



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Report to the Historical Resources Board

DATE ISSUED: January 9, 2025 REPORT NO. HRB-25-001

HEARING DATE: January 23, 2025

SUBJECT: **ITEM #1 – Leona and Albert Winger Bungalow Court**

RESOURCE INFO: [California Historical Resources Inventory Database \(CHRID\) link](#)

APPLICANT: A I Samadi

LOCATION: 3655-3663 6th Avenue, Uptown Community, Council District 3
APN 452-291-04-00

DESCRIPTION: Consider the designation of the Leona and Albert Winger Bungalow Court located at 3655-3663 6th Avenue as a historical resource.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Designate the Leona and Albert Winger Bungalow Court located at 3655-3663 6th Avenue as a historical resource with a period of significance of 1925-1930 under HRB Criteria A and C. The designation excludes the c. 1956-1963 detached garage built outside the period of significance. This recommendation is based on the following finding:

1. The resource is a special element of the historical development of the City and retains integrity to its 1925-1930 period of significance. Specifically, the resource is an intact example of a hybrid bungalow court, which is a type of bungalow court that features a combination of residential buildings from different time periods and architectural styles. Bungalow courts, which originated in southern California, are a finite resource type that represents a unique part of San Diego's historic built environment and reflect San Diego's response in addressing the housing shortage among the rapid population growth that occurred in the early 20th century. The subject resource's proximity to a former San Diego Electric Railway line on 5th Avenue exemplifies the connection between public transit and working- and middle-class housing provided by the bungalow courts.
2. The resource embodies the distinctive characteristics through the retention of character defining features of hybrid bungalow court typology and retains integrity from its 1925-1930 period of significance. Specifically, the resource features a recognizable and well-defined full bungalow court layout; buildings that display different ages, roof forms, and spacing;

buildings reflecting more than one architectural style, with those styles being Craftsman and Spanish Colonial Revival; and that the property was developed in phases.

BACKGROUND

This item is being brought before the Historical Resources Board in conjunction with a preliminary review application to determine whether or not the building is historically significant as part of a constraints analysis for future development.

The property was identified in the [2016 Uptown Historic Resources Survey Report](#) and given a Status Code of 5S3, "Appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation."

The historic name of the resource, the Leona and Albert Winger Bungalow Court, has been identified consistent with the Board's adopted naming policy and reflects the name of Leona Winger and Albert T. Winger, who constructed the subject property and lived on site.

In order to be eligible for designation and listing on the City's Register, a resource must meet one or more of the City's designation criteria as specified in the Historical Resources Guidelines of the Land Development Manual and retain integrity as it relates to the significance of the resource. Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance, which requires an understanding of the physical features and characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance. The National, California, and City of San Diego Registers recognize location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association as the seven aspects of historical integrity.

Although not all seven aspects of integrity need to be present for a property to be eligible for designation, the record must demonstrate that the property retains enough physical and design characteristics to reflect and convey the significance of the property. Each resource depends on certain aspects of integrity, more than others, to express its historic significance. Determining which of the aspects are most important to a particular property requires an understanding of the property's significance and its essential physical features. The [Guidelines for the Application of Historical Resources Board Designation Criteria](#) provide information regarding the City's designation criteria, as well as guidance on their application and how to evaluate the integrity of a resource.

ANALYSIS

The property located at 3655-3663 6th Avenue in the Uptown Community Planning Area is a hybrid bungalow court consisting of a one-story Craftsman-style residence (3659 6th Avenue) and four one-story Spanish Colonial Revival-style residences (3655, 3657, 3661, 3663 6th Avenue), two of which were constructed in 1927 and two others in 1930. Other buildings and structures on site include a modified 1925 detached garage and a c. 1956-1963 detached garage. The property is located in the Hillcrest neighborhood among low-rise and mid-rise residential buildings. The property is in its original location.

Since its construction in 1925-1930, the property has been modified as follows: Rear porch enclosure of 3659 6th Avenue, an addition to the 1925 detached garage, and the construction of a new detached garage, all of which occurred c. 1956-1963. Sometime after 1970, security window

bars were added to the property. At an unknown date, a corrugated metal shed was added to the 3655 6th Avenue unit at the south elevation.

A Historical Resource Research Report was prepared by Scott A. Moomjian, which concludes that the resource is not significant under any HRB Criteria. Staff disagrees, finding the site as a significant historical resource under HRB Criteria A and C. This determination is consistent with the [Guidelines for the Application of Historical Resources Board Designation Criteria](#), as follows.

CRITERION A - Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City's, a community's or a neighborhood's historical, archaeological, cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, landscaping or architectural development.

The [2021 Bungalow Court and Apartment Historic Context Statement](#) studied bungalow courts and apartment courts constructed between c. 1917 and c. 1960 within the City of San Diego. This context statement provided the historical background for the development of bungalow courts within San Diego, the different types of bungalow courts (full, half, complexes and hybrid), and the eligibility standards for historic designation. Relevant portions of this context statement are summarized and analyzed below.

The first bungalow court is believed to have emerged in Pasadena in 1909 as an alternative to the traditional apartment building, taking advantage of the temperate southern California climate. As a new property type, the prototypical bungalow court featured a high degree of architectural and planning design, and buildings were similar without being identical and sited with privacy in mind. In the 1920s, it became cost-effective for bungalow court units to be smaller, standardized, and simplified. The subject property represents a hybrid bungalow court in the 1920s, where the Spanish Colonial Revival units exhibit simplified architectural details and standardized footprint and size.

San Diego's growth between 1917 and 1930 can be largely attributed to the combined effects of the 1915-1916 Panama California Exposition and the growing military presence in the City. The exposition attracted 3.7 million visitors to the City (many of whom became permanent residents) while the post-WWI military established permanent military bases. Between 1910 and 1920, San Diego's population nearly doubled, growing from 74,000 to more than 147,000. The bungalow court, which appeared in San Diego in the late 1910s, was seen as one way to address the housing shortage. Seeking to address the need for housing across Southern California, the 1920 convention of the California Association of Commercial Secretaries, held in Pasadena and attended by representatives from San Diego, recommended the bungalow court concept as a solution. A building boom began around 1923 and peaked in 1926 in San Diego, facilitated by a demand for housing to accommodate new residents and the falling cost of construction materials and labor. The subject property, which began construction in 1925 and was added to in 1927 and 1930, coincides with and trails this building boom.

Bungalow courts appealed to renters and small-scale developers alike. For renters, they offer greater privacy and independence than apartment buildings or boarding houses, which were seen as crowded and unhealthy. The relative proximity of neighbors and the typical placement of front entries facing a shared common space fostered a sense of security and community. The combination of independence, privacy, safety, and traditional domestic lifestyle appealed to a variety of individuals from different socio-economic backgrounds. Bungalow courts primarily house

a mix of married couples, single professional men, and single women. Available San Diego City Directories from 1925-1960 generally indicate that the subject property was occupied by working men, working women, and their families; their occupations include aircraft, railway, garage, and title company employees, stenographers, secretaries, storekeepers, welders, telephone operators, and US Navy and Marine Corps servicemembers.

Bungalow courts also appealed to small-scale and novice developers because they offer a higher rate of return than single-family homes. They also had lower barriers to entry for investment in real estate than apartment buildings or flats, as they required no more construction knowledge than needed to build simple, wood-frame houses. Hundreds of bungalow courts were built in San Diego by 1950, primarily in streetcar suburbs. Bungalow courts were typically constructed within a few blocks of streetcar lines, targeting working-class and middle-class residents who wanted to travel to their workplaces quickly and affordably. The subject property was first built in 1925, one block from a then-existing streetcar route along 5th Avenue.

San Diego bungalow courts are expressed through a variety of forms. The standard, full bungalow court typically exhibits uniform buildings of the same architectural style arranged in a clearly defined plan, and the residential units each contain a clearly defined entrance facing a central common open area, and the common area is accessed directly from the street; bilateral symmetry is common. On the other hand, a half bungalow court is a variation of the full court. It is characterized by a single, linear row or L-shaped arrangement of buildings, and occupies a single residential lot. It contains a well defined as a common open space onto which units face with a shared walkway and designed landscape features. Another type of bungalow court is a bungalow court complex; it contains a full bungalow court and one or more full or half courts and occupies multiple lots. Lastly, a variant of the bungalow court is called the hybrid bungalow court. This court is defined by the presence of a clear and distinct bungalow court on the property along with other building(s) present. Character defining features of a hybrid bungalow court include at least one well-defined and recognizable full or half bungalow court that possesses most of the character-defining features of those property types.

The subject property exemplifies and reflects a special aspect of the City's general historical development in the 1920s. This development involved market demand, land use, and building trends, ultimately creating a type of multi-family building typology called the hybrid bungalow court.

As originally constructed in 1925, the site contained a single Craftsman residence with a deep setback from the street. Two years later, two additional units were constructed. Two more units were built three years later, forming a de facto hybrid bungalow court. Hybrid bungalow courts are unique variants of the bungalow court typology in San Diego, where, in some cases, property owners sought to add units to lots that already contained a single-family house or duplex, thus resulting in de facto bungalow courts. In the subject property's case, a half court was formed when two Spanish Colonial Revival buildings were added in 1927 to an existing lot containing a single-family residence. Subsequently, the addition of the final two residential buildings in 1930, which mirrored the two 1927 structures in terms of its form, plan, and location of entry, resulted in a full bungalow court layout. This piecemeal development would demonstrate that the property was developed in phases. Such incremental improvements on individual parcels tended to occur during periods of housing shortages, including in the 1920s and the 1940s.

Occupying a single residential lot, this hybrid bungalow court is characterized by multiple detached one-story buildings of equal sizes, arranged in two parallel rows, formed around a central common open space where primary entrances to individual units open directly onto the court. It is also a narrow court, featuring a single concrete walkway and small planted areas in front of units, with little parking available to the rear accessible from the alley.

The hybrid bungalow court and other types of bungalow courts are the results of a novel Southern California interpretation of multi-family housing that, by the 1920s in San Diego, emerged as a response to the booming population and demand for housing in the City after the 1915-1916 Panama California Exposition and wartime growth. This novel development specifically targeted areas of existing streetcar infrastructure, and it appealed to middle-class and working-class individuals specifically because of its design. Bungalow courts are considered finite resources and were generally no longer constructed after c. 1960 due to changes in land use regulations. As a hybrid bungalow court, the subject property reflects this special aspect of the City's historical development in the 1920s. The period of significance is 1925-1930, capturing the original construction and ending when the last residential unit was built.

The rear c. 1956-1963 detached garage, which was built decades after the construction of the residential units of the bungalow court, does not contribute to the significance under HRB Criterion A because it was not constructed as a response to the increased housing demand in the 1920s, nor was it part of the original development of the hybrid bungalow court during 1925-1930.

Of the seven aspects of integrity, location, setting, feeling, and association are the most critical to the property's ability to convey significance under HRB Criterion A as a special element of the City's historical development. According to the [2021 Bungalow Court and Apartment Historic Context Statement](#), special integrity considerations shall be applied when evaluating a bungalow court, as a bungalow court must retain sufficient integrity to convey its significance. This includes the integrity of the overall organization, form, and scale of the development; the presence of a discernable court with designed landscape features; a relationship between the units, court, and street; and sufficient design, material, and workmanship integrity of the individual buildings that comprise the bungalow court. Integrity of feeling as a bungalow court is also important, especially for the hybrid examples. Common alterations, such as adding security bars, replacing windows or doors in their original openings, and replacing fences or gates at the street-front entrances into the court, are not sufficient to affect the property's integrity on their own. Existing original site or landscape features are not required but may enhance a property's significance and integrity. The subject property retains its overall organization, form, and scale of the development. Alterations such as the c. 1956-1963 detached garage, enclosed porch, and the metal shed addition do not significantly detract from the court's overall organization, form, and scale of the development. The added window security bars are minor in nature and do not significantly impair the property's integrity. Therefore, the property retains integrity to its 1925-1930 period of significance under HRB Criterion A.

Significance Statement: The resource is a special element of the historical development of Uptown and the City, and retains integrity to its 1925-1930 period of significance. Specifically, the resource is an intact example of a hybrid bungalow court, which is a type of bungalow court that features a combination of residential buildings from different time periods and architectural styles. Bungalow courts, which originated in southern California, are a finite resource that represent a unique part of San Diego's historic built environment and reflect San Diego's response in addressing the housing

shortage among the rapid population growth that occurred in the early 20th century. The subject resource's location near a former San Diego Electric Railway line on 5th Avenue exemplifies the connection between public transit and working- and middle-class housing provided by the bungalow courts. Therefore, staff recommends designation under HRB Criterion A. The designation excludes the c. 1956-1963 detached garage.

CRITERION B - Is identified with persons or events significant in local, state or national history.

Research into the owners and tenants of the property at 3655-3663 6th Avenue did not reveal any individuals who could be considered historically significant in local, state or national history. Furthermore, no events of local, state or national significance are known to have occurred at the subject property. Therefore, the property is not eligible for designation under HRB Criterion B. As the property is not significant under Criterion B, an evaluation of integrity as it relates to Criterion B is not relevant or required.

CRITERION C - Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction or is a valuable example of the use of natural materials or craftsmanship.

The hybrid bungalow court at 3655-3663 6th Avenue contains a Craftsman residence, four Spanish Colonial Revival style bungalows, and two detached garages.

The Craftsman residence, built in 1925, is deeply set back from the street. It features a one-story form, low-pitched front-and-side-gabled roof with moderate eave overhang, exposed rafters, decorative attic vents, projecting beams, clapboard siding, wood double-hung windows, and decorative brackets. The 1925 residence expresses Craftsman characteristics such as overhanging eaves with exposed rafters, a low-pitched roof, clapboard siding, and wood double-hung windows, but does not rise to the level of significance to be individually eligible for historic designation; The property lacks prominent character-defining features, such as porch columns. Therefore, staff does not recommend designation of this building under HRB Criterion C for the Craftsman style.

The four Spanish Colonial Revival residences are sited west of the Craftsman residence and open out to the central walkway and landscape area. Two of these buildings were constructed in 1927, and two others were built in 1930. All four are nearly identical in terms of footprint and styling. They all feature flat roofs, circular clay roof vents, elaborated gable entries with stucco relief details and Mission tile roof, stucco cladding, and wood double-hung windows. However, there are minor variations in design between the four buildings, such as the presence of attached arched wing walls and stucco relief details, and the differences in the location of some window and door openings. Although these buildings exhibit Spanish Colonial Revival features, they are expressed in a limited manner; they lack sufficient character-defining features such as asymmetrical facades, focal windows, and decorative metalwork. Therefore, the staff does not recommend the designation of these four structures under the HRB Criterion for the Spanish Colonial Revival style.

The detached rear garages, built in 1925 and c. 1956-1963, do not embody the distinctive characteristics of any specific architectural style. Therefore, staff does not recommend designation of these buildings under HRB Criterion C for their style.

The [2021 Bungalow Court and Apartment Historic Context Statement](#) establishes the character defining features of a hybrid bungalow court, and provides eligibility criteria and eligibility considerations for designating a bungalow court under HRB Criterion C. In order to be eligible for listing in the local register, a hybrid bungalow court must embody distinctive characteristics of a bungalow court property type.

The subject property, including the 1925 Craftsman residence, the 1925 garage, and the four 1927-1930 Spanish Colonial Revival residences, collectively exhibit most of the hybrid bungalow court's character-defining features, as demonstrated below. The period of significance is 1925-1930, capturing the original construction date and ending when the last two residential units were built.

Hybrid bungalow court character defining features	Subject property's features
At least one well-defined and recognizable full or half bungalow court that possesses most of the character-defining features of those property types.	<u>Yes.</u> The property features one well-defined full court and possesses its features.
May feature a few buildings or elements that display different ages, sizes, stories, roof forms, and/or spacing along the court.	<u>Yes.</u> The property features buildings from 1925, 1927, and 1930. The 1925 Craftsman residence and detached garage are differentiated from the 1927 and 1930 Spanish Colonial Revival residences in age, size, roof form, and spacing along the court.
Bilateral symmetry is less important.	<u>No.</u> The property does not possess bilateral symmetry due to the arrangement of the detached garages. However, this is a less important character-defining feature.
More than one architectural style may be apparent within the court or among individual buildings on the property.	<u>Yes.</u> At least two architectural styles are expressed by the residential buildings – Craftsman and Spanish Colonial Revival.
The property may have developed in phases.	<u>Yes.</u> When two Spanish Colonial Revival structures were added in 1927 to an existing single-family residence, they were specifically arranged to occupy the northwestern portion of the undeveloped space. When two additional units were added in 1930, the builder intentionally mirrored them across an east-west axis to the existing 1927 units. This demonstrates that the property was developed in phases.

The rear c. 1956-1963 detached garage, which was built decades after the construction of the residential units of the bungalow court, does not contribute to the significance under HRB Criterion C because it does not enhance the court organization, nor was it part of the original development of the hybrid bungalow court between 1925-1930.

Of the seven aspects of integrity, design and feeling are the most critical to the property's ability to convey significance under HRB Criterion C as a resource that embodies the distinctive characteristics of the hybrid bungalow court type. The property, which has been modified as detailed in the beginning of the analysis section of this report, continues to retain the significant character defining features of the hybrid bungalow court typology. The subject property retains its overall organization, form, and scale of the development. Alterations such as the c. 1956-1963 detached garage additions, enclosed porch, and later metal shed addition do not significantly detract from the court's overall organization, form, and scale of the development. Other alterations, such as added security bars, are not sufficient to affect the property's integrity on their own. Therefore, the property retains integrity to its 1925-1930 period of significance under HRB Criterion C.

Significance Statement: The property continues to convey the historic significance of the hybrid bungalow court typology by embodying the historic characteristics associated with the type; including a recognizable and well-defined full bungalow court layout; buildings that display different ages, roof forms, and spacing; buildings reflecting more than one architectural style, with those styles being Craftsman and Spanish Colonial Revival; and that the property was developed in phases. Therefore, staff recommends designation under HRB Criterion C. The designation excludes the c. 1956-1963 detached garage.

CRITERION D - Is representative of a notable work of a master builder, designer, architect, engineer, landscape architect, interior designer, artist or craftsman.

The subject property at 3655-3663 6th Avenue was built by Albert T. Winger. Winger has not been established by the Historical Resources Board as a Master Architect, Designer or Builder, and there is insufficient information to designate him as such at this time. Therefore, staff does not recommend designation under HRB Criterion D. As the property is not significant under Criterion D, an evaluation of integrity as it relates to Criterion D is not relevant or required.

CRITERION E - Is listed or has been determined eligible by the National Park Service for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or is listed or has been determined eligible by the State Historical Preservation Office for listing on the State Register of Historical Resources.

The property at 3655-3663 6th Avenue has not been listed on or determined eligible for listing on the State or National Registers. Therefore, the property is not eligible for designation under HRB Criterion E. As the property is not significant under Criterion E, an evaluation of integrity as it relates to Criterion E is not relevant or required.

CRITERION F - Is a finite group of resources related to one another in a clearly distinguishable way or is a geographically definable area or neighborhood containing improvements which have a special character, historical interest or aesthetic value or which represent one or more architectural periods or styles in the history and development of the City.

The property at 3655-3663 6th Avenue is not located within a designated historic district. Therefore, the property is not eligible for designation under HRB Criterion F. As the property is not significant under Criterion F, an evaluation of integrity as it relates to Criterion F is not relevant or required.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Designation brings with it the responsibility of maintaining the building in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The benefits of designation include the availability of the Mills Act Program for reduced property tax; the use of the more flexible Historical Building Code; flexibility in the application of other regulatory requirements; the use of the Historical Conditional Use Permit which allows flexibility of use; and other programs which vary depending on the specific site conditions and owner objectives. If the property is designated by the HRB, conditions related to restoration or rehabilitation of the resource may be identified by staff during the Mills Act application process, and included in any future Mills Act contract.

CONCLUSION

Based on the information submitted and staff's field check, it is recommended that the Leona and Albert Winger Bungalow Court located at 3655-3663 6th Avenue be designated as a historical resource with a period of significance of 1925-1930 under HRB Criteria A and C. The designation excludes the c. 1956-1963 detached garage built outside the period of significance.



Alvin Lin
Associate Planner
City Planning Department



Suzanne Segur
Senior Planner/HRB Liaison
City Planning Department

AL/ss

Attachment(s):

1. Draft Resolution
2. Applicant's Historical Report under separate cover

RESOLUTION NUMBER N/A
ADOPTED ON 1/23/2025

WHEREAS, the Historical Resources Board of the City of San Diego held a noticed public hearing on 1/23/2025, to consider the historical designation of the **Leona and Albert Winger Bungalow Court** (owned by A I Samadi C/O Becker Family Trust, 1616 E. Chase Ave, El Cajon, CA 92020) located at **3655-3633 6th Avenue, San Diego, CA 92103**, APN: **452-291-0400**, further described as BLK 3 LOTS 15&16 (EX ST WID) in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California; and

WHEREAS, in arriving at their decision, the Historical Resources Board considered the historical resources report prepared by the applicant, the staff report and recommendation, all other materials submitted prior to and at the public hearing, inspected the subject property and heard public testimony presented at the hearing; and

WHEREAS, the property would be added to the Register of Designated Historical Resources as **Site No. 0**, and

WHEREAS, designated historical resources located within the City of San Diego are regulated by the Municipal Code (Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2) as such any exterior modifications (or interior if any interior is designated) shall be approved by the City, this includes but is not limited to modifications to any windows or doors, removal or replacement of any exterior surfaces (i.e. paint, stucco, wood siding, brick), any alterations to the roof or roofing material, alterations to any exterior ornamentation and any additions or significant changes to the landscape/ site.

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED, the Historical Resources Board based its designation of the Leona and Albert Winger Bungalow Court on the following findings:

(1) The property is historically significant under CRITERION A as a special element of the historical development of the City and retains integrity to its 1925-1930 period of significance. Specifically, the resource is an intact example of a hybrid bungalow court, which is a type of bungalow court that features a combination of residential buildings from different time periods and architectural styles. Bungalow courts, which originated in southern California, are a finite resource type that represents a unique part of San Diego's historic built environment and reflect San Diego's response in addressing the housing shortage among the rapid population growth that occurred in the early 20th century. The subject resource's proximity to a former San Diego Electric Railway line on 5th Avenue exemplifies the connection between public transit and working- and middle-class housing provided by the bungalow courts. This finding is further supported by the staff report, the historical research report, and written and oral evidence presented at the designation hearing.

(2) The property is historically significant under CRITERION C for its distinctive characteristics through the retention of character defining features of hybrid bungalow court typology and retains integrity from its 1925-1930 period of significance. Specifically, the resource features a recognizable and well-defined full bungalow court layout; buildings that display different ages, roof forms, and spacing; and buildings reflecting more than one architectural style, with those styles being Craftsman and Spanish Colonial Revival; and that the property was developed in phases. This finding is further supported by the staff report, the historical research report, and written and oral evidence presented at the designation hearing.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, in light of the foregoing, the Historical Resources Board of the City of San Diego hereby approves the historical designation of the above named property. The designation includes the parcel and exterior of the building as Designated Historical Resource **Site No. 0**.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the designation shall exclude the c. 1956-1963 detached garage built outside the period of significance.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Secretary to the Historical Resources Board shall cause this resolution to be recorded in the office of the San Diego County Recorder at no fee, for the benefit of the City of San Diego, and with no documentary tax due.

Vote:

BY: _____
TIM HUTTER, Chair
Historical Resources Board

APPROVED: MARA W. ELLIOTT,
CITY ATTORNEY

BY: _____
LINDSEY SEBASTIAN,
Deputy City Attorney

DRAFT