Case Study Apartments No. 1, (originally Case Study House No. 28) our first essay into multi-family residential construction, was undertaken in the hope that A & A can be as influential in gaining popular and institutional acceptance of good, thoughtful and imaginative design in this area of residential building as it has been over the past twenty years with the single family home. By the time you read this, ground should have been broken in Newport Beach, Calif., on CSA No. 2 by Killingsworth, Brady and Associates.

Our intention is to overcome by example, not just precept, as many as possible of those misconceptions and prejudices which have bred the outrageous "dingbat" apartments, the cheap and blowzy eyesores, that continue to proliferate everywhere in our country. Unlike the case of single family construction, economic factors in income projects are only rarely mitigated by pride of ownership and personal use considerations. Here good design must stand on its own feet, defend itself. To date it has had very little success. The belief is widely and deeply held that good architecture is an impractical luxury, incompatible with a fair return on one's investment. Quality is looked on with suspicion. Banks shy from it; their loan policies discourage it.

It is our belief that this is because quality is not considered quantifiable, and ours is a quantified society committed to mass production, sales, consumption. The producers and sellers are committed, at any rate; the consumers have little choice but to follow. The commitment takes the form of capital outlay and, once made, resistance to basic changes is a natural concomitant. In terms of income housing, developers [with an eye to loan and amortization costs and tables] demand a ten to fifteen per cent return on their investment. Material to this is the fact that the normal vacancy factor hovers around the fifteen per cent figure.

It is our conviction that the same vacancy factor should not be applied to a project which is handsomely designed, in which the eventual occupant has been a second client in the design of designer and has been given, as a result, a pleasant and serene environment. In (Continued on next page)
our experience where this has been done, there has been consistent 100 per cent occupancy. This has been true of Baldwin Hills Village over a period of more than 20 years; it is true of smaller projects typified by one of some ten units built 14 years ago which, in an area of Los Angeles where units go begging, has never had a vacancy.

Unfortunately the number of such projects is still too small to be an effective argument.

Located in Phoenix, Arizona, Case Study Apartments No. 1 has successfully met the design requirements of our program. The three small units turn in on a central court creating their own collective quiet and seclusion. The restrained, recessive nature of the architecture and intelligent use of materials give the building individual but unobtrusive character which would make it a good neighbor even in a detached home residential area.

Whether or not the project will successfully support our position that good design and good investment are not mutually exclusive remains to be seen. However, at a rent schedule of $150, it is competitive with the typical "dingbat," and we believe it will prove a good investment. It is situated on a 140' x 96' corner lot which cost $6,000 — an unusually favorable but not decisive factor. Each unit contains 480 square feet with living room, kitchen, bedroom, study-bedroom and bath. (The triplex was conceived as a prototype for a larger development — one of the program's requirements — of 80 units, and accompanying the realized plan is one for the larger scheme.

Construction cost was approximately $21,600 for the 2,700 square feet of enclosed area. The designer-owner has noted that from an investment standpoint the three-unit plan is marginal because of apportionment of maintenance and management costs, etc., among so few units and because one vacancy would reduce the income by one third. With these factors militating against it, if the project is successful — and we shall follow it closely — then it will be all the more convincing as an argument sustaining our assertion.

The structure is 10' x 14' post and beam (for longer schemes 12'4" square would be more economical) framed in Douglas fir. Exterior walls and party walls are made of concrete block; accessory walls are Texture 1-11 plywood over wood stud. Frosted glass is used in the patios, with interior partitions of ½" slate rock.

Sliding doors are Aluminaire, closet doors Firenza Bi-fold. Flooring is white Formica. Kitchen cabinets, made by Jackson Cabinets of Phoenix, are U. S. Plywood with three coats of Martin-Senour industrial lacquer. Plumbing fixtures are American Standard with Eljer lavatories. All appliances are Hotpoint.

Exposed aggregate and concrete block were used in front patios. Lumite nylon netting is used as sun shade over the patio area. All vertical surfaces excepting the white doors and posts are putty-beige.