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...it is the ambition of every citizen of L. A. to have a palm tree in his front yard and two citrus trees in his back yard. Add an atrocious glorified-barn structure called a house, stuccoed and whitewashed and weighted down by red or green tiles, and the "native son" is a happy child in a God-ordained, man-made paradise...
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INTRODUCTION

The Wrigley District presents an interesting view of a bygone era in Long Beach: a neighborhood bearing the mark of the development booms of the nineteen twenties and thirties. Today it remains intact, showing the inventiveness of the small scale house builders of that period and offering a glimpse of the American dream of a home in the suburbs.

It contains no historic landmarks of the usual sort and it is not identified with any of the great moments of American history. Local residents assume that the name has something to do with chewing gum magnate Phillip Wrigley who had development interests in the area and on Catalina, but, for the moment, that link remains shrouded in history. The Wrigley District is important for the way in which it was developed, and the way in which it retains its charm. By present day city planning standards it should not work, but it does.
DESCRIPTION

The Wrigley District is a low density residential area built up between World War I and II. Located less than two miles north of downtown Long Beach, the original subdivision pattern was established as early as 1905, but little development took place until the late twenties.

The area is developed throughout on a gridiron street pattern. The blocks are six hundred feet long. The individual lots have 50 feet street frontages. Street rights-of-way in the area are all 60 feet in width except Daisy and Magnolia Avenues. A trolley line went along Daisy at one time, and it has a 120 feet right-of-way with Deodar trees in a 40 feet wide median from Pacific Coast Highway north to Hill Street. Magnolia Avenue has a 70 foot right-of-way and provides direct access for through traffic south to the Civic Center and Park areas. It is currently the only internal street which serves as a thoroughfare. The district is bounded on the north, south and east by major streets with commercial strip land uses. The Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel and its massive levee form the western boundary of the district. The adjacent neighborhoods are different in character and do not have the homogeneity found in the Wrigley District.

Single family homes predominate within the area. These are primarily small "working men's" cottages built between 1928 and 1940. While they are small in size (typically five rooms averaging 1,000 - 1,200 square feet of floor area) they are by no means modest. Spanish Colonial Revival
architecture is typical in those built between 1928-1934. Tile roof towers and porticos add to simple stucco facades. Arched window and door openings provide variety to the standard house elevations, while esplanade fronts and patio walls are often used to extend the street facade and increase the visual scale of the dwellings.

The Spanish Colonial Revival form is also used in flats and duplexes in the district. These are usually two stories high with hip or gable tile roofs. Some have accents of ceramic tile around doors or in the facades. A typical streetscape might include single family residences on one side of the street with flats on the opposite side.

Interspersed among the Spanish Colonial Revival types are Period Revival homes showing Tudor and Norman influences. These also are stucco. They typically have composition roofs with high pitch gables facing the street. Some feature diamond window pane patterns and imitation half-timber applied to the stucco.

After 1930, Streamline Moderne structures were occasionally built in this area. These are characterized by flat roofs, rounded corners, circular exterior stairways and stucco facades. Late in the same decade, single family homes were built in the typical suburban tract form usually identified with Southern California's post-World War II era. These are also stucco, one story high, with simple floor plans and low pitch, composition shingle, gable or hip roofs.

Visual unity is achieved throughout the district by similarity of construction type (wood frame), materials (stucco and red tile), scale (one story
houses and two story flats), uniform front yard set backs and ar-
chitectural style (primarily Spanish Colonial Revival). Variety comes from
the manipulation of standard details and components applied in unique
ways to the individual structures.

A fantasy quality pervades the area. There are tiny castles and haciendas
on fifty foot lots. Turrets and towers abound. Leaded glass windows
and half-timbers testify to the imitation of medieval building technology.
What appear as gables turn out to be flat roofs. The eclectic styles are
perhaps less European than Hollywood. Through it all comes the Ameri-
can dream: a rose covered cottage with a view of the mountains.

Street trees add interest of the area and help differentiate among the
various streets (palm trees on Golden Avenue and comphor trees on
Pine Avenue, for instance). A complete list of street trees is attached
as Appendix A.

Structures are neat and well maintained. The area is essentially intact,
although some 1950 era apartments are found in the southeast portion.
SIGNIFICANCE: THE DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

Original subdivision of the area began in 1905 shortly after Long Beach had been connected to the rest of the Los Angeles region by the Pacific Electric Railroad. In the ensuing building boom, part of this district was platted with the same twenty-five-foot frontage lots found near the beach. Virtually no development took place at this time, and those parcels were eventually to be developed in tandem to create the fifty-foot frontages found in the area today.

The Wrigley District represents a classic case of "premature subdivision" which is characteristic of much of Southern California. In speculative land boom periods many subdivisions were recorded even though they created parcels well in excess of what could be absorbed by initial market demand. If the boom ended before demand for housing led to construction in the tract, large areas would remain vacant. Already committed to urban use, they would be withdrawn from agriculture and would simply lay fallow. This is what happened in the Wrigley District. There was additional subdivision in 1914 as another boom swept the area, but once again little development took place. While the Pacific Electric ran along Long Beach Boulevard several hundred yards to the east of the area, the Wrigley District was too far from town to attract developers to its stock of building sites.

This was to change in the mid twenties when a trolley line was extended into the area along Daisy Avenue. As housing demand surged, builders began to seek out sites in the District. The character of development was thus determined, not only by the builder's view of the market,
but also by the nature of the pre-existing land ownership and street pattern. The gridiron established in 1905 was continued. Street names from the older downtown area show up here as they are extended in a straight line outward from the original settlement.

By 1929, the Long Beach Independent Press-Telegram was claiming that Long Beach was the sixtieth largest city in the United States with a population of 125,600. In the early part of that year building permits were exceeding $1,000,000 in value per month (Independent Press-Telegram, March 3, 1929). A new home on Eucalyptus Avenue was being advertised for sale at $6,250. Other new homes were available for $3,500 and up. The Wrigley District, as we know it, had begun to come into existence. Additional subdivisions were made in the area, the final one being filed June 10, 1930. Development continued to take place by filling lots previously laid out in the pattern begun in 1905. By 1940 virtually the entire area was built up. While we usually think of the Depression as a period of little residential construction, building records indicate that it did not prevent the completion of the development of this district. Incidentally, there is record of some building permit activity immediately following the March 10, 1933 earthquake, but it appears that the wood frame structures in this area survived the quake with relatively little damage.

Design of the homes in the area is also a result of the development pattern. In the present era of the mass-built tract home, it is interesting to examine the building process used during the early part of the century. (Table 1 compares the present day process with the way housing was built in the early years of this century.)
### TABLE 1
THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POST WORLD WAR II RESIDENTIAL TRACT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS</th>
<th>TYPICAL EARLY 20TH CENTURY LAND SPECULATION BUILDING PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPER</td>
<td>SUBDIVIDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Buys raw land</td>
<td>1. Buys raw land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subdivides the land into parcels</td>
<td>2. Subdivides the land into parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Build homes (uses mass building techniques)</td>
<td>3. Sells parcels to new owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sells land and homes to owners</td>
<td>4(a) Holds land for speculation or (b) Hires contractor to build custom home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

**An integrated process of subdivision and building.**

Developer may have crews building 50 to 100 homes at one time. Mass building techniques are applied.

Development process may be completed in 1 to 2 years.

Home built for sale to unknown owner.

Sometimes associated with monotonous repetition of design elements.

Block obsolescence may result.

**COMMENTS:**

Construction not tied to subdivision process.

Homes are varied: they are designed and built one at a time. No mass building techniques are possible.

Premature subdivision may result in indefinite lag before construction.
Originally, the Southern California development process took place in two separate phases. First, the speculative subdivider acquired the land and laid out the lots which were then offered for sale. Later, (often much later) the individual owner hired a contractor to build a house on the lot. In this situation the houses were designed separately, thus creating a varied set of facades in the streetscape, and a block was built up over a period of several years. Zoning was necessary to prevent the later builders from mixing land uses which would destroy the investments of the early builders. The concept of block obsolescence was unknown.

In contrast, today's tract developer acquires land, subdivides it, and builds all the houses in the subdivision at one time. The result is that mixed land uses are less of a problem, but block obsolescence may be an issue in the long range.

In the Wrigley District, we find the traditional process displayed. The street pattern was established twenty years before the period of greatest building activity. While zoning imposed a standard front yard setback, each house is different in appearance from the street. However, research reveals the beginnings of an integrated development process in the area. In several blocks the homes were built by one developer who subdivided the land (within the existing framework) and built homes for sale. The best example of this is found in the 2000 and 2100 blocks of Eucalyptus Avenue. There, the firm of Fleming and Weber subdivided the land in 1927 and hired contractor Sid Spearin of Wilmington to build houses for sale. The first building permit was issued by the City on December 1, 1927 (2036 Eucalyptus) with other permits being issued in the following two years. All were sold upon completion except 2010.
Eucalyptus which was still owned by Fleming and Weber as late as 1940. These were all stucco single family residences with detached garages. Facades varied, with Spanish styles the most typical. No two facades appear to be the same.

In contrast, on the 2200 block of Eucalyptus, immediately north of the Fleming and Weber development, the lots were laid out in 1906, but development did not begin until 1927, and each house was built by a different individual. The houses are approximately the same in appearance as those on Fleming and Weber block. Table 2 compares the two processes at work in the Wrigley District in the 1920 and 1930's.

The pattern continues throughout the area. Prominent builders and contractors are shown in Appendix B.
TABLE 2
TRANSITIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROCESS
(Found in Wrigley District)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPER/BUILDER</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Buys raw land</td>
<td>1. Buys a parcel (one lot previously subdivided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subdivides the land into parcels</td>
<td>2. Sells lot to owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION (Hired by builder.)</td>
<td>3. Builds custom home for owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Builds individual homes (Often one or two at a time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REALTOR (Hired by builder.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sells homes to owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:
The beginning of an integrated process.
Development occurs at time of subdivision.
Homes built for sale to unknown owner.
Small scale development: small crew builds one or two houses at a time.

COMMENTS:
Depends on pre-existing subdivision.
Home built for specific owner.
CITY PLANNING CRITIQUE

The Wrigley District is the result of un-selfconscious design. It was not laid out by a master planner, and the buildings were not designed by an architect. It is an example of the vernacular in the boom period between the two World Wars. From a city planning standpoint it is instructive for the way in which it shows the techniques of development in that era. If it were being built today it is unlikely that it would take its present form, but, curiously, that obsolete form seems to still work and indeed displays certain advantages over more modern techniques.

The street pattern takes the form of a gridiron, and the blocks are too long to be acceptable today. The gridiron pattern is seldom used in residential areas any more because it encourages through traffic in a neighborhood. Current practice attempts to exclude traffic from residential areas unless it serves a need of the residents. Long blocks are avoided because they permit autos to reach excessive speeds going along the residential street.

While the long blocks may induce some speeding, the gridiron works well in Wrigley. Since there was no overall planning of the district, streets were not aligned from tract to tract, and breaks in the grid occur at the same place on every north-south street within the area except on Magnolia. Thus, the monotony of the straight street stretching visually "forever" is avoided, and through traffic is shunted to Magnolia or to the major streets bordering the district. The street pattern works in spite of itself.
Furthermore, it retains the simplicity of the grid, making it possible for the stranger to easily orient himself in the area. This in contrast to contemporary neighborhoods where confusion sometimes results from the use of curvilinear streets.

The use of standard front yard setbacks is often frowned upon in those same present day neighborhoods, because it can lead to monotony in tract built areas. In Wrigley, the regularity of the setback acts as counterpoint to the variety of the individually designed house facades.

Those cottages are too small by present development standards. They averaged 1000-1200 square feet of floor area when first built (though many have had additions since then). New houses in Southern California are seldom less than 2000 square feet, and sizes twice that are not unusual. Maintenance of housing stock such as that in the Wrigley District, thus, provides some variety in size not possible in new construction.

The north-south grid poses one problem: west facing houses, with their picturesque large front windows, often have been modified with awnings and screens to block out the rays of the afternoon sun. Glare and heat are apparent problems resulting from this building orientation.

Parking clearly is a problem in the area: single car garages do not meet the needs of many residents and on-street parking congestion results.
APPENDIX A

WRIGLEY DISTRICT

Predominant Street Trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Avenue</th>
<th>Tree Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Avenue</td>
<td>Brisbane Box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Avenue</td>
<td>Tristania (Brisbane Box) + Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus Avenue</td>
<td>Brachychiton (Bottle Tree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia Avenue</td>
<td>Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Avenue</td>
<td>Center - Deodar Cedar Side - American Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Avenue</td>
<td>Magnolia and Brachychiton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Avenue</td>
<td>American Elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Avenue</td>
<td>Canary Island Palm /Cocos Palm /Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Avenue</td>
<td>Canary Island Palm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: William Montgomery

  Long Beach Bureau of Parks
APPENDIX B

PROMINENT BUILDERS IN THE WRIGLEY DISTRICT

(A single developer seldom built all the houses in a block in the Wrigley District, but examples of the work of the following builders can be found in the blocks cited.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>BUILDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEDAR AVENUE</td>
<td>Lauer Brothers and O'Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300 block</td>
<td>Francis J. Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stivers Brochers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400 block</td>
<td>Morgan Stivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHESTNUT AVENUE</td>
<td>Lauer Brothers and O'Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100 - 2300 blocks</td>
<td>Fleming and Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUCALYPTUS AVENUE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 - 2100 blocks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLDEN AVENUE</td>
<td>George Threlkeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 block</td>
<td>Hauser and Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morgan Stivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 block</td>
<td>Hauser Realty Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neal Stivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100 block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON AVENUE</td>
<td>Neal Stivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 block</td>
<td>Paul Bohne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>Stivers Brothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 block</td>
<td>Hauser and Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houser Real Estate Building Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IDENTIFICATION
1. Common name: Wrigley District
2. Historic name: Wrigley District
3. Street or rural address: District bounded by Willow Avenue/Pacific Avenue/Pacific Coast Highway/and Los Angeles River Channel
   City Long Beach Zip County Los Angeles
4. Parcel number: N/A
5. Present Owner: Various Address: 
   City Zip Ownership is: Public Private
6. Present Use: Residential District Original use: Residential District

DESCRIPTION
7a. Architectural style: 
7b. Briefly describe the present physical description of the site or structure and describe any major alterations from its original condition:
   See attached.

8. Construction date: 1927-1940 Estimated x Factual

9. Architect None known

10. Builder(s) See Appendix B

11. Approx. property size (in feet)
    Frontage Depth
    or approx. acreage

12. Date(s) of enclosed photograph(s)
    May, 1980

DPR 523 (Rev. 4/79)
13. Condition: Excellent ___ Good ___ Fair ___ Deteriorated ___ No longer in existence ___

14. Alterations: Various

15. Surroundings: (Check more than one if necessary) Open land ___ Scattered buildings ___ Densely built-up ___ Residential ___ Industrial ___ Commercial ___ Other: __________________________

16. Threats to site: None known ___ Private development ___ Zoning ___ Vandalism ___ Public Works project ___ Other: __________________________

17. Is the structure: On its original site? ______ Moved? ______ Unknown? ______

18. Related features: Street trees

SIGNIFICANCE

19. Briefly state historical and/or architectural importance (include dates, events, and persons associated with the site.)

   See attached.

20. Main theme of the historic resource: (If more than one is checked, number in order of importance.)

   Architecture 2 Arts & Leisure
   Economic/Industrial Exploration/Settlement 1
   Government Military
   Religion Social/Education

21. Sources (List books, documents, surveys, personal interviews and their dates).

   Long Beach Press-Telegram
   City of Long Beach Building Permits
   Public Library Long Beach History Collect.
   City Directories

22. Date form prepared ___ July, 1980

   By (name) David E. Bess
   Organization L.B. Planning & Bldg. Dept.
   Address: 333 W. Ocean Blvd.
   City Long Beach, CA Zip 90802
   Phone: (213) 590-6593
WRIGLEY DISTRICT STREET SCENES
Photographs by James Worrel; May, 1980

1. CEDAR AVENUE - west side of the 2100 block (Photo 15-7)
2. CEDAR AVENUE - east side of the 2100 block (Photo 15-8)
3. CEDAR AVENUE - east side of the 2100 block - looking north (Photo 15-9)
4. CEDAR AVENUE - west side of the 2200 block - looking south (Photo 15-5)
5. CEDAR AVENUE - looking south at the 2200 block (Photo 15-4)
6. CEDAR AVENUE - looking southwest at 2200 block (Photo 15-6)
7. CHESTNUT AVENUE - west side of 2000 block (Photo 15-12)
8. DAISY AVENUE MEDIAN - looking south at 1900 block (Photo 16-7)
9. EUCALYPTUS AVENUE - looking north on the 2000 block (Photo 16-2)
10. EUCALYPTUS AVENUE - west side of 2000 block north - looking south (Photo 16-4)
11. EUCALYPTUS AVENUE - west side of 2000 block (Photo 16-3)
12. EUCALYPTUS AVENUE - northwest corner and 20th Street (Photo 16-1)
13. OREGON AVENUE - looking south at the 1900 block (Photo 16-9)
14. SAN FRANCISCO AVENUE - looking south on the 2000 block (Photo 16-12)

NOTE: Photos are arranged in alphabetical order by north-south street. (These streets are also in order from east to west.) Photo references are to roll and frame numbers on File in the Cultural Heritage Office.
2059 CEDAR (1930) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco two story apartment building. Flat roof with tile mansard to simulate a gable. Scalloped second floor front overhang. Built by M. A. Stivers (Photo 32-31)
2070 - 76 CEDAR (1931) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco two story flats. Intersecting low pitch tile gable roofs and circular tower over second floor entry. Mission style shape picture window in upper unit, and arched picture window below. (Photo 25-14)

2101 CEDAR (ca. 1929) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with medium pitch intersecting gables featuring varied color roof tiles. Circular tower at front entry and octagonal bay at front right. Arched window openings. Similar to 2285 Cedar. (Photo 32-33)
**2285 CEDAR** (ca. 1929) - Similar to 2101 Cedar except this has fake cut stone around the door and the arched window. (Photo 33-5)

**2374 CEDAR** (1929) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with intersecting gables and octagonal tower over the entry. An oversize front wall extends over the driveway and is topped with a sloping tile cap. Low stucco wall surrounds a front patio. (Photo 24-16)
Wrigley District Buildings (Cont'd)

2410 CEDAR (1935) - Norman Revival flats with high pitch intersecting gable shingle roofs. Gables are wood siding; rest of structure is stucco. Flagstone court and stairs winding to upper floor. Diamond pane windows on ground floor. (Photo 24-15)

2535 CEDAR (ca. 1929) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with low pitch shingle gable roof. Square tower to front left with pyramid roof. Parapet over front entry. (Photo 32-25)
2552 CEDAR (1937) - Streamline Moderne stucco apartment converted from a motel. Flat roof with streamline railing. Rounded corners and port hole windows. (Photo 24-36)

2025 CHESTNUT (ca. 1931) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco flats. Low pitch hip tile roofs intersect. Arched openings. Tile steps lead to upper floor. (Photo 32-4)
2056 CHESTNUT (1929) Spanish Colonial Revival stucco two story apartment. Flat roof with tile mansard to simulate gable circular tower over central entrance. Entry opening with false stone arch. (Photo 25-22)

2089-91 CHESTNUT (1931) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco flats with low pitch intersecting tile gable roofs. Second floor overhang at front and side gables. Circular tower with arched entry at top of circular staircase. (Photo 32-8)
2109-11 CHESTNUT (1930) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco flats. Flat roof with tile caps and front tile roof gable flared to form entry for upper unit. (Photo 32-9).

2151-53 CHESTNUT (1931) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco flats. Low pitch intersecting gables with tile roof. Arched openings on ground floor. Wrought iron railing on stairway and second floor balcony. (Photo 32-10)
2180 CHESTNUT (1928) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco house. Low pitch tile roof gables. Circular tower with arched entry opening. Wooden bars on some windows. (Photo 25-32)

2227 CHESTNUT (1929) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with flat roof and modified Mission Style parapet. Central entry under tile roof gable porch. Tile awnings over flanking windows. (Photo 32-12)
2264 CHESTNUT (1929) - Spanish Colonial Revival house with arched openings. Front gable extends to side to cover porch leading to entry under an octagonal tower. Side gable extends to create porte cochere. Low stucco wall defines front patio area. (Photo 25–38)

2350 CHESTNUT (1929) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco apartment. Flat roof with twin tile roof gables, and central tower rising from the second floor over the front entry. Tile awnings over front windows. (Photo 24-6)

2424 CHESTNUT (1929) - Similar to 2420 with floor plan reversed left to right. Walter Douglas, owner-contractor. (Photo 24-10)

2535 CHESTNUT (1929) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with low pitch intersecting tile gable roofs. Front gable flares to create porch leading to entry behind arched opening. Pointed arch picture window. (Photo 32-23)
2010 EUCALYPTUS (1928) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with flat roof. Low pitch gable with tile roof over entry, and tile shed roof to right. Built by Fleming and Weber (Photo 23-13)

2036 EUCALYPTUS (1927-first house on the block) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage. Low pitch tile roof with intersecting gables. Octagonal bay to right with arched window. Built by Fleming and Weber (Photo 23-10)
2051 EUCALYPTUS (1928) - Norman stucco cottage with high pitch intersecting clipped gables. High pitch shingle roof on round tower at entry. Diamond windows in square bay at left. Built by Fleming and Weber (Photo 23-20).

2061 EUCALYPTUS (1928) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with intersecting low pitch tile gables. Front gable flares over entry way. Arched picture window at left. Patio to front right with stucco wall and buttress at house wall. Built by Fleming and Weber (Photo 23-21).
2071 EUCALYPTUS (1927-first house on the block) – Hansel and Gretel stucco cottage with high pitch shingle rolled roof. Gables project to front at both sides, creating central courtyard at entry. Stick work and brackets in gable eaves. Small pane and diamond windows. Built by Fleming and Weber (Photo 23-22)

2131 EUCALYPTUS (1928) – Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with flat roof. Tile shed roof reaches across front of structure to create porch and extends over driveway to increase scale of house. (Photo 23-29)
2200 EUCLYPTUS (1930) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with medium pitch tile gables. Octagonal tower over entry. Front patio enclosed by low stucco walls. (Photo 26-18)

2267 EUCLYPTUS (1936) - Two story Spanish Colonial Revival stucco flats with tile low pitch hip roof. Second story overhang at front; upper unit entry at right with scalloped stair railing. Built by Lauer Bros. and O'Brien, Contractors (Photo 33-30)
Wrigley District Building (Cont'd)

2290 EUCALYPTUS (1936) - Similar to 2267. (Photo 24-22)

2311 EUCALYPTUS (1930) - Two story Spanish Colonial Revival flats with flat roof and low pitch tile mansard designed to look like a side gable roof from the street. Octagonal tower to the right front. Upper unit entry partially enclosed under eccentric gable. Arched window and door shapes. (Photo 33-31.
2375 EUCALYPTUS (1928) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with low pitch intersecting gable tile roofs. Arch over front entry. Tile porch floor. Built by owner with "daywork". (Photo 33-37)

2516 EUCALYPTUS (1940) - Similar to 2267 with floor plan reversed left to right. (Photo 24-31)
2522 EUCALYPTUS (1937) – Same design as 2516 (et al) with different landscape treatment. Built by Lauer Bros. and O'Brien, Contractors (Photo 24-32)

2552 EUCALYPTUS (1932) – Spanish Colonial Revival stucco flats with low pitch tile intersecting gables. Second floor overhang at front right. Note four different arch shapes as well as circular attic vent. (Photo 26-21)
1901 GOLDEN (1930) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with intersecting low pitch tile gable roofs. Front gable extends to side to form portico. Square tower with low pitch tile hip roof over entry. Parabolic arch front window. Built by George Threlkeld. (Photo 33-14)

2081 GOLDEN (1927) - Norman Revival cottage with rough finish stucco. High pitch intersecting shingle gable roofs. Front gable is oversize with small high pitch gable porch featuring arched entry way. Small pane windows. Built by Hauser Realty Co. (Photo 33-21)
2124 GOLDEN (1938) - California Tract style (though built by individual) single family house with low pitch hip roof and low pitch hip over garage extending to front. Stucco and clapboard siding. (Photo 26-35)

2140 GOLDEN (1937) - Spanish Colonial Revival cottage with low pitch intersecting tile gable roofs. Tile shed roof porch at central entry. Built by Neal Stivers (Photo 26-34)
2187 GOLDEN (1932) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with low pitch tile main gable and two low pitch gables extending to right front. Irregular pane leaded glass windows in front bay. (Photo 33-23)

2190 GOLDEN (1929-first house on the block) - Spanish Revival stucco cottage with Mission Style derivative detailing. Flat roof featuring modified Mission Style parapet with tile caps. Front low pitch gable with Mission Style shape front window. Shed roof porch with arched openings. (Photo 26-33)
2534 MAGNOLIA (1938) — California Tract style single family home with low pitch hip roof and similar hip extending to front left. Bay window at front right. Brick foundation with stucco above. (Photo 26-27)

2542 MAGNOLIA (1936) — Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with low pitch intersecting tile gable roofs. Arched picture window at left. Low round tower with arched entry opening. Tile roof on oriel window at right. (Photo 26-26)
2550 MAGNOLIA (1939) - Streamline Moderne stucco house with flat roof featuring wide overhang. Flat surface treatment. (Photo 24-10)

2434 MAINE (1937) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with intersecting low pitch tile roof gables. Low octagonal tower at corner entry. (Photo 26-31)
2474 MAINE (1937) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with intersecting low pitch tile roof gables. Side gable has flared eaves to create front porch. Tile shed over driveway entrance. Repetition of arch forms. (Photo 26-30)

2432 OREGON (1938) - Streamline Moderne stucco house with flat roof. Massive brick chimney at front. Rounded wall at front entrance. (Photo 26-32)

2025 SAN FRANCISCO (1929) - Spanish Colonial Revival stucco cottage with flat roof. Tile shed roof at front right and front facing gable to the left obscured by square tower with buttress, arched entry way, small diamond window and low pitch pyramid tile roof. Built by Hauser Realty Co. (Photo 33-26)
2075 SAN FRANCISCO (1928) - Norman Revival stucco cottage with high pitch intersecting clipped gables. Front gable is oversize, has flared eaves, a diamond window and an attic vent. Built by Hauser Realty Co. (Photo 33-28)