier & Ives, 1867

"The suburbs... a brand new kind of social simplex"

"The rapidly expanding void of time... will make the house into a new kind of recreation center..."

Great Republic steamboat cabin
HOUSE PLANNED FOR A FULL LIFE

Bordered on three sides by an inlet of Long Island Sound, this serene, finely-designed house creates an atmosphere rich in space and gracious ease, and produces a constant, exciting awareness of the nearby ever-changing sea.

The sea view is deliberately blocked from the pleasant little entrance court by a fence-extension of the front house wall. A first glimpse of the sea is encountered through a glass panel adjacent to the front door, which allows a view right through the living room and out to the water’s edge. Inside, the view expands explosively to the width of the glass-walled living area (exterior view, photo above). The roof, with its sweeping angle, extends out over a terrace to protect the living room from the glare of summer sun. Skylights on one side of the roof extension admit morning sun to the kitchen. The living area generally receives ample natural lighting until late afternoon, even on dreary winter days. The children’s play-yard is easily supervised from the living area and kitchen.
Half of the angular main roof extends over the
carport by the entrance court, yielding an interest-
ingly slanted shed roof (See page 110). The bed-
room wing has two levels. Though the lower level
is partially underground, a long strip of windows
on both sides allows adequate light and air. The
utilities and two future bedrooms are located on
this level. At the far end of the wing, the site
slopes, permitting an above-ground recreation
room. There is a full view of the sea-scape and ad-
joining play-yard from the recreation room, which
is glass-enclosed on three sides.
Low dining room cabinets and a wood-panelled bar (which houses a hi-fi set) are the only separations between the entry, living, and dining rooms of the Simons house. The soft, pink tones of the used-brick fireplace (See page 111) complement the whites and pastels of the interior color pattern. Folding doors shut off the living area from the bedroom wing. Children’s bedrooms are on the north of the wing and a sunny play-room gallery runs along the south. The master bedroom is at the end of the wing, and has a separate dressing room and sitting area. A glass wall is to the south.
THREE UNITS ZONE ACTIVITIES

This extremely interesting house offers a highly original scheme for giving each segment of a family maximum privacy in its own quarters and ample space for general family living. The problems caused by limitations of a city lot and by the close proximity of neighboring houses are also well answered.

The house is built in three units, linked by glassed-in bridges at the second floor level. The unit nearest the street contains the carport, with quarters for a teenage son above. This apartment will eventually have a private entrance stair. The center unit is the major one, and includes living, dining and service areas at the ground level, and girls’ rooms, study, sewing room and laundry on the second floor. At the back is the parents’ apartment, with a shaded garden for adults below it. A play court for the children is between the first two units. The house was planned for the parents to live in the center section when the children leave home, with the end units for visitors.
The living area of the Philip M. Tiller, Jr., house is considerably increased by the garden courts. These are defined and given privacy by simple brick walls. A "mobile mural" (above), designed and executed by John Clemmer, permits the kitchen to be completely opened to the living area, or closed-off as desired.

There are a minimum of windows facing neighboring houses, and a profusion of skylights over the second level. A unique "floor window" is also included in the master bedroom: a hole in the floor has a cowling built up to coffee table height — this is topped with glass and gives a view of the garden. The spiral staircase in the central unit also forms an eye-catching feature.

Perhaps much of the ingenuity expressed in the house was fostered by the owner. He wanted a house that "need have none of the usual norms of respectability," but be a place where he "could enjoy taking a vacation."
EVANS WOOLLEN, III, ARCHITECT. Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Parke, owners. Location: Indianapolis, Indiana. Frederick Whipple, Contractor.

THE BIG ROOM CONCEPT

With great restraint and economy of means, Evans Woollen has constructed a budget house particularly well adapted to entertaining, and noteworthy for its deceptive aura of size and importance. Inexpensive shapes and materials are well combined to add to the effect.

The illusion is created by devoting the major part of the house to a single room: the living room is fifty feet long and sixteen feet high. Other rooms are minimized and open into it. All is combined into a straightforward rectangular structure.

Placement on the lot is also important. The two-acre tract is well outside Indianapolis, heavily wooded, and triangular shaped. The house is set on a rise in the northernmost corner, away from the road. Besides giving the house a more commanding appearance, this situation gives the living room a southern exposure and a fine view across the property. The drive leads to a parking area on the west side of the house, so that it will not interfere with this vista. Stone steps leads from drive to main terrace.
Room arrangement of the Thomas V. Parke house is quite uncomplicated. Bedrooms are at an upper level, with a balcony serving as passageway. The balcony has a secondary function of adding interest to the living room. Steps also lead from the bedrooms to a terrace at the back of the house. The kitchen, utility room and study are on the main level, and have high windows across the north side. The study can double as a small sitting room.

The structure is of steel, wood and masonry, on a concrete slab. Floors are finished in terrazzo or cork. Most walls are lightweight concrete block, exposed inside and out, and painted light gray. Partitions and ceilings are plasterboard. For contrast, varnished redwood is used for door and window frames throughout the house, and the prefabricated spiral stair and balcony railing are painted black.

Natural ventilation is augmented by an exhaust fan in the living room ceiling. The house has cellular aluminum foil insulation and a gas-fired hot air furnace.
THE SCREENED-IN FLORIDA ROOM

This house makes the most of an idea rapidly gaining popularity in balmy Florida. Often called the “Florida Room,” it consists of a large, screened, insect-free area to supplement living space during all but a brief portion of the year. Here, the idea is pursued to a near ultimate. Screened terraces, lawns and gardens flank the house and about treble its size. With sliding walls open, the entire structure is one huge screened porch — exotic, but comfortably pleasant in a warm climate.

From the outside, the house has a unified and relatively closed appearance: horizontal louvers along the front (photo above), plastic screen across the back, and solid end walls of yellow-painted concrete block. Inside, the effect is one of extreme openness (see photo, right, of the back terrace). Lush plants and grass continue in from the absolute outdoors, and help visually minimize the protecting screen. Circulation between living and service quarters and the bedrooms is via a covered walk in the front loggia.
RUFUS NIMS, ARCHITECT. John H. Messmore, owner. Location: Redington Beach, Florida. Alois Steinwachs, Contractor.
The plan of the John H. Messmore house is arranged with bedrooms for the children at one end of the house, the parents' bedroom at the other. Each room has its own bath. Living, dining and service rooms are at the center of the house, and allow for inside circulation. Walls have alternate panels of glass and sliding jalousies, which can be closed in bad weather. All ceilings are sand-finished plaster with imbedded radiant heating cables. The roof structure has wood joists spanning between rigid steel bents on square steel columns. The section (far left) shows screen extensions.
PATIO SPLITS TWO-ZONE HOUSE

The dramatic two-zone plan of this house separates formal and informal living areas by means of a central courtyard flanked on both sides by parallel wings. A rugged stone wall merges artfully with the heavily wooded landscape which surrounds the house, and yet is a forceful enough barrier to yield a secure sense of well-defined containment.

The bedroom area and living area are in separate wings. Covered walks at either end of the courtyard connect them. Entrance to either must be gained by traveling outside, along the walks. Walks could be glass-enclosed, though the sun and the heat which radiates from the house keep them free of snow — even during Connecticut winters.

The stone wall which closes in the garden (and house) at opposite ends is divided by massive wood doors which slide open to create dual gates to the garden (photo right). Closed, the doors offer protection against storms. The garden, which in effect becomes a room in the house, is well cultivated to contrast with rough surrounding landscape.
Richard Kelly, Lighting Consultant
Plan of the Eliot Noyes house puts five bedrooms, baths, snackbar, laundry, storage, and sitting room areas along one wing. Four of the bedrooms face the Connecticut woods. The master bedroom spans the width of the wing, yielding a view of both woods and courtyard. The sitting room (photo page 125) doubles as a playroom for the children and a family T.V. room. A snackbar equipped with combination refrigerator and range serves for early-morning coffee and late evening snacks. The other wing is composed of kitchen, dining area, living room and study. The kitchen is a compact horseshoe shape with pass-through to dining area. Living and dining areas are together, separated only by placement of furniture (photo top left). Focal point in the living room is a stone-and-plaster fireplace which screens study. Floors are bluestone, walls are glass. Study (photo bottom left) is furnished with long table, bookshelves. Skylights in the study, which doubles as working area or extension of living room, provide additional natural lighting.
To counter the often hampering restrictiveness of building codes, they have been carried out forthrightly here — but with imagination — to produce a very festive, unsterotyped home. A three-dimensional approach, developing the structure along with the plan, gives unusual spaciousness and livability for an inexpensive house on a small plot.

Local city and sub-division codes required houses in the area to be single story, with pitched roofs, and exterior walls entirely of brick or glass. With strict adherence to these requirements, William Muchow has used an exaggerated exposed-wood ceiling to get desired two-story room heights, an "upstairs" room, and the suggested warmth of wood siding. Brick is relegated to minimized areas below windows, bedroom walls and fences. Low overhangs at the sides help bring the house in scale with its neighbors, and also to screen interiors from them. The bright, airy quality of the rooms is heightened by painting all structural elements, trim, and the underside of the roofdeck white.
The addition of a balcony (dotted lines on plan) gives Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Muchow and their children an amazing amount of living room at little extra cost. The upper area (which is protected by an expanded metal railing) also gives the children a place to play where they have a feeling of privacy, yet are under fairly close supervision and not under foot.

The plan centers on a bank of baths and closets, plus a unique raised brick unit which combines fireplace, wood storage, kitchen range and oven (photo above). The family entrance is off the kitchen, and gives access via the multi-purpose area to all rooms in the house. A formal front entry is off the living room. Separated and private outdoor living areas adjoin kitchen, master bedroom and living room. Twelve-foot overhangs and a wall make the latter into a sheltered porch. A skylight is along the roof ridge.

Bedrooms are placed at the back of the house for added protection from street noises. Trundle beds are used in the children’s rooms for extra sleeping space.
Yamasaki, Leinweber & Associates, Architects. Mr. and Mrs. S. Brooks Barron, Owners.
Location: Argyle Crescent, Detroit, Michigan. S. Brooks Barron, Contractor.
Edward A. Eichstedt, Landscape Architect

CITY HOUSE HAS COUNTRY PRIVACY

This luxurious urban house has the personality, privacy, and gracious elegance of a suburban or country residence. Built in a Detroit subdivision, the house meets rigid zoning laws with good contemporary design and at the same time provides detachment from neighbors. The house is deliberately planned, by means of visual surprises, geometric patterns, and rich materials, to make walking through it and living in it an enjoyable experience.

This well-established neighborhood had zoning restrictions which made two stories and a pitched roof mandatory. The owners wanted the convenience of a one-story house. Architects Yamasaki, Leinweber and Associates met the problem by designing a two-story bedroom wing at the front of the lot and a one-story living-service wing at the rear.

From outside, the house blends quietly with the character of the neighborhood. A pierced brick wall shields the two-story brick wing with built-up roof (photo above.) It is on the inside, away from the city scene, that this house becomes architecturally exciting.
Within the brick wall of the S. Brooks Barron residence lies a half-shadowed, half-open reflecting pool (photo above). A covered walk approaches the house alongside the pool. Inside the front door a glass roof opens the entrance hall to the sky (color photo). White travertine flooring extends to the sunken area, where steps lead down into a carpeted living room overlooking a Japanese rock garden through a wall of glass (photo middle left). A 3-ft ledge around the room provides more seating space. Dining area is separated from the living room only by difference in floor level. That area, too, has a wall of glass and view of garden. The stairhall, with its 15-ft high glass wall, faces the reflecting pool. Vertical brass poles cage the stairway. Luxurious materials, such as the green and copper onyx panel above the fireplace, give rich background to the simple but elegant furnishings selected by Mrs. Barron.
CONVERTIBLE PLAN LENDS SPACE

Visiting children and their offspring can pose a major planning problem in a house for an older couple. Frequently, the resulting home seems too big for comfort and easy maintenance when the couple are there alone. Or, if it is planned just for the parents — it can be much too small when the children arrive. By the use of highly flexible, multi-use living areas, this modest but extremely pleasant house adapts quickly to either situation. Spacious daytime areas for family gatherings can be divided into several sleeping rooms for those that stay overnight.

The living areas include spaces for sitting, dining, music, games, studio (the wife is a painter), and display gallery. Divisions are suggested by head-height bookcases, cabinets, screens, and a unique round bathroom. Screens and curtains close to create three distinct rooms, each with access from the gallery. The master bedroom is a quiet area at one end of the house, a servant’s or children’s suite is at the other.
The house is designed to fit quietly and unobtrusively on its site—the edge of a beautifully wooded bluff. From the front, the house is shielded by an arrangement of baffle fences. One steps down from the drive into a delightful, and surprising, Japanese court (above). The glass-walled gallery looks out upon it, but Shoji screens (detail, right) give privacy. From this point, carefully planned vistas are encountered throughout the house. At the back, windows and sliding doors link living areas with the terrace and emphasize the view (above left).
Along with the vistas planned for each room in the Rosenau house, thoughtful attention has been given to the quality and control of light — inside and out, daytime and night. Downlights edge the roof to light gardens and terraces, add a party sparkle (note in photos on preceding page). Glass walls admit light on gray days, but sunlight is tempered by pierced screens, curtains and louvered overhangs. Skylights provide natural or artificial illumination to light up interior walls. In the display gallery, a ceiling channel permits spotlights to be placed wherever desired.
A COUNTRY HOUSE ON A PLATFORM

A fresh, new use of a raised terrace, coupled with a sensitively designed open plan, marks this as a very distinguished house for a small family. The deft blend of casualness and formality in its design also makes it unusually adaptable, for its size, to the inevitable variety of everyday and special family activities.

Although the idea of raising a house on a "platform" is hardly new (it has been associated with buildings in the Grand Manner, of course, all through history), the freshness lies in its use to such advantage for a small house. On a country hilltop site as this, it gives the house importance and expands the defined living area. It also minimizes the maintenance of sizeable grounds. Garden areas and lawns are confined to platform. The rest of the land needs only rough, occasional mowing. The entrance garden (photo right) is planned to look well winter and summer: myrtle and ivy are used as ground cover, with flowers peeking through in season.
The plan of the Edward Barnes house is basically conceived as one big room which combines terrace, living area, entrance hall, master bedroom and kitchen. Yet each individual area has its own importance and privacy. The bedroom doubles as a library, with the bed set back from living room view. A sliding door can close off the room.

The kitchen is treated as a major room, with full windows and careful detailing. It includes a pleasant dining area. The food preparation area is screened from the living room, and there is a sliding door. The dining table is moved to the living room for large parties. A convenient service entrance adjoins the kitchen and contains the laundry.

The main entrance hall is defined by a storage wall flanking the fireplace. The cabinets are fitted to store outdoor clothes, tools, linen, hi-fi equipment and games. As in the rest of the house, storage is well planned and handled in a neat, unobtrusive manner. The entire back wall of the house is of glass, shielded by trees and outside blinds.
GEORGE NEMENY, ARCHITECT. Mr. and Mrs. Lee Blair, Owners. Location: Kings Point, Long Island, New York. Debra Reiser, Jack Freidin, Architect’s Staff. Andrew Johnson, Contractor
A secluded studio for work or quiet repose away from the bustle of normal family activity has been achieved in the design of this house for writer Lee Blair and his artist-wife, Mary. The master bedroom and studio wing, paneled with crisp, off-white cypress boards, is raised on stilts to separate it from the main ground floor living quarters. Connection is by way of a glass entrance hall and U-shaped stone stairwell. Elevation of the wing lends a soaring quality to the sleek, angular lines of this house.

The raised wing is composed of one large, open space with bedroom located nearest the stairway, and studio at far end. This plan could be adapted to provide a quiet, secluded area for the average family in any house. Glass doors open onto a balcony where the Blairs can work if they wish (photo left). Center of the wing contains a sitting space behind which are located the dressing and bath rooms. Ceiling height is low and intimate at the bedroom end and rises to a height of 16 ft at the studio-balcony end.
L-shaped massing of the Blair house creates a private garden to the south. Living room wing of the house is divided into three main elements: living, kitchen-dining, and children’s quarters. All three elements have a view of the garden, for the entire wall along the south side of the wing is glass. Exterior siding is cypress board stained dark brown to contrast with the natural white siding of the raised wing.

Kitchen-dining area, with skylight, is located in the center of the wing and is open to both the living area (photo above opposite) and the children’s play area. Kitchen is separated only by a long cabinet-counter. A dramatic fireplace near the center of the living room can be used for barbequeing, roasting, or as an adjunct to serving the evening meal. A folding wood-slat wall shuts off the children’s play area from living area. Structural frame of the house is steel and wood. Stilts that raise the studio-bedroom wing are 4 in. round columns. Beneath the wing is shaded sitting area.
STEEL FRAME, FLEXIBLE PLAN

A new sense of undisturbed space and freedom to move about evolves from the particularly flexible plan of this house. The structural steel framework is engineered to make load-bearing walls unnecessary, thus freeing the interiors from restricting, floor to ceiling barriers. Rooms flow into one another, changing character gradually with the help of shifting moods in color. Glass walls integrate garden with interiors.

Essentially an experimental house, the X-100 was designed for Eichler Homes to test new construction materials and to project planning ideas which seem to suit new living patterns — informal but gracious with much emphasis on close indoor-outdoor relationship. All rooms are located along the perimeter where they can utilize outdoor space. Sliding glass doors lead from the children’s bedroom to a play yard at the front of the house enclosed by a concrete block wall (photo above). Some of the blocks are reversed to give a pierced effect and to allow light.
The X-100 employs high-density overlay fir panels along the bedroom wall. Indoors, the bedrooms are enclosed by draperies. Kitchen and dining area are also separated by sliding drapery partitions. The interiors can thus be closed off for privacy or opened completely from east to west wall. Exposed steel beams, painted cinnamon red, run across the ceiling. Roof panels are interrupted by a 32-ft skylight to provide natural lighting. A kitchen, two baths, utility area and laundry room are grouped in a central core, which saves stringing expensive plumbing lines to separate areas.

C. W. ACKERMAN

HOUSE THAT LOOKS TO NATURE

Perched atop a wooded hill and overlooking rugged, tree-scaped countryside, this delightful little house was designed with a back-to-nature approach. The architects have skillfully blended the informal, congenial, uncomplicated atmosphere most desired in a country retreat with the conveniences, polish, and simple graciousness of a more elaborate residence. Materials such as stone and wood were selected to produce maximum relationship of house to site and enhance feeling of “being close to nature.”

The owners wanted a place for themselves, their children, and their guests to enjoy a convenient escape from suburban living. The result is a house that would be comfortably suitable for full-time family residency. The site the owners chose was just an hour’s drive from the city. The architects decided on a plan which situates one large living area on an upper floor where view of surroundings is best, and sleeping area on floor below. A fence-wall along the south side of the house provides privacy for bedrooms.
The north side of this hilltop house, which faces
the downhill view, is glass in winter and screened
in summer. The house is anchored to the hill with
heavy stone piers. Wood beams and planks project
the house out from the hill. Kitchen, dining, and
living room areas run across the north length of
the upper floor. These areas are essentially un-
broken, with fireplaces centered at either end.
Cantilevers extend the upper floor at both ends,
yielding more space to living area and shielding
bedrooms below. At rear of the upper floor are the
guestroom, bath, closet space, and stairs.
PHILIP JOHNSON, ARCHITECT. Dr. and Mrs. J. E. MILLER, OWNERS. LOCATION: IRVINGTON-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK.
EASE AND ORDER IN THE SUBURBS

This highly stylized, elegant little house is an excellent example of the school of thought that concentrates on order, balance and perfection of workmanship. It is also a very livable house for a family that leans toward neatness and formality — which many do.

The bold overall concept of the house — the simplest rectangular shape, perfectly symmetrical façades — is softened by a number of subtle touches. The most important of these is, perhaps, the careful integration of the house with its site. Trees, terraces, garden walls, walks, all become integral parts of the design. These means are also used everywhere for planned, extended vistas, as can be noted in the photos above. Quiet contrasts of materials play a big part, too. Painted fascias are contrasted with the pattern of brick, the sleekness of glass; smooth flagstone floors abut polished wood walls.

The formal alternation of glazed and solid wall sections works well with the plan, giving both areas of privacy and views to each room in the house.
Facilities are abundant in the J. E. Miller house for indoor-outdoor living. There is a terrace off each room. The area off the sparkling white dining kitchen (left) serves as a dining patio, screened from the street by a brick wall. From the front, this wall enormously increases the apparent size of the house and offsets its absolute symmetry.

At the back, a low brick retaining wall defines a large living terrace overlooking the Hudson river. The part of the terrace immediately adjoining the living area is paved, the rest is a neat lawn (see photo right of living area).
IDEAL FOR COUNTRY LIVING

The effectiveness of natural simplicity in the proper setting is highly apparent in this house. It is unpretentious and casual in plan and design, without much regard for rules set by formalities of more suburban areas. Yet the house is lifted high above the ordinary by a bold and positive character that seems to belong just where it is.

The site consists of some six acres of sloping land, including a small promontory which made a natural building location. Here, the house overlooks the town of Healdsburg in the valley, the winding Russian River, and timbered hills beyond. To make the most of this view, the side of the house facing it is almost completely glazed. Exterior match-stick blinds are hung from these westerly eaves in summer to cut sky glare. In the dining area (right) an angled window was designed to exploit the complete sweep of the panorama.

To minimize grading and preserve the large oak that umbrellas over the house, the plan is on two levels; living areas step up with the slope from dining and work areas.
The house amply fulfills the owners' requirements. It was to be specifically designed for country living—open, informal and easy to maintain. A sleeping area was to be provided for an unmarried son, and separate guest quarters for visitors or other family members. Access to the outdoors was to be freely provided for each room.

To obtain the maximum freedom and living area in the plan, sliding walls are used between work and dining areas, and between living room and bedrooms. Thus the entire house can become a single large room for various occasions.
Finishes in the Leo Frediani house also reflect its informal, easy-to-keep qualities. Most walls, inside and out, are natural redwood; a few are grass cloth over plasterboard. Clear fir planks and beams are left exposed for the ceilings. All floors are cork except in the dining area, where cement topping is dyed and waxed in variegated shades of brown.

These materials are also used in the master bathroom (above center), where even the tub is made of redwood ply. This bath connects to a sundeck and a future swimming pool.
DESIGN EXPRESSING DIGNITY

This restrained and dignified house provides uncompromising privacy, security, and sense of enclosure on a site that was already part of an urban residential area. A binuclear plan divides the house into two buildings — one long and rectangular, the other fairly square — to provide maximum ease of traffic flow for a family of diverse ages and interests. A quiet brick exterior adds to the sense of elegance and solidarity.

Complex family requirements were prime considerations in the design. Consisting of a mother, father, two young girls, grandfather and aunt, the family needed several related areas in the house, including: 1. bedrooms, well placed for parental control of the children's room and for quick assistance to the grandfather and aunt; 2. master bedroom and library which is used by parents as a sitting room; 3. children's den and bedroom. The solution was achieved by grouping an activity room, dining room, kitchen, garage, and maid's room in the long wing; and bedrooms, children's den and library in the other wing.
Connecting the two wings of the Farfel house is a glass entry hall. Herringbone floors of red oak are used in both the hall and the children's den. Bedrooms and activity room are carpeted. Sink tops are marble. Walnut paneling, as well as solid walnut trim, are used extensively throughout the house to give it an added sense of luxury. Library, master bedroom and grandfather's room face the street. Ample privacy without the use of heavy drapery or solid wall is achieved by means of a front bedroom court. This enables the use of windows, heightens sense of security.
PAUL HAYDEN KIRK, ARCHITECT. Mr. and Mrs. Lewis J. Dowell, Owners. Location: Seattle, Washington. Stern & Towne, Mechanical Engineers. William G. Teufel, Landscape Architect.

DEARBORN-MASSAB

**GARDENS INSIDE AND OUT**

In addition to an extremely attractive and well organized exterior garden (above), this house also features a dramatic garden court completely closed from the weather (right). The court is used as a major theme for the design of the house: it affords a surprise vista on entering the house; it lends space and light to every major room in the house; and it doubles as extra living space and a luxurious stair well.

Perhaps it is worth considering here, that most all really good houses of the past or present have had some such dominant element (or series of elements) to seize the imagination. True, and fortunately, the exact forms and ideas have varied — some subtle, some startling, elaborate at times, often inexpensive. It may be that this is the most singular quality missing from our more humdrum houses. At the least, it helps remind one that, architecturally, houses need not be just a series of innocuous spaces to be “decorated” in the fashionable whim of the moment to give them a slight semblance of interest.
The simple, textured stone front of the Lewis J. Dowell house makes a marked contrast with the open lightness of the interiors. The court is enclosed (because of the Seattle weather) by a glass penthouse which extends above the roof (photo above). The floor of the court is placed midway between the basement and main level. This gives the area sufficient height to make a strong focal point. It also makes an extremely pleasant transition level for the house, which is one story at the front, two at the back (note section).

Shoji screens make it possible to shut off areas from the court if desired (photo right). The rest of the house is also planned to give needed seclusion. The library-den is placed where it may be used with the living area for entertaining, or with the master bedroom to form a private apartment. A balcony and stairs link this suite with the outside garden. The children's rooms are on the lower level, and also form a separate suite with a workshop and indoor and outdoor play areas.
As Mrs. Dowell had spent a good part of her life in the orient, the design and materials of the house have slight Eastern overtones to form an appropriate background for collections and mementos, contemporary furnishings.

The structure is framed in Douglas fir and steel, and exterior walls are Oregon basalt stone or Western red cedar. The roofing is built-up, surfaced with white marble chips.

Interior walls are walnut veneer or hemlock. The den and master bedroom were carefully sized to exactly fit two oriental carpets.
TWO LEVELS ON A SLOPING SITE

Making the most of a sloping site, this long, horizontal, two-level house is set against the back of a hill so that the upper living and playroom level faces an impressive vista to the north and yet rests at ground level to the south. Approach is from the north through a large clearing of rolling meadow. The horizontal lines of the house offer balanced contrast to the verticality of trees which surround the clearing. Vertical cedar siding relieved with bright panels of stark white, lemon yellow, dark blue, and vivid red creates a particularly interesting exterior (photo above).

Important economies were realized as a result of the plan arrangement, since two levels built against the hill permitted simple framing and produced usable above-ground space instead of what would normally be basement. The framework of the house is wood. Painted cinder block is used on the lower exterior and for retaining walls. A panel of stonework is near the entrance. Glass walls border both sides of the upper level.
WILLIAM W. LANDSBERG, ARCHITECT. Mr. and Mrs. Randall P. McIntyre, Owners. Location: Deer Park, Long Island, New York. Martin Wuttke, Builder

Entrance to the McIntyre house is at the lower level, where most of the utilities are located along with two bedrooms and a workroom. Stairs lead from the entrance hall to the upper-level living room area. Supplies can be moved easily to the upstairs kitchen by way of a dumbwaiter. A prefabricated spiral staircase is used for circulation to laundry and maid’s quarters below. Kitchen and playroom are organized as a single unit to facilitate supervision of the children. Living room and playroom face the south, which provides easy access to the outside ground-level play areas.
Hallways have been kept to a minimum. Only a fireplace separates the living and dining areas. One corridor leads from the central kitchen-playroom area to the four bedrooms and baths. The house can easily be expanded to the west of the living room to provide a future study and guest room.

All sliding windows, sliding doors, and glass walls are details developed by the architect. Heating is provided through radiant floor coils in the lower level and radiant ceiling coils in the upper level. Flooring through most of the house is oak. The entrance hall has a bluestone floor.
BALCONIES ADD CHARM AND SPACE

The generous use of balconies and terraces in the design of this hillside house lends charm and spaciousness to an already distinctive plan. Working with a particularly difficult site problem, the architects have produced an effective and dramatic solution by designing this two-story house to rest midway down a steep, rocky slope.

The site is composed of two fairly level areas separated by rocky cliffs and tall trees. Differences in elevation of the two levels is about 45 ft. The architects decided to build the house on the slope to take advantage of the view and the natural, rugged background. The plan situates the living area about midway on the slope, with the bedroom and entrance level above. An outdoor terrace, bordered with planters, extends from the living area level. The living room itself rises to the full height of the house. The rest of the structure is divided into two stories. A balcony projects out from the second-story floor level, providing an overhang which shades a portion of the terrace below.
A sun deck on the west side of the Mills house is sheltered from the north by a natural rock ledge. Below the main front terrace is another covered terrace. A gentle slope leads to the meadow below. The entrance lobby looks down into the two-story living room. Warm interior colors were selected by the owner-architect's wife to blend with the natural colors of the site. A light cerulean blue ceiling, which continues from the living room through the study and entrance hall, offers color contrast and accentuates flow of space. Exterior finish is natural redwood vertical siding with white trim.
WALLED-IN PLAN FOR A CITY LOT

The basic concept of this attractive little house is a highly interesting one for city lots or high-density suburban areas. The entire lot is simply walled in and a glass pavilion for living quarters is set in the middle. There are no windows at all along the sides (skylights add extra light). Thus the entire lot — except for the setbacks required by the codes — becomes living space. Glass walls and outdoor areas are given complete privacy from passers-by.

The utter simplicity of the scheme and the aloofness of its almost stark walled-in front paradoxically gives the house considerable distinction and an aura of "quality." A careful selection of the few items which adorn the front wall become a public facade — coping, letterbox, light, door, and a translucent glass panel with the street address. A paved court serves as a carport. Inside the street door (which opens from the house by an electric button) there is a warm, friendly private world.
The construction of the house is as simple as its planning — and as effective. It is wood frame, with the house and front walls surfaced with natural finish cypress siding. A metal gravel guard caps the roof. Interior walls are painted plasterboard, floors, tile squares or carpet applied to a concrete slab. Glazed areas, in steel or milled cypress frames, are set back to provide protective overhangs for the major rooms. In the kitchen, the glass is brought out to the roof line to gain extra work space. The house has a year-round, gas-fired air conditioning and heating system.
GEORGE MATSUMOTO, ARCHITECT and owner. Location: Raleigh, North Carolina. Frank Walser, Contractor.
DETAILS ENHANCE A SMALL HOUSE

This good looking little house stands as vital proof that standard stock materials and equipment can—with care, thought, and a knowing touch—be combined to make a fresh, unsterotyped structure. The result has warmth and elegance of finish, and the cost was amazingly low. In plan, the house works extremely well, with a maximum of living space and as little waste as there is in the structure.

The success of the house lies, no doubt, in the meticulous attention given to each tiny detail—for itself, and for its relation to the overall scheme. Each item dovetails with the next in a logical, coordinated manner, yet retains individuality through contrasts of natural color, texture and patterns of the materials.

The main impact of the house is one of lightness and suspension. This is created by cantilevering the house over its raised basement on all four sides, so that it has a modified cross shape. And it is emphasized by glass fillers between all girders.
The George Matsumoto house has a precise post and beam structure, laid out in regular eight-foot bays. In the living area, free-standing posts and the exposed beams suggest divisions for different activities. Rich, warm wood and plywood surfaces abound throughout the house to counterbalance the precision of the structure.

The plan also combines practicality with out-of-the-ordinary features. Utilities are conveniently located, and are close together to minimize plumbing — kitchen and bath straddle the utility room on the lower floor. Traffic patterns through the house are fairly direct and unencumbered; the bedroom hall is a near minimum.

For the less usual side, there is the delightful entrance court (see close-up on preceding page) with its patterned planting beds and gentle ramp up to the recessed front door. The entry gives privacy to most of the living-dining area, and focuses attention on a vista of the back garden as one comes in the house.
MALONE AND HOOPER, ARCHITECTS. Dr. and Mrs. Russell R. Klein, Owners. Location: Kentfield, California. Wilson & Wadekind, Contractors. Buonacorsì & Murray, Mechanical Engineers. Lawrence Halprin, Landscape Architect.
CASUAL EASE FOR FAMILY LIFE

A very personal and controlling attitude of the clients dominated the design of this house. They hold a strong belief that a house belongs to the whole family, and that all main living areas — insofar as practicable — be open to the children and their friends. This is in direct contrast to the current trend in many contemporary houses, where emphasis is on increasing separation between the activities of the different age groups. An extremely pleasant, easy-going house is the successful result.

The family of five is headed by a busy doctor and his wife; she is exceptionally interested in civic and community affairs. The children include a boy age 10, and two girls ages 8 and 6. To assure freedom of living for all in a house providing generous and casual living space inside and out, simplicity and ease of housekeeping was carefully provided for. Each room has quick, direct access to the terraces which surround the house. The site has no particular view, but boasts a fine grove of trees, privacy from neighbors.
The main area of the Russell R. Klein house combines living and dining space into a single multi-use space (photo above). The room is large enough to absorb the activities of all the members of the family: snacks at the bar counter, games at the dining table, block play on the floor, televiewing, and adult conversation around the fireplace. Changes in ceiling height and clerestory windows add interest and brightness to the room.

Other elements of the house are grouped in wings around this central room. The master bedroom flanks a study to form a suite for the parents. Children's bedrooms are in a wing of their own; their bathroom is split to minimize congestion, and the corridor between provides generous toy storage under the windows. Sliding panels permit the girls' rooms to be joined into a single area. The service areas are at the other end of the house, and include a children's entrance with a large coat and boot closet and adjacent bath. This entrance opens off the same front court as the formal entry (photo left).
THE MAIN FLOOR IS UPSTAIRS

Dramatically poised on a hilltop, this delightful, crisply-styled little house makes the most of a view by placing all major rooms on the second floor. The idea is an old one, of course — used both in “raised cottages” and formal town houses — but with contemporary construction methods, it serves to considerably reduce foundation construction costs.

The raised basement is built of painted, lightweight concrete block, and is somewhat smaller than the floor above; cantilevers at front and back add main floor space and provide protection for lower floor windows. This treatment also gives the major floor the prominence in the design that it deserves.

The lower floor includes a very gracious foyer and nicely detailed staircase, a bedroom, bath, utility rooms and garage. Other bedrooms, living areas and kitchen are upstairs; an outside ramp also connects this floor with the ground level at the side. The exterior of the second story is sheathed with vertical cedar, painted white.
Worth particular note is the interesting treatment of the nearly all-glass southeast façade shown on this page. Slightly heavy window framing members give a distinct pattern for relief and a sense of scale to the design. Standard casement sash are fitted within these members, with double glass used elsewhere. Screens are of the roll type that permits them to be kept out of view when windows are closed.

The roof and side walls are extended beyond this window wall for protection. Lights in the overhang illuminate this side at night.
For its small size, the Asher White house contains quite a number of interesting plan features. The entrance hall and all major living rooms are so arranged that each may be used separately, or all together for entertaining. Folding doors in the study-guest room permit it to be opened to both the hall and the living area.

The skylighted bathroom is compartmented in three sections, which facilitates its use by several people, or as a powder room. Laundry equipment (washer and dryer) are included in the tub section. A bar-counter (left) can open kitchen to living area.
DESIGNERS & BUILDERS, ARCHITECTS. Mr. and Mrs. Franklin E. Schaffer, Owners. Location: Greenwich, Connecticut. Leonore Baronio, Landscape Architect.
CONSIDERABLE time and money were saved in the construction of this house by the use of floor, roof and wall panels designed and built on the site by the architects. These repetitive units were fabricated on an 8 by 12 foot work table; they consist of stressed skin panels of plywood, nailed and glued to 2-inch frameworks. Exterior surfaces are textured redwood, interiors are painted. The framing module was allowed to vary, within stock plywood sizes, to fit interior space requirements.

The post and beam frame is carried on steel fins imbedded in concrete piers. The piers were formed and poured in dry-stacked, masonry chimney block. Non-solid exterior walls were glazed with plate glass or packaged sliding windows—all clipped on the exterior of the structural frame. The stressed skin panels also serve other functions. Floor panels were aluminum lined and used as ducts to insulate and heat floors. Warm air is fed through them to a perimeter duct, where floor registers direct air against the glass.
The panels in the Franklin Shaffer house also contain electrical wiring, passed through voids in them and in hollow columns. Built-in lights are incorporated in the columns. All paint finishes were primed before the panels were put in place. Two large closet elements, at either side of the house, were fabricated with separate roofs and cantilevered off the ends of the framework.

In plan, the house features a number of dual-use elements. The cantilevered “closet” unit off the living area is fitted as a compact studio for painting and can be closed with sliding screens (visible at right in photo above). Sliding panels also divide the living and dining areas. A rather novel use of a folding wall permits part of the hallway off the kitchen to be used as a breakfast area (photo far left). The children’s bedroom is also divisible and can be rearranged for play or sleep. Services are banked to form a utility core; the laundry opens directly on the hall.
GLAZED STAIRWELL GIVES DRAMA

The simple massing and exterior treatment of this white-painted house is sparked with considerable drama by a glassed-in, two story stair hall that serves as entry and connecting link for the two wings of the house. The plan is designed to separate various family activities, and the design is deliberately understated to focus attention on its site.

The house sits on about 13 acres of wooded land overlooking the Concord River in “Thoreau Country.” The large impressive trees were planted by the owners’ grandfather and have been cared for each season. The owners wanted the house to be secondary to all this; the exterior was thus designed in quiet, clean planes, with the exterior of redwood, cedar clapboards and brick chimney — all painted the same color.

Interior spaces are extended into the open by a flagstone dining porch and a bluestone terrace. A sunken playcourt at the back (photo above) gives daylight and access to the outdoors to the basement playroom.
Mr. and Mrs. Pickman requested that the master bedroom and bath have some degree of separation from the children's bedrooms. This was accomplished by placing the master bedroom over the study with its access across a kind of link bridge in the glazed stair hall. A further separation of noisy and quiet activities was accomplished by placing the playroom on the basement level.

A small area off the kitchen serves as a "mudroom" for the children to take off boots and snowsuits. The interiors (see living room, left) combine traditional furniture with the modern house.
MULTI-USE ROOM EXPANDS HOUSE

This clean, crisp house offers a very interesting plan arrangement for those who pursue careers or serious hobbies at home. The owners are a photographer-illustrator team, and the house includes complete facilities for their work: studio, darkroom, office, dressing room and bath for models, and a workshop for constructing sets and props. Though this wing can be closed-off from the rest of the house for work, at other periods it augments the living areas in a variety of ways.

Plastic panels open the studio to the living area for added living and entertainment or recreation space. The office becomes a family study, the bath a powder room. On special occasions, the entire wing could be converted into a private suite for grandparents or guests. This multi-use wing gives the house the conveniences of a much larger establishment. The close relationship of indoor and outdoor areas in the house further increases useful space and provides a pleasant setting for the casual Southern California life.
W. Frazier Overpeck, Architect. Mr. and Mrs. Peter Gowland, Owners. Location: Santa Monica, California. Paul Greenfield, Structural Engineer.
The living room of the Peter Gowland house is itself conceived as a "multi-purpose," "family room" kind of area. Terrazzo floors and other easy-to-keep surfaces make it practical as a children's playroom as well as an area for general living and dining. The kitchen opens directly into the living area via a bar-height counter and offers good visual control of play areas and pool.

Each bedroom has an outside entrance to reduce tracking from the pool and excess traffic through the living area. The children's rooms open onto a private court, and are joined by a compartmentalized bath.

Most all rooms have sliding glass walls opening onto terraces. Planting areas are carried through the house to help visually link these areas. To extend the season for outdoor living, radiant heating is installed in terraces and in garage work areas as well as in all interior floors.
The foyer of this house for Mr. and Mrs. John Upton opens wide to an entry garden which is shielded from the street by a high wall. Through this plan, Architects Curtis and Davis have provided a pleasing entranceway along with ample privacy on an urban site. (See plan, page 182.)
On the following pages are elements or parts from the houses we have just presented. They have been assembled here for easy comparison and study, and to emphasize that the parts are as fine as the total in a really good design.

They also stress a new phase of thought we seem to be entering in contemporary house design—one which adds a new "function" to our previous lists of practicalities. This is a provision for satisfaction to the mind and senses, as opposed to pure creature comfort and efficiency.

We are all quite conscious of how rapidly and how enormously our way of home life has changed. And there have been many criticisms. Perhaps it is just that, in our rush toward simplification, we have neglected to include a dash of ceremony, or pure joie de vivre. The elements shown here indicate a significant change in this direction.
From the cloistered Rosenau entry gate there is an unexpected view. Architects are Davis, Brady & Wisniewski. (See plan, page 139.)

Translucent glass provides light and, at the same time, privacy to the Klein foyer. Architects Malone and Hooper conceived the pattern.

An esplanade of trees highlights the simple elegance of this entrance, designed by Architects Bolton and Barnstone. Again, geometrical patterns are used to inspire lingering interest. Crisp white walls add a feeling of spaciousness. (See plan, page 166.)
Even if grandeur of façade in our homes is no longer an overwhelming desire, the importance and quality of the entrance itself is gaining attention. More than just an access, it is a major part of the ceremonial of arriving — the place where greetings are made and goodbyes are said — and the first real clue to the public and the family as to whether the house is warm and inviting or otherwise.

The entrances pictured here are of a wide variety of types, but a number of general trends can be noted. Courts, gardens, covered walks and glass play major roles. Patterns of shadows and the play of light add emphasis day and night. Often, exterior entry-gardens merge directly with the interior foyer, with a sheet of glass as the only separation. Other examples are planned for the surprise of entering via a solid door, to discover oneself again outdoors in a lushly planted court — or looking straight through the house to the view beyond it. The dramatics, however, are seldom of an elaborately ornamental type, and are almost always accomplished with great economy.
The Architects Collaborative used a very simple stair design with airy metal posts to create a vertical tracery of light against a glass-wall background in the house for Mr. and Mrs. David Pickman. (Plan, page 202.)

This sleek spiral staircase, designed by Lawrence, Saunders & Colunne, becomes a bold sculptural form in the house for Mr. and Mrs. Philip M. Tiller. View is of stairwell from upper floor.

Viewed from below, the Tiller staircase (see also photo above) displays an open lightness of treads. Vertical grips replace handrail and form a decorative pattern. (Plan, page 114.)
STAIRWAYS

With the resurgence of interest in multi-level houses during these past few years, stairways are naturally gaining importance as a design element. They are also closely allied with the sense of “arriving” in the house — with the going up or down to greet guests, and with the entrance into a group. Thus visual quality is considered as carefully as functional use. Frequently, stairs serve as the major decorative note in entrance halls — but there is little of the massive solidity of earlier types.

A prefabricated iron stair provides a highly dramatic accent in this house (plan, page 118), designed by Evans Woollen III. Owners are Mr. and Mrs. T. V. Parke.
The new stairways usually have rather dramatic, often playful forms — trellis-like patterns or sculptural shapes. Generally, there is great stress on lightness and openness. New structural methods and out-of-the-ordinary materials have been experimented with to further this effect.

The use of open risers, in spite of some inherent danger from tripping, has become a near standard. Handrails, however, show a wide variety of inventiveness — from sinuous wooden shapes to shiny metal floor-to-ceiling rods or short handgrips arrayed in a decorative pattern.

A stone stair alcove forms a solid terminus for the glassed-in entry of the Lee Blair house (plan, page 146), designed by Architect George Nemeny.

Metal rods and carpeted treads enrich Brookes stairs (plan, page 134), designed by Yamasaki, Leren, and Assoes.
Contrasts of metal rods and wooden shapes stress a counterplay of elements in the staircase of this house for Dr. and Mrs. Acher White (see plan, page 194).

While yielding bold contrasts below (see photo opposite), this stairway quiets to simple lines at the second story level. Architect is Norman C. Nagle.
Actually a luxury today — considering the near-general use of excellent central heating systems — fireplaces continue to be built in all but the most stringently budgeted houses. This is probably deeply involved with the symbolism, and association with tradition, of an open fire — “the fireside” is still almost synonymous with “home.” The constant movement and changing values of an open fire also seem to provide nearly as much fascination as a TV screen.

These factors are all strongly reflected in the current designs for fireplaces. No longer a utilitarian unit doubling as a display center for assorted bibliots and ornamental treasures, the new fireplace serves more as a stage to heighten the effect of the fire itself. Simple shapes, however unusual, are most often used, with little ornamental detail.
FIREPLACES

A flush opening in a brick wall highlighted by simple linear accents forms the fireplace, flanked by storage cabinets, in the house for A. J. Faison (plan, page 166) by Bolton and Barnstone.

The hearth in the Lee Blair house, designed by architect George Nemeny, can double as a snack bar and cooking grill for delightful indoor picnics. A suspended metal hood interferes little with the view (plan, page 146).
A stage-like apron and freestanding fire screen focus attention on the fire itself in this house for J. E. Miller (plan, page 158), designed by Philip Johnson.

The unusual metal design of this fireplace revolves to face any direction in the Eichler X-100 house (plan page 150) by Jones and Emmons.

An indoor unit is backed by this fireplace for outdoor cooking at the Peter Gevald house (see plan, page 207). Architect is Frazier Overpeck.

A pierced brick hood above the fireplace becomes a decorative focus in the living room of this house (plan, page 154) designed by Robert A. Little & Associates.
The undecorated brick unit that forms the fireplace in the house designed for Mr. and Mrs. Randall P. McIntyre serves also as a room divider (see plan, page 175). Flues are painted soft colors to minimize bulk. The brick itself is painted white. William W. Landsberg is the architect for the house.

This compact, metal-on-stone-slab fireplace was designed by architect George Matsumoto for his own house (plan, page 186).

Other trends worth mentioning are the re-introduction of cooking facilities in fireplaces, and a preoccupation with new variations of the Franklin stove.

Now that any social stigma cast on a servantless household is pretty well a thing of the past, cooking is becoming more of a ritual to be performed before assembled guests. Grills, rotissaries and the like are in fireplaces indoors and out. Some fireplaces, as the example on page 217, are even designed with a table surface for eating.

The "stove" approach stems, no doubt, from the variety of light shapes possible in metal, and the ease with which they can be prefabricated. Their light weight also eliminates the usual heavy foundations, with a resulting saving in cost and freedom of placement.
Brightness, views and neat cabinetry are as carefully considered in the design of this kitchen as they are in the living area (see plan, page 110). Architect John Hancock Cullender has made the kitchen a prominent, beautiful element in this house for Mr. and Mrs. Langdon S. Simons, Jr.
Kitchens — which not too long ago were scientific-looking little "nooks" shelved away in a corner of the house, where a part-time housewife could have a go at cooking with the cold efficiency of a laboratory technician — are now regaining their innately intended role as a major family room.

Since the advent of labor-saving automatic equipment, domestic help, with the exception of occasional part-time maids, has disappeared from the scene, and more and more women are gladly resuming duties as mistresses of the kitchen. Families, too, are returning to the kitchen for a warm and comfortable place to enjoy snacks and informal meals. As a family room, kitchens now boast of brightness, views, ample space, and cheerful atmosphere.
Influenced by its revived role as a family room, the kitchen begins to take on the same atmosphere as the rest of the house. If the family has a relatively formal living pattern, the kitchen reflects this pattern by way of elegant cabinetry and rich materials. In an informal household, more space is provided for kitchen dining, sometimes with a fireplace nearby (see photo of kitchen designed by Robert A. Little & Assoc., above), and such unusual kitchen materials as brick are used to yield a sense of warmth, security, and cheerful companionship (see photo of W. C. Muchow kitchen, page 225). Unpainted woods, with their wide variety of natural grains, are used predominately for cabinets. Much attention is given to fine detailing in the design of the cabinetry.
Architects Jones and Emmons have built ovens into a cabinet at the end of the dining table in the kitchen of the Eichler house. The table pulls apart to reveal two supplementary burners. (See plan, page 150.)
Fine detailing in the kitchen of the house for Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Fertel is expressed in the neatness with which cabinets and equipment fit together. Architects Bolton and Barnstone have so arranged the breakfast area that it can be opened to the kitchen or closed off. A glass door opens onto an outdoor breakfast patio. (See plan, page 166.)

Counters and cabinets are used to display equipment and supplies decoratively, adding warmth and charm to this kitchen. A pass-through opens directly to the dining room table in the living area. The U-shaped kitchen was designed by Eliot Noyes, architect and owner. (See plan, page 127.)

The luxuriousness of the built-in cabinets gives a living-room quality to this combination kitchen-dining room designed by owner-architect Edward L. Barnes. The table can be moved into the living room for formal dinners. (See plan, page 142.)
The size of the kitchen continues to vary according to the stress people put on cooking, but flexible partitions have become useful, and decorative, devices for expanding and contracting the kitchen space to meet the demands of a particular situation. The kitchen of the Philip M. Tiller house (see photo, page 234), for example, can be closed off from the dining area in the case of a formal dinner by means of a sliding mural wall—or it can be thrown open to double the kitchen space and assume a "family room" character. Pass-throughs are convenient devices for expediting food service from the kitchen to the dining area. In many cases, the kitchen opens directly into the living-dining areas, and sometimes is actually a part of these areas, but there is generally some way of shutting it off for formal occasions. Built-in equipment frees work space.

Easy supervision of children at play can be effected from the kitchen of the W. C. Muchow house. Only a screen separates the upper level from cooking area (see plan, page 130). The oven is built into a brick unit. Architect Muchow designed the house for his family.
BATHROOMS

"Pleasantness" as a design concept has overtaken even the bathroom—which was, for a long period, the most starkly antiseptic area in the house. Except for the hesitant introduction of color in the tiles or fixtures, and a band or monogram on the towels, all was strictly planned for utility and ease of maintenance.

Currently, wood panelling, carpets, pictures, and considered detailing of counters, storage drawers and closets, are becoming more and more prevalent. Many of the dressing and grooming facilities formerly in bedrooms are now joined with the bath, as bedrooms tend to become secondary sitting areas. The "indoor-outdoor" trend can also be noted in the bath, as in the photo far right.
Mirrored wall doubles visual space in the bathroom of Dr. Asher White (plan, page 194).

A round bathroom forms a compact island unit in the G. E. Rosenau house (see plan, page 139).

Unique features of Leo Frediani bathroom include window wall, wood tub (plan, page 162).

This extremely simple but luxurious bathroom was designed for the A. J. Farfel house by architects Bolton & Barnstone (plan, page 166). Light globes surrounding mirror are coated; counter top is marble.
The self-service aspect of our lives, coupled with the added leisure time that we have at home, has caused the assemblage of more (and more attractive) things to store, and the demand that they be as close as possible to the point of use. With no "Jeeves" on call, the general storage catch-all (relegated to the service area of the house) has become highly inconvenient.

Fewer and smaller rooms in houses have compounded the problem; there isn't enough room for separate, isolated pieces of furniture for storage. And multipurpose rooms, which must constantly and quickly change function, also complicate things.

The architectural answer to all this has been, naturally, to neatly build-in more facilities as these photos indicate.
STORAGE AND BUILT-INS

Bar and serving pantry in the Fosfel house (plan, page 166) is compact and neatly arranged. Panelled doors lead to dining area.

A fireplace wall serves to divide the living area from the study area in the Eliot Noyes house (plan, page 127). Ample shelving is provided for library, hobby equipment.

Structure of the Sheffer house (plan page 198), combines many built-in functional and architectural elements (bookcases, etc.)
Built-ins have included nearly all types of "furniture"—seating, tables, bars, bookcases, desks, beds, radio-phonograph and other equipment. But most concentrate mainly on storage units; individual chairs and tables usually permit more flexibility in room arrangement.

The built-ins are incorporated most frequently in "storage walls" or room-dividers; sometimes they are made as inconspicuous as possible, as in the paneled wall of the Simons house dining area. Others, as in the Matsumoto house, are treated more as furniture. And there are bits of whimsy—as the Tiller house table.
This built-in serves as a divider between dining area and kitchen in Simons house (plan, page 110). Wood panels conceal storage cabinets which open both ways.

Much storage space within a small house is provided for by this wall of cabinets and bookcases, designed by William W. Landsberg (see plan, page 175).

This crisp, white buffet and serving counter doubles as a room divider and a storage place in the house by the Architects Collaborative (see plan, page 202).
DUAL PURPOSE ROOMS

Shoji screens open up to make living room and general family room one large area in the Gustave E. Rosenau house, designed by Architects Davis, Brady and Winlemewski. Wall of round bathroom can be seen in this view (plan, page 139).

In the Leo Frediani house, shoji screens close off one alcove to provide a guest bedroom (see plan, page 162). Screens also close off another alcove which can serve as a writing room. The house was designed by Mario Corbett.
An accordion wall forms a corridor which doubles as sitting space when the wall is closed, or a breakfast counter when the wall is pushed back. Or, the counter can be used as a serving pass-through to court. House by Designers & Builders (see plan, page 198).

As Russell Lynes pointed out in his article, there is a most conscious effort underway to make our smaller houses function as commodiously as the large ones of an earlier era.

Dual-purpose, or multi-use, rooms are a prime means being developed to further this end — and with considerable success. We are certainly used to the living-dining area idea by now; the same thinking is being applied to each room in the house. They are planned to change, chameleon like, to suit different activities that previously required a separate room. Some change in use only, with equipment that can be concealed or not; others are easily divisible by disappearing (folding, sliding, etc.) partitions to make two or more areas.
The completely open-plan, which makes the entire house into one multi-purpose room has a great disadvantage for most families — there is no place for a private retreat, or for two antipathetic group activities to be carried on at the same time.

In place of this, there is an increasing tendency to have several rooms, but to make each room more of a living room. Bedrooms, with their sofa-beds and sitting room furniture are indicative of this. Perhaps the ultimate, if this idea is followed, will be a multi-use room for each family member, and a large one (adjoining general service areas) for the entire group.

Sliding panels open to reveal the full length of the kitchen in the house of Mr. and Mrs. Philip M. Tiller, Jr. (See plan, page 114.) Closed, the kitchen is hidden behind a decorative mural which can be rearranged in numerous patterns. Lawrence Saunders and Calongue designed the house.
An accordion wall divides one large room into a sleeping area and a play area for children, or into two separate children's bedrooms in the house designed for Mr. and Mrs. Franklin E. Schaffer by Designers and Builders. (See plan, page 198.)

Sleeping, bath, and dressing facilities are confined to a simple area in the house designed for Mr. and Mrs. Peter Goodland (plan, page 207). Architect Frazier Overpeck, by carefully relating and detailing built-ins, has created extra space.

Shoji screens separate the dining and living areas in the house designed by Paul Hayden Kirk (see plan, page 171). The screens can be opened to bring both areas into close relationship with the court for extra entertaining space.
This lovely court links all the rooms of the Peter Gowland house (see plan, page 207) with the swimming pool and outdoor fireplace, while maintaining great privacy indoors. Architect is Frazier Overpeck.

One of the major phenomena that has affected our houses is the trend toward outdoor living. Among other influences — the movies, and the California way of life, increased leisure, and the fact that we work more indoors at our jobs — is certainly the strong desire to expand our shrinking indoor living space. Visually at all times, and actually in fine weather, terraces and courts opening into rooms add an enormous feeling of spaciousness.

Advances in technology have done much to foster this trend; better heating, insulating, glazing, lighting. And there is also the little-acknowledged fact that public protection has advanced to the point that we feel quite secure in our homes. About the only real barriers erected in many homes are those against the weather and those to give privacy. Outdoor living facilities are also becoming somewhat of a “prestige” item, serving much in the manner that imposing façades and front lawns did before. But now they are private areas rather than ones for general public display.

Screened-in areas on each side of the John H. Meehan house trebles the size of the living area (see plan, page 125). These courts serve as corridors from room to room. Overhangs afford protection. Architect is Rufus Nims.

A central courtyard links two separate wings and becomes an outdoor “room” in the Eliot Noyes house (see plan, page 127). Connection is made by way of a covered walk. Patio serves for informal dining.
An access to three terraces is provided off the master bedroom of the Leo Frediani house (see plan, page 162). The entrance court is relatively and conveniently informal for this rather secluded country house designed by Mario Corbett.
A walled-in site and portions of the house raised on stilts add an enormous amount of outdoor living area to the Tiller house (plan, page 114). Architects are Lawrence, Saunders & Calonge.

Baffled walls at the entrance conceal an unexpected view of the pleasant Japanese garden which is part of the Rosenau house (plan, page 139), by Davis, Brody & Wisiewski.

Stepped levels and terraces create a series of "outdoor rooms" and help link the two floor levels of the Lewis J. Dowell house which rest on a sloping site (see plan, page 171). Architect is Paul Hayden Kirk.
As can be noted by leafing through this issue, terraces and courts are used in many ways and places in our houses — at the entrance, in the center of the house, or at the back. Besides living space, they provide major decorative functions, and often greatly reduce maintenance requirements of the grounds; cultivated planting is confined to court areas, and the rest of the grounds are left in a more-or-less natural state, with only occasional rough mowing. Partial paving further reduces upkeep of the courts.

In areas where insects are a major problem, distinctive ways are used to screen terraces.

*This courtyard is walled in and partially paved, which adds great privacy and extra living space to a city house (see plan, page 182). Architects are Curtis and Davis.*

*The approximate U shape of the Franklin E. Schaffer house (see plan, page 198) provides space for a courtyard where children can play, and for outdoor dining which is directly accessible to entrance, kitchen, etc. Architects are Designers & Builders.*
THE ARCHITECTS OF RECORD HOUSES OF 1957

Houses designed by the following firms and individuals appear on pages noted

23 E. 67th St. EDWARD LARRABEE BARNES, ARCHITECT 140
New York City, N. Y.
Edward L. Barnes, A.I.A.

811 Lovett
BOLTON AND BARNSTONE, ARCHITECTS 164
Houston 6, Tex.
Preston M. Bolton, A.I.A.
Howard Barnstone, A.I.A.

33 W. 42nd St. JOHN HANCOCK CALLENDER, ARCHITECT 108
New York City 18, N. Y.
John H. Callender, A.I.A.

1304 Montgomery St. MARIO CORBETT, ARCHITECT 160
San Francisco 11, Calif.
Mario F. Corbett, A.I.A.

338 Baronne St. CURTIS AND DAVIS, ARCHITECTS 180
New Orleans, La.
Nathaniel C. Curtis, A.I.A.
Arthur Q. Davis, A.I.A.

220 E. 23rd St. DAVIS, BRODY AND WISNIEWSKI 136
New York City, N. Y.
(Formerly Davis, Brody
Jaster and Wisniewski)
Lewis Davis, A.I.A.
Samuel Brody, A.I.A.
Clement Wisniewski, A.I.A.

265 Church St. DESIGNERS AND BUILDERS 196
New Haven, Conn.
Fred J. Mahaffey
David B. V. Toomers
Howard H. Perry

89 Main St. PHILIP JOHNSON, ARCHITECT 156
New Canaan, Conn.
Philip C. Johnson, A.I.A.

12248 Santa Monica Blvd. JONES AND EMMONS, ARCHITECTS 148
Los Angeles 25, Cal.
A. Quincy Jones, A.I.A.
Frederick E. Emmons, A.I.A.

615 Lakeview Blvd. PAUL HAYDEN KIRK, ARCHITECT 168
Seattle 2, Wash.
Paul H. Kirk, A.I.A.

5 Tsiandeh Rd. WILLIAM W. LANDSBERG, ARCHITECT 172
Port Washington, L. I., N. Y.
William W. Landsberg, A.I.A.

1114-e South Carrollton Ave. LAWRENCE, SAUNDERS & CALONGNE 112
New Orleans, La.
(All are on faculty of Tulane U.)
John W. Lawrence, A.I.A.
George A. Saunders, A.I.A.
William F. Calongne, Jr.

1303 Prospect Ave. ROBERT A. LITTLE & ASSOCS. 152
Cleveland 15, Ohio
Robert A. Little, A.I.A.

188 MALONE AND HOOPER, ARCHITECTS 402 Jackson St.
San Francisco 11, Calif.
Adrian H. Malone, A.I.A.
Roger Hoofer

184 GEORGE MATSUMOTO, ARCHITECT 621 Ronanmide Rd.
Raleigh, N. C.
(On faculty at North Carolina
State College)
George Matsumoto, A.I.A.

128 WILLIAM C. MUCHOW, ARCHITECT 1730 Glenarm Pl.
Denver, Colorado
William Muchow, A.I.A.

192 NORMAN C. NAGLE, ARCHITECT 688 Section Bldg.
Minneapolis 15, Minn.
Norman C. Nagle, A.I.A.

144 GEORGE NEMENY, ARCHITECT 157 W. 57th St.
New York City, N. Y.
George Nemeny, A.I.A.

120 RUFUS NIMS, ARCHITECT 2682 Coral Way
Miami, Fla.
Rufus Nims

124 ELIOT F. NOYES AND ASSOCIATES 85 Main St.
New Canaan, Conn.
Eliot F. Noyes, A.I.A.

204 FRAZIER OVERPECK, ARCHITECT 695 Highree Rd.
Santa Monica, Calif.
W. Frazier Overpeck, A.I.A.

176 SHERWOOD, MILLS AND SMITH 65 Broad St.
Stanford, Conn.
Thorntn Sherrwood, A.I.A.
Willis N. Mills, A.I.A.
Lester W. Smith, A.I.A.
Carrell S. McNulty, Jr.
Thomas A. Norton
Gray Taylor, A.I.A.
A. Raymond von Brock

200 THE ARCHITECTS COLLABORATIVE 63 Brattle St.
Cambridge 38, Mass.
Jean B. Fletcher, A.I.A.
Norman Fletcher, A.I.A.
Walter Grophius, F.A.I.A.
John C. Harkness, A.I.A.
Sarah P. Harkness
Benjamin Thompson
Robert S. McMillan, A.I.A.
Louis A. McMillen

116 EVANS WOOLEN III, ARCHITECT 8 E. Market St.
Indianapolis 4, Indiana
Evans Woollen III

132 YAMASAKI, LEINWEBER & ASSOCIATES 103 W. 5th St.
Royal Oak, Mich.
Minoru Yamasaki, A.I.A.