

EAMES HOUSE
(Case Study House 8)
203 Chautauqua Boulevard
Los Angeles
Los Angeles County
California

HABS CA-2903
HABS CA-2903

WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA

REDUCED COPIES OF MEASURED DRAWINGS

FIELD RECORDS

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240-0001

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

EAMES HOUSE (CASE STUDY HOUSE 8)

HABS NO. CA-2903

Location: 203 Chautauqua Boulevard
Pacific Palisades, Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California

The Eames House (Case Study House 8) is the mid-twentieth-century residence and studio of designers Charles (1907–1978) and Ray Eames (1912–1988), and part of the Case Study House program promoted by *Arts & Architecture* magazine. The house is the focus of an irregularly shaped 1.4-acre property that occupies a bluff overlooking the Pacific Ocean in Pacific Palisades, California. The property is bounded to the west by the Corona del Mar road corridor, to the north and east by other residential properties, and to the south by the bluff and Chautauqua Boulevard.

The house is reached via a paved driveway that is entered from Chautauqua Boulevard. Three other residential properties that include structures also built for the Case Study House program share this driveway.

Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates: Zone 11 Easting 0359702 Northing 3766513

Present Owner: Charles and Ray Eames House Preservation Foundation, Inc.
203 Chautauqua Boulevard
Pacific Palisades, California

Present Occupant: Charles and Ray Eames House Preservation Foundation, Inc.

Present Use: Museum and foundation offices

Significance: The Eames House is significant as an exemplary and influential example of post-World War II modern architecture and for its association with the lives of notable designers and residents Charles and Ray Eames. The Eameses were prolific artists who played a formative role in design and popular culture during the mid-twentieth century. Perhaps best known for their molded plywood chairs and other furniture, they also worked in experimental and educational film production, graphic and industrial design, and architecture.

The Eames House is one of the best-known examples of American postwar modern residential design. It embodied the objectives of the Case Study House program, which sought to explore how the products of industrial mass production could be applied to postwar housing, and would prove highly influential in residential design during the 1950s. At the same time, the house was a remarkably personal structure. With the large, two-story living room as its focal point, the residence was a showcase of the Eameses' tastes and design priorities.

EAMES HOUSE
HABS No. CA-2903 (Page 2)

Their collection of vernacular art and craft objects contrasted with the setting of a high modern interior marked by a sparse austerity.

The house served as a promotional tool for their practice, a public representation of their personalities, a setting for their films, and a backdrop for photo shoots featuring their furniture, toys, and other designs. The subject of innumerable magazine profiles, the house and studio provided a home base for the couple's myriad talents and interests.

The house has won numerous accolades since its construction. In 1977, the American Institute of Architects bestowed upon the house its Twenty-Five Year Award. The AIA Southern California Chapter listed three factors contributing to their nomination of the house for this award: its status as the most beautiful and least altered of the Case Study houses; its integration of landscape features, such as the meadow site overlooking Santa Monica Canyon and the Pacific Ocean into the site design; and its combination of industrial assembly with a rich variety of interior spaces and collection of objects.

In the mid-1940s, Charles and Ray Eames purchased a grassy lot on a bluff in Pacific Palisades from the editor of *Arts & Architecture* magazine, John Entenza. The house they planned to build was to be part of an initiative promoted by the magazine to encourage the development of well-designed, low-cost housing prototypes. The Case Study House program, as it was known, would result in the construction of twenty-six examples of modern residential architecture designed by renowned architects such as Richard Neutra, Pierre Koenig, and Raphael Soriano, among others, between the mid-1940s and the early 1960s.

An initial design for the Eames House, developed in 1945 as a collaboration of Charles Eames and Eero Saarinen, featured a steel-framed rectangular box cantilevered perpendicularly across the site. The plan was later reworked so that the residence, a smaller detached studio, and an open paved court were aligned on a concrete pad set into the hillside, beside a concrete retaining wall, rather than extending from it. Rotating the structure parallel to the lot preserved much of the meadow that occupied the center of the site, as well as an existing row of eucalyptus trees.¹

Construction on the house began in January 1949 and was completed by the end of the year. The structure featured a steel framework of 4-inch columns and 12-inch open web steel joists. Off-the-shelf industrial steel window and wall components were customized where necessary, assembled, and attached to the frame to enclose the space. Operable and fixed window frames (some glazed and

¹ The developer and conservationist Abbot Kinney (1850–1920) was responsible for planting many eucalyptus in the area during the late nineteenth century, although it is not known whether the trees present on the Eames House site are associated with his efforts. With a fortune earned in the cigarette industry, Kinney had moved to California in the 1870s and became involved in a number of conservation and arboreal projects. As chairman of the State Forestry Bureau, he saw much potential in the Australian native eucalyptus tree and was responsible for planting thousands of seedlings throughout the region. Kinney is best known as the developer of Venice, California, as an Italian-themed community on the edge of Los Angeles. Kevin Starr, *Inventing the Dream: California through the Progressive Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 80. See also: Jared Farmer, *Trees in Paradise: A California History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2013), 134–137.

others filled with cement board), sliding glass doors, and large projecting stucco over Ferrobord panels (some with exposed cross ties and turnbuckles) formed an exterior that was rectilinear yet varied and playful. Today, the exterior facade of the house continues to feature a mix of translucent glass panels as well as opaque blocks of primary red, blue, black, white, and “earth,” as conceived by the Eameses. A gold leaf panel denotes the main dwelling doorway; a large red panel denotes the sliding door of the studio entrance; windows are surrounded by steel H-columns painted black.

Exposed steel decking forms the second floor loft, ceiling/roof, and exterior cladding on the west elevation. On the inside, expanses of glass and sliding doors provide open views and easy access to the patios and the landscape beyond. The branches of overhanging eucalyptus trees filter and pattern the light thrown on interior walls and floors.

PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History:

1. Date of construction: 1949

Initial construction of the Eames House was first reported in January 1949 in *Arts & Architecture* magazine. Subsequent issues over the course of the year charted the house’s development in textual descriptions and photographs. The February issue showed the finished concrete slab and the concrete retaining wall with the forms still in place. The following month, photos depicted the assembled steel columns and open web joists. A team of five laborers erected the steel structural system in one and one-half days. The April issue included a single image of the house with roof and floor decking complete, and the first of the projecting steel window units installed. According to the magazine, the roof was completed in three days by one laborer. The magazine’s December issue showed the house essentially complete and sparsely decorated. The owners moved in on December 24, 1949.

2. Architects: Charles Eames and Ray Eames; Consulting Architect: Kenneth Acker

The first (1945) design for the site is attributed to Charles Eames and Eero Saarinen, with Edgardo Contini serving as a structural consultant. Eames and Saarinen had met and collaborated on a series of furniture projects around 1940, when Eames studied and then taught at Cranbrook Academy of Art outside Detroit, Michigan, under Saarinen’s father, Eliel. The 1945 project was to be one of two houses the pair designed for adjacent lots on a meadow owned by John Entenza in Pacific Palisades. These would become Case Study House 8 (the Eames House) and Case Study House 9 (the Entenza House) The original Eames House scheme, a rectilinear steel and glass “Bridg House” extending out over the meadow, was changed radically in 1948 before construction began.² A revised design (apparently developed without Saarinen’s involvement) rotated the main structure 90 degrees to align it with the meadow, and set the lower floor of both structures partially into the western hillside. While this second design was

² Multiple sources attribute the change to a trip to New York City by Charles Eames in 1947, during which he saw the similarity between his design and an earlier (1934) unbuilt design by Mies van der Rohe at the Museum of Modern Art.

originally attributed to Charles Eames alone, more recent scholarship acknowledges the essential role Ray Eames played in developing the house for which she was co-client and co-occupant. Because neither was a licensed architect, they relied on Kenneth Acker to draft and sign construction drawings. Acker also served as the architect of record for the Eameses' unbuilt design for a house for director Billy Wilder that was to be constructed on a hillside site on Sunset Boulevard in Los Angeles.

3. Original and subsequent owners, occupants, uses:

Charles and Ray Eames were among the most influential and well-known designers of the twentieth century. Their house served as a space for living, entertaining, working, and promoting their work throughout the remainder of their lives; Charles and Ray Eames lived in the house until their respective deaths in 1978 and 1988. Following Ray Eames's death their daughter, Lucia Eames, inherited the property. In 2004, Lucia Eames established the Charles and Ray Eames House Preservation Foundation, Inc. (Eames Foundation), to which she transferred ownership of the house. This not-for-profit organization has as its mission the preservation of the house and the continuation of its role as a tool for celebrating the Eames legacy. Today the house continues to serve as a center for educational initiatives about its owners and their work and, with the involvement of the Getty Conservation Institute's Conserving Modern Architecture Initiative, is also a center of study on the preservation of architecture from the recent past.

4. Builder, contractor, suppliers:

The general contractor for the Eames House was Lamport, Cofer, Salzman, Inc. The firm, led by principals Paul Lamport of Hollywood, Jack Cofer of San Francisco, and Henry Salzman of the Midwest, was among the most notable contractors involved in postwar modernist building projects in Southern California. Craig Ellwood, who would later become a prominent modernist designer in his own right, worked with the firm early in his career. Ellwood (whose real name was Jon Nelson Burke) served as cost estimator for the Eames House project as well as the house for John Entenza, which Lamport, Cofer, Salzman, Inc., also built. California Cornice, Steel & Supply Corporation in Los Angeles provided steel structural drawings dated December 1948, which indicate field connections, cuts, and welds. Drawings dated October 14, 1948, list the Los Angeles firm Mackintosh & Mackintosh as consulting engineers.

As a part of the Case Study House program, the Eames House was intended from the beginning to serve as a showplace for modern materials and assemblies. The April 1949 issue of *Arts & Architecture* promised, "Materials long used in common practice, by the very directness of their application here, take on a new freshness."³ Magazine articles, advertisements, and other promotional literature mentioned the names of the companies and corporations whose products were featured in the house. A partial list includes:

Structure and Envelope

Kaiser Steel: H-columns

Truscon Steel Company: "O-T" open truss (open web) steel joists, "Ferrobord" steel

³ The list of products and manufacturers was assembled through a review of various references included in the bibliography, most notably the January 1949, April 1949, and July 1949 issues of *Arts & Architecture* magazine.

EAMES HOUSE
HABS No. CA-2903 (Page 5)

roof deck, architectural projected steel window, diamond mesh steel lath

Celotex Corporation: Cemesto Board, Building Board, Preseal Roof Insulation, roofing felt

Mississippi Glass Company: Factrolite obscure glass

Ventilation and Heating

Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Company

The Payne Furnace Company

Pryne & Company, Inc.: Blo-Fan Electric Ventilator Heatilator

Payne Forced Air Unit

Plumbing and Fixtures

Kohler Company: kitchen sink, bath fixtures

W. A. Case & Son Manufacturing Company: plumbing fixtures (bathroom lavatory)

Binswanger and Company: Gulfspray shower enclosure

Harvey Machine Company, Inc.: Harcraft plumbing fixtures

Flooring and Interior Finishes and Partitions

United States Plywood Corporation: hardwood plywoods and Decorative Micarta

Voit: rubber tile

Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, Inc.

Chicopee Manufacturing Company: Lumite Plastic Screening

Alexander Smith & Sons: Crystal Point carpet

Modern Building Specialties Co.: Modernfold Accordion doors

Roberts Company: tackless carpet gripper

E. L. Bruce Company

Swedlow Plastics Company

Textiles and Wall Coverings

Klearflax Linen Looms, Inc.

Deering Milliken & Company: drapery fabrics

Laverne Original: Squared Circle printed fabric and wallpaper design

C. W. Stockwell Company

Swedlow Company, California Panel & Veneer Company: Plyon wall laminate

Cabinets and Counters

The Formica Company

American Cabinet Hardware Corporation

Republic Steel, Berger Manufacturing Division: All-Steel kitchen cabinets

Knape & Vogt Manufacturing Co.

Lighting and Electrical

Gotham Lighting Corporation: Downlites and Formlites

Cannon Electric Development Company: Cannon Pathfinder Lights

Kierulff and Company

Century Lighting, Inc.: Reflectolites, Recessed Ceiling Fresnelites, and Projectolites

Bell Electric Company: No-Shok electrical outlets

Heavy Appliances

American Stove Company

The Blackstone Corporation: automatic clothes washer and dryer

Kelvinator: "Automatic Cook" electric range, FR-9 home freezer, Moist-Master refrigerator

EAMES HOUSE
HABS No. CA-2903 (Page 6)

Light and Hand Appliances

Sunbeam Corporation: automatic kitchen appliances (Wafflemaster, Coffeemaster, Mixmaster, Ironmaster, Shavemaster, Toaster)

Hardware and Other Accessories

Grant Pulley & Hardware Company

Kirsch: drapery hardware

Bobrick Manufacturing Corporation: lotion dispenser

Howard Miller Company: Wall-Hung Chronopak (clock)

Sunmaster: automatic clothesline

Meilink Steel Safe Company: Hercules closet vault

Altec Lansing Corporation: home music system

Flush Wall Radio Company: kitchen wall-mounted radio

American Device Manufacturing Company: built-in mail box with flexible chute

The Eameses employed available “industrial technology to provide . . . an ‘unselfconscious’ enclosure that would satisfy the essentials for comfortable living. Such a structure could then be made into a personal statement by the occupant, who could fill it with the accessories of his or her own life.”⁴ During the period in which Charles and Ray Eames lived in the house, it featured a constantly evolving collection of sculptural works, rugs, pillows, toys, dolls, masks, paintings, and other artifacts. Acquired during their travels and received as gifts, the objects reflected the couple’s appreciation for vernacular craft traditions that revealed something about the processes and materials with which they were made.

The house also became a repository of objects developed by Charles and Ray Eames for their various projects. The couple often brought furnishings from their workshop at 901 Washington Boulevard in Venice, California, to the house to photograph and evaluate them in a residential setting. Describing the house in 1984, Ray noted, “Most of whatever is here is something that was just brought over and left.”⁵ Some were fixtures of the house, appearing in magazine articles and advertisements and thus becoming closely associated with the couple. For example, a black wood crow carved by central Illinois folk artists Charles and Edna Perdew was often visible in photos of the living room and was used as a prop in photos of the Eames wire chairs.⁶ Objects were also placed on and around the house exterior—a revolving bell by the door, sculptures and carvings on the south porch and central courtyard—to enliven the space, provide handmade counterpoints to the industrial aesthetic of the structure, and suggest the owners’ myriad interests. Some objects, such as the surviving 15-foot-tall, gravity-powered xylophone on the south wall of the studio, were relocated to the house from the office following Charles and Ray’s deaths.

The display of these objects within the house departed from common representations of the modern interior as a sparse, even sterile place, toward one showing active occupation and personalization. Robert Venturi lauded the Eameses’ eclectic propensity for filling their house with objects as a reinvention of “good Victorian

⁴ John Neuhart, Marilyn Neuhart, and Ray Eames, *Eames Design: The Work of the Office of Charles Eames and Ray Eames* (New York, New York: Abrams, 1989), 356, as quoted in Beatriz Colomina, “Reflections on the Eames House” in *The Legacy of Charles and Ray Eames: A Legacy of Invention* (New York, New York: Abrams, 1997), 128–129.

⁵ Doris Saatchi, “All About Eames,” *House & Garden*, February 11 (1984), 200.

⁶ See, for example, the June 1952 cover of the British magazine *Architectural Review*.

clutter.”⁷ While the selection of each individual piece was important, so was its arrangement in relation to adjacent objects and to the setting itself. Rough-surfaced objects were juxtaposed with smooth surfaces; darks and lights, and colorful and monochrome elements all coexisted. Such a process of composition was characteristic of the couple’s overall approach to design—calling attention to everyday items of aesthetic interest and utility through their relationship with other objects. The catalogue for the 1946 exhibition *For Modern Living* at the Detroit Institute for the Arts noted this approach in describing the Eames-designed room at the exhibit. There, the display of objects chosen “from daily use” or “selected for some quality” suggested that “the enjoyment of any two objects is increased proportionally by their proper relation to each other.”⁸

5. Original plans and construction:

Plans for the Eames House were first published in *Arts & Architecture* magazine in December 1945. As noted above, the original design, attributed to Charles Eames and Eero Saarinen, was for a steel and glass rectangular “Bridge House” that extended from the hillside on the northeast of the site below Corona del Mar. The structure was to be supported on two steel H-columns and cantilevered across the property and perpendicular to the meadow to allow for expansive views toward the Pacific Ocean. A smaller studio building of similar construction would be detached from the main residence. However, after the fabricated steel arrived at the building site, Eames reconsidered the bridge design. Most sources attribute the change to the Eameses’ dissatisfaction with the amount of space enclosed by the materials specified, a growing reluctance by Charles and Ray to bisect the meadow space that they had come to appreciate, and the discovery that the “Bridge” project was similar to earlier unbuilt designs by Mies van der Rohe and Eero Saarinen.

The final plan took the rectangular volume of the original project and embedded it into the partially excavated hillside parallel to the meadow. The studio space remained a separate volume but was now aligned with the main house (to the north) and the interstitial space, which was used as a brick-paved courtyard. In the process of finalizing the design, some elements evolved or were omitted. Drawings dated October 1948 called for corrugated glass in the upper half of the two northernmost bays on the east elevation of the studio, and three light window units with central projecting sash for the ground level and upper south edge of the studio east elevation, as well as for all units on the west elevation of the studio and the residence. Later drawings relocated the corrugated glass to the northernmost bay on the residence ground level (along the dining room). All of these plans were eventually modified, as reflected in the fenestration pattern currently found on the structure. In the finished structure, the only corrugated glass is the interior partition between the kitchen and the utility area. Drawings showed the original intention of locating a freestanding fireplace at the north end of the living room between the east corridor and the alcove. This was abandoned on the advice of Eero Saarinen. Revised drawings from March 1949 called for installation of a fireplace within the plaster wall at the south side of the full height studio space. The same drawings omitted earlier plans to install sliding panels in the

⁷ Esther McCoy, “An Affection for Objects,” *Progressive Architecture* 54 (August 1973), 67.

⁸ A. W. Girard and W. D. Laurie, Jr., *An Exhibition for Modern Living* (Detroit: Detroit Institute of Arts, 1949), 81.

EAMES HOUSE
HABS No. CA-2903 (Page 8)

loft area on this same wall. Sometime before construction, the fireplace and its chimney were likewise omitted.⁹

The current appearance of the house matches nearly exactly the structure completed in 1949. The main house is 51 feet long, 20 feet wide, and 20 feet high, enclosing approximately 1,500 square feet; the studio is 37 feet long and has an area of 1,000 square feet. The two structures and the court that separates them are divided into seventeen bays that are each 7-1/2 feet wide. The residence is eight bays, the court is four bays, and the studio is five bays as measured along the north-south axis. Four-inch steel H-columns, 12-inch open web steel trusses, and steel decking form the basic structural system that supports a series of steel-framed panels with solid and glazed infill. All steel members were originally painted a warm medium gray (though they currently have a glossy black finish). Both the relationship of the glass and infill panels (the relationship of transparent to opaque, solid to void) and the careful use of color (red, blue, black, white, and “earth,”) on the panels provide a geometric rhythm and a sense of variation to the exterior elevations.

6. Alterations and additions:

Both the residence and the studio are remarkably intact despite the passage of more than sixty years, the experimental nature of their construction, and the coastal climate in which they are sited. Alterations made to the interior and exterior have been minimal, and no additions have been appended to the original structures. Descriptions of the house in postwar architectural magazines suggested that the design of the house would allow for the easy rearrangement of its glass and infill window compositions according to the changing whims of the owner. One magazine wrote that the wall units were fixed, “at least until Eames should decide to knock them out and replace them with some material of different texture or translucency.”¹⁰ A comparison of the house’s original configuration to its present condition, however, suggests that such alterations were never undertaken. In fact, the arrangement of window openings and infill panels today is the same as that described in the early 1950s, soon after the house was erected.

At some point before 1955, the floor of the living room and the hallway between the living room and the dining room, which were originally exposed concrete, were finished with light colored 9-inch by 9-inch asbestos tiles. Also in the first years after construction was completed, an open staircase with steel side and handrails and wood treads replaced a painter’s ladder as the means to reach the studio loft. In 1958 parquet wood flooring covered the studio’s original concrete floor.

The buildings have undergone regular maintenance and several more substantial repair campaigns. The steel frame and stucco panels have been repeatedly repainted with close approximations of the original colors in order to inhibit corrosion and deterioration. The studio’s parquet floor tile was taken up and relaid in a different pattern, and stainless steel fittings substituted for the original brass fittings on the large sliding doors. The canvas carport covering has been replaced several times. Around 1990 most of the built-up roof was replaced to address drainage issues (collected

⁹ Drawings published in September 1949 depict both fireplaces. “Case Study House for 1949: The Interiors,” *Arts & Architecture*, September 1949, 33. Ray Eames made reference to Eero Saarinen’s influence in omitting the fireplaces, as noted in Pat Kirkham, “Introducing Ray Eames (1912–1988),” *Furniture History*, 26 (1990), 136.

¹⁰ “Life in a Chinese Kite,” *Architectural Forum* 93 (September 1950), 94.

rainwater spilled down the walls, where it penetrated window frames and the concrete retaining wall). In 2011, conservators from the Getty Conservation Institute investigated the tallowwood paneling on the house's west interior wall and guided a cleaning and revarnishing project that restored the original appearance. Also at that time, the asbestos floor tiles in the living room, which had grown brittle over the decades, were replaced, while a liquid moisture barrier was applied between the tiles and the concrete slab below.

In nominating the house for the AIA's Twenty-Five Year Award in 1977, Esther McCoy wrote that it was the only one of the Case Study houses "in its pristine form." According to McCoy, "The house has remained almost unchanged since 1949."¹¹ Thirty-seven years later, this characterization still holds. The original structural system, the residential and studio volumes, the interior layouts, and the landscaping and site remain essentially unchanged since the period of construction.

While little was added or altered in the house, the function of some spaces within the residence and the studio did evolve over time. During the lifetimes of Charles and Ray Eames, the studio frequently served as a guest space (or a space where the couple retired to allow their guests the use of the master bedroom in the house). As the Eameses began to relocate their photographic development equipment to their workshop in Venice, the darkroom became a storage space. The studio itself served as a guest room. The Eames Office, led by the Eameses' daughter Lucia and her son Eames Demetrios, later moved to the studio building, where it remained until 2004. Today the studio is the headquarters of the Eames Foundation.

B. Historical Context:

Charles and Ray Eames

Charles Eames was born in St. Louis, Missouri, in 1907. As a youth he worked part-time for an industrial firm where he was first exposed to architectural and engineering ideas. He studied architecture for two years at Washington University in St. Louis before leaving to establish his own architectural practice.¹² In 1938, Finnish architect Eliel Saarinen invited Charles to study architecture at Cranbrook Academy after seeing Eames's 1935–1936 design for St. Mary's Catholic Church in Helena, Arkansas, in *Architectural Forum*. Eames began teaching as the head of Cranbrook's Department of Industrial Design in 1940. Ray and Charles met at Cranbrook and married in 1941. The following year they moved to the West Coast.

Born in 1912 in Sacramento, Bernice Alexandra "Ray" Kaiser studied at Bennett Woman's College in Millbrook, New York. She moved to New York City in 1933, where she immersed herself in the modern art movement. Ray studied painting with the German abstract expressionist Hans Hofmann, working with him in New York City and in Gloucester and Provincetown, Massachusetts. She was a founding member of the American Abstract Artists group in 1936. In 1940 she began studies at Cranbrook Academy.

In Los Angeles, Charles and Ray Eames first lived in a hotel and then in an apartment, where in a spare bedroom they experimented with methods of molding plywood for various applications.

¹¹ Quoted in "The Eames House . . . 28 Years Later," *L.A. Architect*, October 1977, n.p.

¹² Archival materials indicate that in the 1930s Charles Eames participated in the documentation of the Jean Baptiste Valle House in Ste. Genevieve, Missouri, for the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS).

These experiments were a continuation of work on plywood furniture that Charles had started at Cranbrook with Eero Saarinen, and which was featured in a competition and exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City in the early 1940s. During the war, the U.S. Navy commissioned the Eameses to oversee production of a plywood leg splint that the couple had developed. Charles also designed sets for the architecture department at MGM Studios. The couple befriended John Entenza, who had taken over as publisher of *California Arts & Architecture* magazine in 1938, and was remaking the journal as a premier voice for West Coast Modernism. Charles served as an editorial associate of the renamed *Arts & Architecture* magazine, writing articles and providing photographs; Ray served on the advisory board, wrote an article, and designed twenty-four covers for the magazine.

Case Study House Program

During World War II, American designers and industrialists began to identify ways to redirect wartime industrial capacity toward the mass production of postwar housing. The goal was to bring modern materials—as well as the speed, efficiency, and cost savings of the assembly line—to residential construction. Announced in January 1945, the Case Study House program was aligned with these goals. It was the brainchild of John Entenza, who promoted the program through *Arts & Architecture* magazine. Entenza announced that his magazine would serve as the client for a series of architect-designed houses built and furnished using techniques and materials derived from the experience of the Second World War, and expressively suited to life in the modern world. Entenza intended the term “Case Study” to refer to the idea of exploring the needs of a hypothetical or real client through the design process. The magazine planned to publish the house plans for the benefit of its readers. In all, the magazine published thirty-five plans, twenty-six of which were built in California and Arizona through the mid-1960s.

The Case Study House program prompted architects to develop specific solutions to the challenges of postwar mass production housing and to test those solutions through actual construction. By encouraging experimentation with different construction processes and materials, the program was intended to stimulate production (and interest) in high-quality, easily-replicated homes that utilized up-to-date technology. The program was a successor to an earlier housing design initiative Entenza had sponsored through the magazine, the 1943 competition “Designs for Postwar Living.” Both projects were part of a longer tradition of magazines promoting and normalizing innovations in residential design that stretched back to the nineteenth century.

Entenza initially proposed eight houses by well-known contemporary designers including Richard Neutra, William Wurster, Ralph Rapson, and Eero Saarinen. The program description specified that each house would address a specific “problem” and called for “the best materials to be used in the best possible way in order to arrive at a ‘good’ solution of each problem, which in the over-all program will be general enough to be of practical assistance to the average American in search of a home in which he can afford to live.”¹³ Each house was to be opened for public viewing during a six to eight week period following construction. While the magazine was presented as the “client,” it did not fund construction of the designs. Only those projects that had paying clients were built.

Charles and Ray Eames served as both clients and designers of the house at 203 Chautauqua Avenue. The house was designed for a married couple who wanted a home studio space to accommodate their work in design and the graphic arts. As clients, the Eames wanted the house

¹³ John Entenza, “Announcement: The Case Study House Program,” *Arts & Architecture*, January 1945, 38.

to require little in the way of maintenance, and to offer connections to the natural environment, or, as Charles is known to have suggested, support “life in work,” with nature acting as a “shock-absorber.” The house created by Charles and Ray Eames offered them a space where work, play, life, and nature co-existed. Deferring to the landscape in its placement, and screened by the permeable edge of eucalyptus trees, the house is designed to be a single component of its environment, not the main focus. The Eameses quickly recognized the importance of the meadow to their site as representing the shock absorber they had sought to weave into the design of their house. The final design, which represented a reworking of the original plan that featured an object building in the middle of a field, preserved the meadow and made it a part of the site design.

The Eames House was constructed on part of a 5 acre bluff overlooking the ocean in Pacific Palisades, California, which John Entenza had purchased from the estate of actor and author Will Rogers in 1945. Entenza subdivided this tract into six lots. Four parcels (lots 3 through 6) were sold in 1947, two of which became sites for Case Study houses designed by Richard Neutra and Rodney Walker (both constructed in 1948 and surviving in situ).¹⁴ Case Study House 8 (the Eames House) and Case Study House 9 (the Entenza House) were built on the two largest lots constituting three acres in total. The Eames and Entenza houses shared a grassy meadow, numerous eucalyptus trees, and views out to the Pacific Ocean. As well, the houses were constructed of similar structural components, although they are distinctly different in appearance. The two structures were separated by about 200 feet and an earthen berm created in part by fill from the hillside below Corona del Mar excavated for construction of the Eames House.

Throughout their careers, Ray and Charles Eames considered their home to be a creative center and ongoing inspiration for their work. While living in their house, Charles and Ray Eames built one of the most artistically diverse, prolific, and influential design practices of the twentieth century. Extending earlier experiments with molded plywood and prefabrication, they developed a series of furnishings, most notably chairs and shelving units, that became icons of Midcentury Modernism. Their partnerships with corporate clients such as IBM and Polaroid for the production of films and exhibitions merged graphic design, educational design, and public relations in a distinctly contemporary package.

Constructing a Livable Modernism

The house has commonly been described as a collection of off-the-shelf industrial parts, selected from a catalogue and assembled into a domestic space. The analogy was often made to an object that also held great fascination for the Eameses: a toy assembly set. As *Architectural Forum* noted in 1950, all of the pieces were “detailed to be bolted together like a Meccano set.”¹⁵ Resembling an overscaled child’s construction kit, the house fulfilled its designers’ intention to provide an unpretentious and playful background for a diversity of activity. The idea of design as the rearrangement of a limited kit of parts is evident in much of the Eameses’ work. In the house, however, considerable customization and detailing of the stock parts was necessary to adapt them to a function for which they were not originally intended. Where the various components met the H-columns or where window openings were punched into the Ferrobord decking used as sheathing, gaps had to be filled and profiles modified. There are no known records documenting specifically how this was done, but numerous locations on the

¹⁴ The still extant Neutra design, at 219 Chautauqua Boulevard, was constructed in 1948 for Dr. Stuart Bailey. The Walker design, which also survives, is located at 199 Chautauqua Boulevard. It was constructed in 1948.

¹⁵ “Life in a Chinese Kite,” 93.

house—door frames, the south elevation of the residence—reveal how lengths of steel channel and prefabricated components parts were joined in ways they would not have been in a more typical industrial application. Wood, covered with the same paint used on the house, filled some of the interstitial spaces. These examples of adaptation do not diminish the stature of the house as an architectural achievement, but provide a more nuanced understanding of the challenges that the Eameses and their assembly team faced in reconciling parts made for a light industrial facility with an entirely new program of human dwelling.

In addition to the kit-of-parts quality of the materials used in construction of the dwelling, the Eames house exhibits a modular character that is also representative of Modernism. Moreover, the pattern of materials used to construct the patios reflects the modular character of the house, employing a regular geometrical order despite the use of several distinct media. Within the construct of these modules, there was flexibility in the partitioning. Everything produced could be rearranged; no layout was ever fixed.

In their work, the Eameses sought to promote a post-World War II vision of standardized production of housing from available contemporary materials. The idea of standardization, which had been perfected by the military, was very much a part of the Case Study House program's agenda, and predicated on the assumption that postwar families would prefer to live in a modern environment utilizing the most advanced technology, rather than old fashioned houses with enclosed rooms.¹⁶

To contemporary visitors, the house, with the exception of the living room, is compact both in its overall dimensions and in the portion dedicated to personal rooms, kitchen, and dining room. This austere use of space reflected design norms at the time; it was also a product of the immediate postwar economic situation of high costs and material shortages. But the room layouts, the spiral staircase, and the partitions that correspondingly served as both cabinets and storage spaces, also reflected the couple's interest in creative spatial efficiency. In contrast to the small quarters, the living room opens and soars. These very conscious decisions about apportioning space are small expressions of the Eameses' overall design philosophy, which sought to mix practicality and playfulness, efficiency and whimsy.

Modernist designers had been experimenting with steel and glass dwellings since at least the 1920s, and California was already a locus of work incorporating these materials by architects including Richard Neutra, Rudolf Schindler, and Raphael Soriano. Entenza, the Eameses, and the other modernist designers who participated in the Case Study House program sought to domesticate steel, to make it an acceptable (and eventually assumed) material for use in residential construction.¹⁷ Its ability to bridge large spans allowed steel to erase mass, and allowed glass to be substituted for opaque structural materials. Though seemingly rigid in its geometric purity and expression of structure, the Eames House was considered a successful example of how steel, glass, and infill panels could be combined in a pleasing, effective way.

¹⁶ Colomina, 136.

¹⁷ Dana Hutt, "Experimental Jet Set: Aerospace and the Modern House in Los Angeles," in *Overdrive: L.A. Constructs the Future, 1940–1990*, Wim de Wit and Christopher James Alexander, eds. (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2013), 150.

As Colin Davies noted:

. . . in the hands of another designer (Mies van der Rohe, perhaps), this formula [of steel and glass and panel] might have been worked through rigidly and dogmatically, emphasizing its symmetries and regularities, its structural articulation and its austere materials. Instead, the house is all reasonable compromise. Solid and transparent panels are arranged not according to some abstract system but to create a subtle, shifting light in the interior.¹⁸

The Eames House opened contemporary design to a broader conception of Modernism that allowed for a more personalized expression of the occupants' tastes and lifestyles. There was room in the Eameses' modern vision for both mass production and craft, for hard and plush surfaces, opaque and transparent, old and new. Their house exhibits a dialogue between these seemingly opposite ideas, or rather their harmonious integration. Many thought this warming and domestication could make Modernism more appealing to those who might otherwise be turned off by a monolithic steel and glass box. Olga Gueft, writing in the November 1950 issue of *Interiors* magazine, claimed that the house "demonstrated that the machine need not degrade or dehumanize or denaturalize us, but that it can serve as the sensitive instrument of a poetic conception—in a wooded meadow as well as on asphalt."¹⁹ Portraits of Charles and Ray Eames relaxing on the floor of their expansive living room, films of children frolicking in and out of the house and up and down the spiral stairs, and photos of Eames furnishings amongst their collection of folk objects presented the modern, light-filled house as an appropriate setting for contemporary life. The Eames considered their house to reflect the idea that architecture could contribute to the ongoing theatrical spectacle of everyday life.²⁰

California Living

In the post-World War II period the nation turned to the West Coast, home of Hollywood and the aeronautics industry, as a model for the American lifestyle. Southern California in particular presented itself as an example of informal, up-to-date living. It was an environment where Modernism had flourished during the interwar period. After the war, swimming pools, sliding glass doors, and patios were considered quintessentially Californian, as was the way they merged indoor and outdoor living. Free from East Coast traditions, Southern California was also considered a place for experimentation and reinvention. The designer Henry Dreyfuss, after relocating to Los Angeles in 1944, stated, "On the Pacific Coast there are fewer shackles on tradition. There is an unslackening development of new thought. There is a decided willingness to take a chance on new ideas."²¹

From the moment they arrived in Los Angeles in 1941, Charles and Ray Eames embraced a California lifestyle that included a professional and social network of filmmakers (like Billy Wilder), modern designers, and artists. It was a lifestyle embedded in and shaped by a warm climate and varied landscape of coast, mountain, and desert. There are many stories of the Eameses taking sleeping bag trips to various spots around the state, collecting plants and other objects along the way.

¹⁸ Colin Davies, *Key Houses of the Twentieth Century: Plans Sections and Elevations* (London: Laurence King Publishing, 2006), 106.

¹⁹ Olga Gueft, "Steel on the Meadow," *Interiors* 110, no. 4 (November 1950), 111.

²⁰ Colomina, 128.

²¹ Quoted in: Wendy Kaplan, *California Design, 1930–1965: "Living in a Modern Way,"* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011), 28.

At first consideration, their rectilinear house of steel and glass does not seem to exemplify a sympathetic relationship with the natural world in the tradition of the California vernacular ranch house or hacienda. Yet its orientation on the site and its arrangement of glazing and openings does reveal a sensitivity to the landscape and an interest in effacing traditional distinctions between interior and exterior. Its large sliding panels of glass allowed easy movement between inside and outside, and were usually kept open during agreeable weather. As with other modern designs featuring large expanses of glass, the house functioned as a clear shell that provided both shelter and connection to the outside. Extensive glazing allowed the dappled light passing through the canopy of the eucalyptus trees outside to enter and refract through the house. Placement in the hillside and the solid west wall presented the house as a camera facing out to, and framing for the occupant, views of the meadow and the ocean beyond.

By encompassing the natural features of the site, the Eameses embraced the spectacle of constantly changing light conditions, which penetrate the inside through a variety of translucent and transparent glazed panels. The interiors are enlivened by the play of light and shadows on the glass exterior of the house resulting from the adjacent eucalyptus trees. As noted by architectural historian Esther McCoy, “After 13 years of living in a house with an exposed steel frame, Ray Eames said, ‘the structure long ago ceased to exist. I am not aware of it.’ They lived in nature and its reflections—and reflections of reflections.”²² The reflections of the eucalyptus trees are a constant presence. The Eameses even replaced one of the panels on the south facade with a photograph of a reflection of the trees, suggesting that the panels were treated almost like photographic frames. The cinematic quality of the light play was a constant source of inspiration and much photographed. The Eameses also frequently photographed themselves reflected in the house.

The house also reflected the Eameses’ ongoing interest in traditional Asian design and forms, an interest shared by many others in the postwar era, especially on the West Coast. In the Eames House, the horizontally oriented divisions of the stock window frames and opaque panels set into larger, vertically oriented bays resembled the wood and paper shoji of traditional Japanese architecture. Sliding glass doors on the north and south ends of the house and the north side of the studio furthered the association. Photos of the living room taken during the 1950s show a nearly empty space with woven straw tatami mats arranged on the floor. At various times lanterns and other items evocative of Asian material culture adorned the interior. The couple’s interest in Japan extended to performance and ritual. In 1951 they hosted Charlie Chaplin, the sculptor Isamu Noguchi, and others for a tea ceremony performed by the master Shizuye Sosei in the living room.

Enduring Influence of the Eames House

As with other structures produced for the Case Study House program, the popularity and lasting influence of the Eames House was not marked by the design’s replication on a mass scale. Truscon never developed a prefabricated, mass-produced version modeled after Case Study House 8. Americans did not enthusiastically embrace either the Eames House model or other homes based on prefabrication (such as the Lustron House, with its steel frame and porcelain enamel walls).²³ Rather, the home’s influence, like that of the Case Study House program in

²² Esther McCoy, *Case Study Houses 1945–1962* (Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, 1977), 54.

²³ For a history of prefabricated housing efforts, see Barry Bergdoll and Peter Christensen, *Home Delivery: Fabricating the Modern Dwelling* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2008). The Eames House is discussed on pages 94–97.

general, was manifest in the broader dissemination of its ideas and attitudes through design and popular culture.

While the steel-framed dwelling did not prove successful as a model for other dwellings as intended by the Case Study House program, the Eames House was immediately popular and influential in other ways, and successful in disseminating ideas about integrating modern, industrially produced materials into the vocabulary of contemporary residential architecture. The narrative of the Eames House as a product of “off the shelf” factory-made materials reverberated through contemporary architectural practice. The ongoing interest among contemporary residential designers in factory finishes and assemblies demonstrates the enduring influence of the industrial aesthetic that the Eameses promoted.

The house was also influential in its frank celebration of structure. Unlike Case Study House 9 next door, with its steel framework embedded within the walls, the Eames House makes its structure explicit. The H-columns rising vertically and marking the modules, and the open web joists below the ceiling, are revealed, as are the connections between them—a composition that Edgar Kauffman described as a “gray web of steel.”²⁴ The open span and full height of the living room and studio spaces, and the light, almost gauzy skin have influenced generations of designers. Today, partly due to experimentation by the Eameses and other postwar designers, open trusses and exposed columns are accepted and desired features of contemporary residential design. Upper-level lofts opening onto cathedral-like open living rooms with a glazed end walls framing a view also appeared in a multitude of housing types that followed.

These ideas, which also emerged as part of postwar vacation home design trends and the increasing appropriation of industrial space for recreational use, were the primary contribution of the Eames House to architectural culture and to American culture in general. However, several dwellings also used the house more literally as a point of departure to explore the use of standardized building systems in residential design. Peter De Bretteville’s 1976 Willow Glen Houses on a steep site in Laurel Canyon, California, mirror the Eames House in their industrial aesthetic and volumetric composition. Some designs have attempted to replicate the Eames House more directly. The 2001 Clarke McLeod House in Brisbane, Australia, by architect Chris Clarke emulated the industrial character of the Eames house. According to the designer it was developed as a “kindred spirit,” assembled using custom-detailed prefinished steel and aluminum components.²⁵

The fact that the Eameses occupied the house continuously for the remainder of their lives contributes to its exceptional influence. They maintained the house in a manner consistent with their original design intent, and the house facilitated and exhibited the activities and ideas they espoused. In the living room the couple entertained friends, colleagues, and representatives of their corporate patrons such as Herman Miller and IBM. But the dwelling’s influence extended far beyond architectural circles. Interiors and exteriors served as backdrops for photo shoots of their furniture designs, and profiles in *Life*, *Look*, *Sunset*, and numerous other popular magazines. Films were shot in the house and the meadow. Lastly, many designers recall how Ray and Charles Eames used their home as an educational tool. They were generous with their time and access to their home, hosting students and the architecturally curious from around the world. The home’s educational role continued with the establishment of the Eames Foundation following the death of Ray Eames in 1988. As a result, the house is a central icon of postwar

²⁴ Dorris Saachi, “All About Eames,” *House & Garden* 36 no. 2 (February 1984), 122.

²⁵ Chris Clarke, “The Tradition of the Primitive with Modern Materials—An Australian Perspective,” in *Innovation in Architecture*, ed. Alan J. Brookes and Dominique Poole (New York: Spon Press, 2004), 143.

modern culture. Its image continues to serve as a sort of visual shorthand for the body of work that the couple produced and for Midcentury Modern design in general. Today the house and studio are reproduced in a set of alphabet blocks manufactured by House Industries. Twenty wood blocks for the house and sixteen for the studio are screen printed with letters on some sides and graphics depicting the exterior elevations on others.

PART II. ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION

A. General Statement:

The Eames House and Studio are located in the residential community of Pacific Palisades in the City of Los Angeles. The two structures are oriented along an axis that runs in a generally north-south direction. The primary elevations face northeast onto a grassy meadow, with views toward the Pacific Ocean to the south. The buildings exemplify mid-twentieth century experiments by designers, architects, and industrialists to utilize factory-made building materials in the production of mass single-family home construction. Charles and Ray Eames adapted stock H-columns, steel window units, and a range of other components and materials in a distinctive, informal manner. This structural composition, combined with an eclectic (and often promotional) decorative approach, reflected the character of their professional design practice and their various interests.

1. Architectural character:

The residence and studio are two discrete glass and steel rectilinear boxes separated from each other by an outdoor paved court. They are linked visually by the same material vocabulary and composition, as well as by circulation paths on the buildings' interiors and exteriors that reinforce their axial relationship. Outside, a pathway originally made of railroad ties and currently of 2x6 planks runs immediately adjacent to the south elevation of both structures, between the exterior walls and a row of historic trees. This path is mirrored by a parallel interior corridor that runs from living room to dining room in the residence, and from the studio's south entrance to the main studio space and sliding glass door on the north elevation. Interior plans of the two structures are further related by a similar combination of loft space and open living room and studio areas that reach the full height of the structure.

The orthogonal nature of the Eames House, which suggests a rigid simplicity of construction and program, conceals considerable detailing and individuality. Off-the-shelf components were modified as necessary for domestic application. Some components, such as the doors and two staircases, were custom built. Screens and textiles countered the transparency of the steel and glass shell, while moveable wall partitions reconfigured rooms and allowed for the flexible use of space. Rugs, paintings, works of folk art, and personal mementos further softened the Eameses' brand of Modernism.

2. Condition of fabric:

The residence, studio, and site are generally in good condition and are well maintained. In response to ongoing moisture penetration, the house roof and skylight are presently covered with a woven polyethylene tarp that is not visible from grade.

Some of the projecting sash are no longer operable and a number of Cemesto infill panels have chipped or cracked, revealing the fiberboard substrate. Ongoing monitoring and evaluation by the Getty Conservation Institute will be incorporated into a conservation management plan.

B. Description of Exterior:

1. Overall dimensions:

House: 59'-0" x 20'-10" rectilinear shaped building, 18'-6" to the top of the roof.
Studio: 37'-1" x 20'-10" rectilinear shaped building, 18'-6" to the top of the roof.

2. Foundations:

Both the house and the studio structures sit on concrete slabs on grade.

3. Walls:

The structure of both the house and studio is exposed on the exterior walls of the buildings. Steel columns, painted black, line the exterior perimeter and area spaced at approximately 7 feet 4 inches. A combination of operable and fixed windows, doors, and clear and opaque panels make up the space between the exposed columns. On some elevations the columns are concealed behind a cladding made of Ferrobord steel decking that is also used on the loft floors and roofs of both structures. As a cladding, the Ferrobord is oriented vertically, and the floor or roof surface (as opposed to the standing seam ceiling underside) is exposed. A concrete retaining wall, 8 feet in height, extends continuously along the west elevation of the house and studio.

Each elevation of the house is divided into rectilinear bays defined by the steel columns. The east elevation is composed of eight bays. The south bay on the east elevation is open to the covered portion of the patio south of the house. Moving north, the next bay is defined by a buff, plaster coated wall on the second floor and a two-window assembly characteristic of those prominent throughout the structure. The buff plaster finish on the second floor continues across the next bay. At the first floor, a fixed single light window extends the width of the bay and the height of the first floor. The fourth bay from the south is defined by a typical two-window assembly at the first floor, and a twelve-light window system at the second floor. In the next bay to the north, the typical two-window assembly is present on the second level. The bottom two lights of each window assembly are filled with Cemesto board. Black-painted plaster is present at the first level. Steel rods extend from each corner of the plastered area and are connected by turnbuckles. The main entrance to the house is located on the first level of the sixth bay from the south. A six-light window is situated to the south of the steel-framed door. The door is composed of five lights. A single-light window is present over the doorway. The upper portion of the bay is blue-painted plaster. The remaining two bays on the north end of the east elevation are composed of the typical window units seen throughout the building.

EAMES HOUSE
HABS No. CA-2903 (Page 18)

Because the house is built up against the hill, only the second floor of the house is visible on the west elevation. The north portion of this elevation consists of four bays with two of the typical window assemblies in each bay. The south half of the elevation is clad with 4-inch-thick panels of Ferrobord steel decking, painted and installed so that the seams run vertically.

The south elevation is set back from the edge of the roof of the house, which partially extends over the patio. The concrete retaining wall extends south from the building at the first floor. Two single-light windows and a steel-framed sliding door are present at the first floor. Above, a set of six jalousie windows is located along the east end of the elevation and two, eight-light fixed windows are located to the west.

The north elevation of the house contains a sliding steel-framed glass door at the east end of the first floor. A second, plywood panel door is located at the west end of this elevation. Three window assemblies are present between the two doors. On the second floor, the two east bays are clad with buff plaster, while the westernmost bay contains the typical two-window assembly.

The exterior of the studio consists of similar facade elements to those seen on the house. The east elevation is five bays wide. The first floor portions of the two southernmost bays are clad in buff plaster. The second floor of each bay consists of the typical two-window assemblies. The remaining first floor bays to the south each consists of the typical two-window assemblies.

Like the house, the studio is built up against the hill, with only the second floor of the house visible on the west elevation. The northern three bays are clad in 4-inch Ferrobord steel decking with the seams oriented vertically. Each of the two southern bays consists of the typical two-window assemblies seen throughout the building.

The south elevation of the studio is similarly clad in Ferrobord steel decking on the second level. A small two-light operable window is located on the east half of the second level. The west portion of the first floor is clad in buff plaster. A single window assembly, similar to the typical assembly seen elsewhere on the building, is located next to a steel-framed door at the east end of the south elevation.

A steel-framed sliding door, similar to those on the house, is present at the first floor on the east end of the north elevation. The remaining portions of the first floor are clad with buff plaster. The area immediately above the sliding door is clad in red-painted plaster. Two seven-light windows comprise the remaining two bays.

4. Structural system, framing:

The Eames House and Studio are both steel-framed structures. The steel frame is composed of 4-inch steel columns along the exterior walls of the building supporting 12-inch open steel web joists at the roof.

5. Porches, stoops, balconies, porticoes, bulkheads:

The house and the studio are separated by an open air courtyard. A partially covered patio is located off of the living room.

6. Chimneys:

There are no chimneys located on the buildings addressed in this study.

7. Openings:

a. Doorways and doors:

There are three door types on the house and studio. The main entrance to the house is a steel-frame door with five glass inserts that extend to the frame. The doors at the west end of the north elevation of the house and the east end of the south elevation of the studio are both steel-framed units with a plywood infill. Large steel and glass sliding doors seen on the north and south elevations of the house and the north elevation of the studio make up a third door type. These have a steel frame with glass infill, single lights on the two house sliding doors and a six-light panel on the studio sliding door.

b. Windows and shutters:

The glazing throughout the house and studio is a mixture of clear, opaque and safety glass. Despite the presence of different configurations, the windows on the house and studio are composed of similar parts. The most typical window assembly contains a two-light fixed glass unit over a two-light awning window, over a single-light fixed unit and a single-light hopper window. The width of this assembly is half the width of a typical bay. This assembly is seen throughout the two buildings, most often in pairs. While the majority of the window openings contain glass, a number of openings contain Cemesto board infill, some painted some left the material's natural gray color. In addition to this typical window assembly, large window units, in many cases one-story in height and the width of a typical bay are present throughout the house. Some of these windows are single-light units, while others are multi-light units. A series of six jalousie windows is present on the south elevation of the house. These windows extend the height of the second floor and the width of a typical bay. There are also two punched openings on the south elevation of the studio. These windows—a hopper unit on the first floor and an awning unit on the second floor—are similar in size and shape to the hopper and awning windows that are part of the typical window assembly.

8. Roof:

a. Shape, covering:

The roof over both the house and the studio is a low-slope built-up roof. A skylight is present near the center of the house roof. The skylight is composed of sheets of wire glass set within a framework of steel angles. The perimeter steel frame and glass are currently set in place over a flashed wood curb that is integral to the existing roof system.

b. Cornice, eaves:

The roof structure terminates at the exterior walls of both structures. There is no cornice on the house or studio.

c. Dormers, cupolas, towers:

There are no dormers, cupolas, or towers located on the house or studio.

C. Description of Interior:

The ground floor of the residence is 1,500 square feet in plan. Its organization relates to the seven bays found on the building exterior. The open, two-story living room in the southern portion of the structure occupies three bays (along the north-south axis) and is the focal point of the interior. The remaining four bays in the northern portion are divided into two floors, with a pair of bedrooms and bathrooms above the hallway, kitchen, and dining area. Vertical circulation is provided by a circular [spiral] staircase. The smaller studio has a 500 square foot ground floor plan, framed by five bays (along the north-south axis), each of the same dimensions as in the residence. Also like the residence, the studio is dominated by a large room that extends the full two-story height of the structure. This studio space occupies three bays on the northern portion of the building. In the two bays to the south, an upstairs loft area reached by a steel-framed staircase is located above a darkroom, furnace room, bathroom, and corridor with sink and counter unit.

1. Floor plans:

The floor plans of the residence, court, and studio are oriented approximately on a north-south axis. The residence has four points of ingress: a sliding door at the dining room, a service door corresponding to the utility room on the north elevation, the main door on the east elevation, and a sliding door into the living room on the south elevation. The modest main entrance on the east elevation enters perpendicular to a passageway that connects the living room to the left and the kitchen/dining area to the right. The ground floor passage provides a visual and circulation link between the glazed south elevation at the far end of the living room and the sliding glass door on the north elevation. Just inside the residential entrance on the east facade, a narrow spiral staircase illuminated by a skylight ascends to the second level living space. To the right, a narrow dining space flows into the kitchen with steel cabinets on the south wall, a sink/counter cabinet unit to the west, and additional counter on the north; a utility space with a small furnace room is located along the west wall, separated from the kitchen by the sink counter and a corrugated glass screen.

The corridor to the south (along the east facade) has storage cabinets along its west side. It opens into the large living room, which extends the full two-story height of the structure. The exposed ceiling is on full display in this space, with open web steel trusses and steel decking spanning the twenty-foot width of the room. Historically, furnishings and objects collected by the Eameses have been circulated regularly in this space. The current configuration has not changed substantially since the death of Ray Eames in 1988. The most prominent feature is an original wood and aluminum-framed bookshelf prototype designed by the Eameses. At the rear (northwest) corner of the living room is an alcove recessed

beneath the upper level guest room. The carpeted alcove is furnished with a built-in, L-shaped sofa and built-in cabinets. These cabinets, which extend above the sofa on the north wall and along the east wall, provide storage space and originally concealed the music system and projector (currently, only a record player survives in the cabinets). A pass-through opening to the kitchen is also located on the north wall above the sofa.

At the top of the spiral staircase, an inward-swinging door to the east provides entry to a small north-south hallway framed by the stairwell. The door is attached to the bank of cupboards that divides the long hallway along the east façade. This corridor links the east bedroom with a dressing room to the north (again mirroring the main circulation route found on the ground floors of the residence and the studio). The dressing area has prefabricated steel closets on both the north and south. These units divide the space but do not reach the ceiling. A second inward swinging door at the end of the dressing area leads to a bathroom with sink, toilet, and tub at the northwest corner of the structure. At the staircase landing, closets on the north wall are similar to those in the dressing area. To the west, a door opens into a bathroom with sink, toilet, and shower. To the south, a door opens to the west bedroom. Like the east bedroom, this space opens out to the living room below on the south side. A solid panel slides on a track across this 30-inch-high south wall contiguous with the east bedroom. The east wall is made up of a second screening panel that can be retracted northward to combine the west and east bedrooms as a single large space.

The studio floor plan mirrors that of the residence on a smaller scale. Entrance is provided on the north and south elevations. A swinging door on the east corner of the south wall opens to a corridor running along the east wall, continuing the line established by the corresponding ground floor corridor in the residence. This feature, which allows an unobstructed southward view from the studio through the open south doorway, and through the length of the residence, emphasizes the axial arrangement and the diaphanous nature of the structures. Inside the south door, the corridor features a steel sink and counter on the west and wood cupboards the east. These cupboards, with sliding Plyon door, being approximately two feet above the floor and cover much of the wall height. The top of this bank of cupboards serves as shelf space. The main corridor is intersected by a small east-west corridor that leads to the bathroom with sink, toilet, and shower to the south. The east-west corridor continues to the darkroom space along the west wall. All of these spaces are one story in height beneath the loft portion of the studio. The main corridor along the east facade continues to the main studio space, a square opening the full two-story height of the interior. A steel-framed stairway along the east facade ascends to the open loft area. A sliding glass door on the east corner of the north facade connects to a narrow brick paved pathway along the north exterior and the carport beyond.

2. Stairways:

The second floor in the house is reached by way of a spiral staircase located between the kitchen and the living room. The staircase has a framework of individual steel steps welded to and extending from a central, 3-inch-diameter steel pipe. Plywood treads cover the steps. The staircase was constructed by Don Albinson, a member of the Eames Office and a former student at Cranbrook who

helped with Charles Eames and Eero Saarinen's first plywood furniture experiments.²⁶ Archival documentation indicates that the railing was purchased from a marine supply catalog. The stairwell walls are covered with korina (or limba) faced plywood. In the living room, a portable ladder with the upper rails terminating in hooks connects to the open web ceiling joists, permitting the hanging of objects from the ceiling and along the walls. In the studio, an open staircase with steel side and handrails and wood treads that was designed and built for the space connects the ground floor with the upper-level loft. This stair replaced a temporary painter's ladder that was used during the initial months of occupation before the staircase was constructed.

3. Flooring:

Flooring in the living room is white 9-inch by 9-inch vinyl composite tile. This material replaced earlier 9-inch by 9-inch asbestos tile of the same general color removed during 2011 conservation work. The seating alcove beneath the residence loft and facing the living room is covered with two carpets and padding over the concrete slab. The original dining, kitchen, and utility room rubber tile flooring is in situ. All other flooring is original except the living room and hallway flooring that was replaced in 2011. Flooring in the main studio space, the darkroom, and the corridor is wood parquet tile. The bathroom and studio loft have rubber tile flooring. All studio flooring is original except for a few replacements.

4. Wall and ceiling finish:

The most prominent wall surface throughout the interior is steel-framed glass. There is great variety in the configuration of operable and fixed units, and of glazed and infill units across the various facades. Though the majority of glazing is clear, some lights have wire glass (in the studio), while others have opaque glass (in the dining room and in portions of the bedroom). Glazed areas in the living room have featured linen and rayon pleated drapes that were temporarily removed for cleaning and have yet to be rehung.

Where the interior walls correspond to the large infill panels on the building exterior, those interior surfaces are either plaster or Walltex fabric wall covering over a wood panel substrate. The entire west wall of the living room is finished with vertically oriented, narrowly grooved panels made from a eucalyptus species called Australian tallowwood. The narrow grooves of the panels emphasize the verticality of the lofty open interior; their solidity is a contrast to the glazing on the opposite elevation. The wood-paneled wall also functions as a screen that reflects the shifting gradations of light marking the house over the course of a day. Because this wall surface extends beyond the plane of the south window wall, it also plays an important part in providing a sense of permeability between interior and exterior. The corresponding studio wall has a surface of Walltex fabric wall covering. A sliding panel between the bedrooms enables the two spaces to be merged into one larger bedroom. A similar panel slides along a track atop the low wall that looks out onto the living room, allowing the Eameses to separate the bedroom from the living room. Additionally, a sliding vinyl

²⁶ Marilyn Neuhart and John Neuhart, *Eames House* (Berlin: Ernst & Sohn, 1994), 43. Cited in Ostergren, 10.

“Modernfold” accordion door is located between the dining room and kitchen. Other solid interior partitions have plaster finishes.

The ceiling finish on the underside of both loft spaces is plaster. Recessed lighting fixtures are placed at various locations on this ceiling. A track from which the accordion partition is suspended runs along the ceiling in a line dividing the dining area from the kitchen. The ceiling in all of the second story spaces, as well as the two-story living room and studio spaces, is open to reveal the 12 inch open web steel joists and the “Ferrobord” steel decking above. Standing seams of the decking run north-south, elongating the ceiling line while complementing the vertical grooves of the west wall paneling. In general, the main 4 inch steel structural columns are left exposed throughout the interior, as are the joints where the columns and joists meet.

5. Openings:

a. Windows, doorways, and doors:

Windows along the west and east walls of the loft area (corresponding to bedroom space) as well as windows in the studio loft have interior diffusion screens of a glass cloth laminate called “Plyon.” These screens are set on wooden tracks that can be moved for privacy and shading. The dining room and kitchen can be partitioned by a sliding, semi-rigid vinyl accordion door that hangs from a track embedded in the ceiling. A sliding door separates the furnace room from the utility room along the west side of the house. Interior doors on the second floor provide entry to the master bedroom and dressing area, to both bathrooms, and to the second bedroom. The former functions to divide the two hallways essentially creating two suites of rooms, each with a bedroom, hallway, dressing area, and bathroom. In the studio, conventional swinging doors provide access to the ground floor bathroom and the darkroom.

6. Decorative features and trim:

In the design of their modernist house, Ray and Charles Eames sought decorative embellishment in the use and combination of color panels, the play of light and shadow on the interior as filtered through the trees outside, and the window muntins and structural framework of the building facade. They rejected traditional decorative features such as ornamental elements and trim profiles. Decorative effect can also be seen in the various depths and thicknesses of the window profiles. The facade is not a flat plane, but has a variety of recessive and projective surfaces that give the house a dynamic, almost sculptural quality.

7. Hardware:

Most of the original window hardware survives in both the house and the studio. With the exception of some locks and handles, much of the historic door hardware, has likewise been retained. The original brass fittings for the large sliding doors have been replaced with stainless steel components.

8. Mechanical equipment:

Architectural drawings from 1949 indicate that the utility room was originally equipped with a washing machine and dryer.

a. Heating, air conditioning, ventilation:

Undated drawings from the period of construction show the furnace room layout (at the west end of the utility room), plans to install a Payne Model 167 forced air furnace and a water heater, layout and sections for heating ductwork set in the concrete slab, and the location of all vents and returns throughout the house. The original Payne furnace remains in the house. The studio furnace and both water heaters have been replaced.

b. Lighting:

The Eames house was wired for electrical service and lighting. Fixtures were provided by a number of sponsoring companies. Light sockets over shelves and wardrobes were set behind fascias and cabinet surfaces to direct light upward and conceal the bulbs and fixtures. Recessed lights were placed in locations along the lower ceiling (beneath the loft areas). Ventilation fans were installed in the studio darkroom and the kitchen. Most of the original lighting fixtures survive in the house, although a number are not currently functioning.

c. Plumbing:

The three bathrooms (two on the second floor of the residence and one on the ground floor of the studio), as well as the residence kitchen and the studio and darkroom sinks, are plumbed with water and sewer piping concealed in construction. All bathroom and kitchen facilities appear to be contemporary.

9. Original furnishings:

The Eames Foundation is steward of all of the original surviving furnishings, objects, materials, art works, and personal effects found in the house.

D. Site:

1. Historic landscape:

The Eames House is located within a cluster of four single-family residences, all designed as part of the Case Study House program. Like several of the Case Study houses, the Eames House is located in a foothills community on the edge of Los Angeles; by the mid-1940s, many of these communities had become showplaces and testing grounds for modern architecture. Completed in 1949, the Eames House occupies a plateau at the edge of Santa Monica Canyon in Pacific Palisades, California. The landscape is characteristic of the bluff and canyon system that edges the Pacific Coast north of Los Angeles. Most of the level plateaus that extend from the canyon walls are now thickly settled residential enclaves.

EAMES HOUSE
HABS No. CA-2903 (Page 25)

The Eames House occupies a 1.4 acre, irregularly-shaped parcel that extends inland from a steeply-sloped bluffline overlooking the Pacific Coast Highway. The property affords expansive views of the Pacific Ocean; other key features include the pavilion-like house and studio complex set at the base of a steep slope and wrapped by mature eucalyptus trees, a rolling grassy meadow, and the dramatic descending topography of the bluffline.

Although the obvious focus of the property, the house was carefully sited to maintain the largest possible area of the property in open meadow for the enjoyment of the family. In contrast to the prevailing Modernist strategy of placing buildings as objects in the center of a field, the Eameses chose to press the dwelling closely into the side of the hillside wall, anchoring it to the vertical landscape, and gaining additional buildable space by constructing a retaining wall behind the house. The visual and physical influence of the house is further downplayed, even concealed, by a linear arrangement of mature eucalyptus trees that parallel the building to its east. These pre-date the Eameses' ownership of the property. Early photographs of its construction illustrate the steel frame of the house being erected in a narrow slot of space between the newly poured concrete retaining wall and the extant trees. The dwelling emerges treehouse-like from the eucalyptus row, at the edge of the sloping terrain of the meadow. The trees filter oblique views toward the ocean and are reflected on the thin skin of the building, composed of glass, metal, and painted panels. Taken together, the interplay of sun, shadow, and dappled shade, the textural qualities of site vegetation and the architecture of the house, and the woody fragrance of the eucalyptus trees impart a unique and memorable sense of place.

Ironically, the trees are a relic of an earlier era, and may have been planted by developer and arborist Abbot Kinney in the 1890s, as noted previously. The community of Pacific Palisades, where the house is located, was founded in 1922 by Reverend Charles H. Scott as a site for the local Summer Assemblies of the Chautauqua Movement, which grew out of the idea of a summer school for Sunday School teachers of the Methodist Church in the 1870s. The movement later broadened to include educational programs and cultural offerings for the general public organized in retreat-like settings. The Pacific Palisades Summer Assemblies took place annually over a six week period. The road that provides access to the Eames House was originally named Torrence Drive by Abbot Kinney, later changed to Marquez Avenue in reference to the family who co-owned the original Spanish land grant, but was renamed Chautauqua Boulevard in 1928 to reflect this aspect of the area's history.²⁷

The Eames House is actually an assemblage of five distinct spaces unified in their alignment, orientation, and modular geometry. The house is one of the spaces; the others include a free-standing studio, an outdoor patio that mediates between the house and the landscape, an open court that links the house and studio, and an open carport covered with a canvas awning. The house is composed of eight bays, while the studio features five. The open court is four bays wide, while the patio and carport together measure approximately two bays. The southern and northern elevations of the house and the northern elevation of the studio feature sliding glass doors that open out onto paved patios. The glass doors and patio spaces provide a transition

²⁷ Historic Resources Group, "Eames House" National Historic Landmark nomination (Hollywood, California: May 2005), 15.

between the building interiors and the surrounding landscape; the sliding glass doors and a metal roof overhang that extends from the southern end of the residence link interior and exterior spatially and materially, while an angled section of low wall embraces the patio, yet allows for views toward the meadow and ocean beyond.

The primary living area of the house, the studio interior, and the open court afford a series of cube-like volumes of unbroken interior space. Rectangular in plan and with horizontal massing, these spaces are light and open, and were created using large panels of translucent glass and a thin steel frame exposed to view on both the interior and exterior. These visually thin walls, the floor, and the roof appear to rest one upon the other without apparent support. The outdoor patio, however, reverses this treatment. The patio gains its volume from landscape anchors such as the steeply-sloped hillside wall, the eucalyptus trees, and the concrete retaining wall along the western edge of the house. The carport is similarly contained by heavier concrete walls on two sides.

The patio and outdoor courtyard are level areas edged to one side by the concrete retaining wall. Potted plants frame the patio margins. Within the overall regular grid system, the materials vary. Bricks are arranged in parallel rows, while in the courtyard marble paving is cut into squares. There are also sections of the grid composed of wood blocks set in rows. Paving is absent in some areas; the openings are used as planting beds for trees and ground covers, including eucalyptus and monkey grass. Wood furring strips separate each geometric paving block. These paving patterns reinforce the rhythmic order of the bays used in the house and studio.

The southern patio is also edged by planting beds. The patio features an arrangement of wooden pylons salvaged by the Eameses when the Venice pier was demolished. The concrete wall that wraps the patio at a 45 degree angle also splits to form a stepped planting bed approximately 4 feet above the level of the patio. Herbaceous and perennial flowering plants and ferns, vines, and shrubs are displayed in the bed.

The steel-reinforced concrete retaining wall is a forceful presence in the landscape. It extends for 175 feet along the hillside and is 8 feet high. The wall wraps the rhythmic volumes north and south at a 45 degree angle to the main body of the structural system. The angled extensions partially embrace the outdoor patio to the south, and the carport to the north.

As part of the initial construction, soil was excavated from the base of the hillside and deposited along the eastern property boundary where it formed a linear berm. The berm functioned as a privacy screen that defined precincts associated with the Eames House to the west, and the Entenza House to the east. Case Study House visionary John Entenza lived in the adjacent Entenza House (Case Study House 9) for approximately five years before selling the property in 1955. Though the Entenza House was substantially altered in subsequent years, it was entered in the National Register of Historic Places in 2013. It is said that “in later years Ray Eames could hardly bear to let anyone so much as catch a glimpse of it, let alone consider looking inside, so different was it from the original design.”²⁸ Vegetation along the property line is much thicker today than was the case during the home’s early years. The

²⁸ Pat Kirkham, *Charles and Ray Eames, Designers of the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1995), 126.

EAMES HOUSE
HABS No. CA-2903 (Page 27)

vegetation was purposefully allowed to obscure the view of the Entenza property by the Eameses. A metal fence along the property line also serves to divide the properties today.

The Eames House property is approached from the northeast along a narrow, shared, 11-foot-wide asphalt drive that arises from Chautauqua Boulevard between Corona del Mar and the Pacific Coast Highway. The Eames House is not visible from the street.

As it approaches the property, the drive is edged to the north by a serpentine brick wall. The wall is part of Richard Neutra's landscape design for the property at 219 Chautauqua, also known as the Bailey House (Case Study House 20). Other portions of the drive are edged by mature eucalyptus trees, shrubs, and wood fencing that divides the Eames and Burly properties. A gravel and wood-chip path parallels the access drive leading to the property from Chautauqua Boulevard.

Rows of similarly-sized fieldstones edge the drive as it approaches the house, introducing a theme that is repeated throughout the living area. Each of the walks that encircle the house is edged by stones that are consistent in shape, size, and finish to one another, although the graded arrangements vary in size throughout the property.

The drive forms a Y as it terminates at the northern edge of the property. The western extension of the Y leads to the carport, while the eastern terminus is a trapezoidal parking area. The carport, which edges the studio to its north, it is contained by the concrete retaining wall to the west and north, and has a concrete floor edged by brick paving. The carport is sheltered by a canvas covering that extends from the retaining wall to a pipe frame.

The parking area splays outward along the edge of a descending embankment. An irregular row of trees, equitably graded fieldstones, juniper shrubs, and a ground cover composed of bigleaf periwinkle cloak the sloped embankment as it falls away toward the meadow. A portable bathroom for the comfort of contemporary visitors is sited at the edge of the parking area along the property line, marked by metal mesh fencing, trees, undergrowth, and stacked fireplace logs.

Fieldstones follow the edges of a dual walk system that arises from the drive and parallels the house and studio complex. The walks are each relatively level, but are set at different elevations. Narrow, 3 foot 6 inch wide stairs link the walks on axis with the primary entrance to the house, and near the outdoor patio. The stairs are composed of 1x4 wood plank risers, pinned in place with rebar, and 1 foot 8 inch wide gravel treads. Near the parking area, a low, battered stone wall takes up part of the slope between the two walks. Rocks embedded into the sloping hill above the wall have been interplanted with ground covers and perennials.

The upper walk lies 1 foot 4 inches from the edge of the dwelling, and is separated from it by a narrow band of medium-sized, graded river rocks. Between the carport and the first bay of the studio, the walk is surfaced with gravel. A wooden boardwalk, 3 feet 3 inches in width, replaces the gravel approximately 9 feet from the northern end of the studio. The upper walk provides access to the outdoor courtyard, from which the studio may be entered, the primary entrance into the house, and the

outdoor patio. The lower walk, which measures 2 feet 9 inches in width, is surfaced with gravel.

An irregular line of thirty-two eucalyptus trees, of mixed ages and a variety of sizes, separates the two walks. The ground where the trees emerge is sloped slightly; rock has been used in places to retain the soil. Some of the trees were present when Charles and Ray Eames acquired the property and are thought to have inspired the couple in the siting of the house. The Eameses actively promoted a living community of eucalyptus within the linear span below the house by allowing the trees to self-seed. Over time, some of the original trees have died; several stumps indicate where trees were removed in the past.

The eucalyptus trees below the house are underplanted with shrubs and ground covers such as English ivy and ferns. Potted plants, like the fieldstone edging, are placed consistently throughout the property along walks and patio spaces, the row of eucalyptus trees, and at the margin of the parking area.

An informal path leads around the rear of the house and behind the concrete retaining wall. Access to the path arises near the northern end of the carport and south of the outdoor patio. The path from the carport environs includes a stone and timber stair and large flat stepping stones edged by a stacked stone retaining wall. The path south of the patio is also composed of stepping stones. Behind the house, the path is surfaced with gravel and edged by a stacked stone retaining wall to the west.

A secondary path also leads up the hillside to the south of the house. Wood timbers have been used to form stairs that comprise a portion of the path. A yard hydrant marked by a handle and a wooden cover sits at the edge of the path near the patio.

Below the parallel path system, the property is generally characterized by grassy meadow and open grown trees, primarily eucalyptus. Shrubs are also present along the eastern and southern property boundaries and the woven wire fence that has been installed at the edge of the bluff for the protection of visitors. Located at the southeastern end of the meadow are children's play features and interpretive panels. A weather station is also located at the edge of the meadow in this area. Sprinkler heads suggest the presence of an irrigation system within the meadow.

The Eames Foundation maintains the landscape of the property in accordance with its historic appearance. The only contemporary additions to the property are the interpretive exhibit panels located in the meadow, the weather station, and the portable bathroom located at the edge of the parking area.

2. Outbuildings:

Other than the carport located to the north of the studio, there are no original outbuildings associated with the site. The carport is made of a canvas covering that extends from the retaining wall to a pipe frame. Currently, a portable toilet for the use of visitors and Foundation staff is located in the northeast corner of the property, at the edge of the asphalt parking pad.

PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

A. Architectural drawings:

Original architectural drawings were provided by the Charles and Ray Eames House Preservation Foundation, Inc. They include the following series:

- Set of nine sheets (not to scale) dated October 14, 1948, consisting of:
 - Plot plan
 - Site plan
 - Foundation plan
 - Framing plan
 - Sections at column/joist connections
 - First and second floor plans
 - Elevations
 - Typical wall sections and stair plan and details
- Set of five sheets from California Cornice, Steel & Supply Corp., dated December 7, 1948, consisting of:
 - Structural plans and anchor bolt details
- Set of fourteen sheets from January 1949, consisting of:
 - North elevation of house and details, dated January 10, 1949
 - South elevation of studio and details, dated January 10, 1949
 - South elevation of house and details, dated January 19, 1949
 - North elevation of studio and details, dated January 19, 1949
 - West elevations of house and studio and details, dated, January 18, 1949
 - East elevations of house and studio and details, dated January 19, 1949 (presumably misdated as 1948)
 - Elevation of studio south wall with section through fireplace, revised March 7, 1949
 - Plan showing paved walks, dated February 28, 1949
 - Elevations and plans for storage and shelving units, dated February 24, 1949
 - Plan and section of low ceiling studio area, dated March 7, 1949
 - Plan of living room seating area, kitchen, and utility room, dated March 5, 1949
 - Second floor plan and section, date illegible
 - Not labeled. Heating Layout, no date, Sheet 1
 - Not labeled. Heating Layout, no date, Sheet 2
 - Typical wall sections and stair plan and details
- Set of two sheets dated July 20, 1949, consisting of:
 - Plan, elevation and detail of circular staircase
 - Circular stair detail

B. Early views:

Copies of images showing the house during and immediately after construction were published in *Arts & Architecture* magazine throughout 1949 (see the Bibliography below). Historic images can be found among the Charles Eames and Ray Eames Papers, 1885–1988, in the Library of Congress.

C. Interviews:

Information about the house, its recent history of use and conservation issues was provided by staff of the Eames Foundation. No oral history interviews were performed for this documentation project.

D. Bibliography:

“A Designer’s Home of His Own.” *Life* 29, no. 11, September 11, 1950, 148–152.

“Announcement: The Case Study House Program.” *Arts & Architecture*, January 1945, 54–55.

Bergdoll, Barry, and Peter Christensen. *Home Delivery: Fabricating the Modern Dwelling*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2008.

Banham, Reyner. *Design by Choice*. New York: Rizzoli, 1981.

“Case Study House for 1949: The Steel Frame.” *Arts & Architecture*, March 1949, 30–31.

“Case Study House for 1949: The Plan.” *Arts & Architecture*, May 1949, 38–39.

“Case Study House #20, Richard Neutra, Architect.” *Arts & Architecture*, December 1948, 32–41.

“Case Study House [#8]: A House Designed and Built for the Magazine *Arts & Architecture*.” *Arts & Architecture*, July 1950, 26–39.

“Case Study House, Rodney Walker, Designer.” *Arts & Architecture*, February 1948, 39–43.

“Case Study Houses.” *Arts & Architecture*, March 1948, 39–41.

Colomina, Beatriz. “Reflections on the Eames House,” *The Work of Charles and Ray Eames: A Legacy of Invention*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1997.

Davies, Colin. *Key Houses of the Twentieth Century: Plans Sections and Elevations*. London: Laurence King Publishing, 2006.

Demetrios, Eames. *An Eames Primer*. New York: Universe Publishing, 2001.

de Witt, Wim, and Christopher James Alexander. *Overdrive: L.A. Constructs the Future, 1940–1990*. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2013.

“The Eames House . . . 28 Years Later.” *L.A. Architect*. October 1977, n.p.

Farmer, Jared. *Trees in Paradise: A California History*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2013.

Girard, A. H., and W. D. Laurie, Jr. *An Exhibition for Modern Living*. Detroit: Detroit Institute of Arts, 1949.

Gueft, Olga, “Steel on the Meadow.” *Interiors* 110, no. 4 (November 1950), 108–115.

EAMES HOUSE
HABS No. CA-2903 (Page 31)

Hay, David. "Conserving a Classic." *Los Angeles Times*, September 24, 2011. Accessed September 12, 2013, <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/sep/24/home/la-hm-eames-house-restoration-20110924>.

Hutt, Dana. "Experimental Jet Set: Aerospace and the Modern House in Los Angeles." In *Overdrive: L.A. Constructs the Future, 1940-1990*. Edited by Wim de Wit and Christopher James Alexander, 150–161. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2013.

Johnson McAvoy, Christy, Jennifer Minasian Trotoux, and Kari Michele Fowler, Historic Resources Group. *National Historic Landmark Nomination Form, Eames House*, May 2005; designated a National Historic Landmark, September 20, 2006.

Kaplan, Wendy. *California Design, 1930–1965: "Living in a Modern Way."* Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011.

Kirkham, Pat, "Introducing Ray Eames (1912–1988)." *Furniture History* 26 (1990), 132–141.

_____. *Charles and Ray Eames: Designers of the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995.

Koenig, Gloria. *Charles & Ray Eames, 1907–1978, 1912–1988: Pioneers of Mid-Century Modernism*. Los Angeles: Taschen, 2005.

"Life in a Chinese Kite." *Architectural Forum* 93 (September 1950): 90–96.

McCoy, Esther. "An Affection for Objects." *Progressive Architecture* 54 (August 1973), 67.

_____. *Case Study Houses, 1945–1962*. Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, 1977.

_____. "On Attaining a Certain Age." *Progressive Architecture*, October 1977, 80–83.

_____. *The Second Generation*. Layton, Utah: Peregrine Smith Books, 1984.

Muchnic, Suzanne. "Case Study Conservation on the Eames' Case Study House," *Los Angeles Times*, May 18, 2013. Accessed September 12, 2013. <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/may/18/entertainment/la-et-cm-eames-home-restoration-20130519>.

Neuhart, Marilyn, and John Neuhart. *Eames House*. Berlin: Ernst & Sohn, 1994.

Ostergren, Gail. *History of the Eames House and Its Site*. Draft history narrative to accompany the Getty Conservation Institute's Conservation Management Plan, June 2013.

Saatchi, Doris. "All About Eames." *House & Garden*, February 11, 1984, 122–131, 200.

Starr, Kevin. *Inventing the Dream: California through the Progressive Era*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Steele, James. *Eames House: Charles and Ray Eames*. London: Phaidon, 1994.

E. Likely Sources Not Yet Investigated:

The Eames House is one of the most famous structures of the twentieth century and has been researched and written about by numerous authors and historians. It is the subject of a National Historic Landmark nomination, as well as a historical narrative currently being undertaken by Getty Conservation Institute staff. It is unlikely that additional documentary sources will be uncovered regarding the history of the property. Ongoing monitoring, investigation, and assessment as part of the Getty's Conserving Modern Architecture Initiative will provide additional information about the as-built construction, condition of the house, and its conservation in the future.

F. Supplemental Material:

[Images from Library of Congress to be added for final submittal.]

PART IV. PROJECT INFORMATION

The Eames House Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation project was sponsored by the Historic Preservation Education Foundation (HPEF) and the Getty Conservation Institute (GCI), with the cooperation and support of the Eames Foundation, the University of Southern California Graduate Programs in Heritage Conservation, and Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc. (WJE). The project was completed during the summer and fall of 2013 and the winter and spring of 2014. Timothy Penich of WJE directed field measurement, coordinated the measured drawings, and co-authored the HABS narrative; Chad Randl of Cornell University served as project manager, historian, and co-author of the HABS narrative; Deborah Slaton of WJE served as project advisor and co-author and editor of the HABS narrative; Liz Sargent of Liz Sargent HLA participated in the field studies and authored the landscape portions of the HABS narrative; Kyle Normandin, Getty Conservation Institute (GCI), Conservation of Modern Architecture Initiative (CMAI) Project Manager, served as liaison to GCI and the Eames Foundation; and Trudi Sandmeier, Director, Graduate Programs in Heritage Conservation, University of Southern California at Los Angeles coordinated student participation. Timothy Penich and Amable García Enguita prepared the measured drawings based on field measurements recorded by Amable García Enguita, Sarah Gilbert, Dan Herrick, Daniel Neri, Timothy Penich, and Chad Randl.