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INTRODUCTION

No one will ever accuse Hollin Hills as being like any other suburban subdivision. Nestled in the hills overlooking the Potomac River south of Alexandria, Virginia, the community is easily overlooked and that is how the residents prefer it. When turning off the colonially historic Fort Hunt Road, one enters an environment that was once intended to be the future of American suburban life, but is obviously now the past. Built between the years 1949 and 1971, the homes are dated and the landscape an overgrown shadow of its designed intention. Hollin Hills remains a place marker to a unique time in American culture and the history of the American built environment as an archetypical Modern suburban subdivision. As the community extends past its fiftieth anniversary, it is faced with the reality of becoming historic. Its ability to adapt to future generations of homeowners is being reconciled with its desire to remain unique and true to its founding progressive ideals. This thesis will look to Hollin Hills and the steps its community has taken to manage change in an attempt to better understand the preservation challenges faced by suburbs of the recent past.

Every American city has its equivalent to Hollin Hills; a Modern suburban community whose star has fallen on what was an experiment intended to shape the American dream and change the way Americans live in their homes. The suburb has emerged as the dominant housing environment in American, gaining its strength from the traditional American value of owning ones own home. However, unknown to most is that three fourths of all American housing stock was built prior to 1940.¹ The postwar

¹ Dolores Hayden, Redesigning the American Dream (New York, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1984), 12.
building boom resulted in a phenomenon that affected millions of people and may never be duplicated again.² American suburbia is the largest and most costly undertaking in world history. In no way is the postwar suburban expansion subsiding.³ In many ways, the suburbs are at the center of what remains the great American housing experiment.⁴ Perhaps it is America’s continuing preoccupation with the suburban environment that makes addressing suburbs of the recent past so daunting.

What to do with postwar suburbs perplexes historians, preservationists and Americans alike. To many they represent the generation of their parents or grandparents, and a society they would still like to improve. Often communities built during the postwar period are dismissed as “sprawl” and examples of poor planning and uninspired architecture, without an interest in looking critically at the forces that shaped these environments. The recent “anti-sprawl” sentiment among professionals has further spearheaded a dislike for postwar suburbs. This resulting condemnation of 1950s suburbs undermines a historical perspective on suburbanization.

The overwhelming question remains, should preservationists consider the suburban landscape significant enough to warrant preservation? The answer reached by professionals is yes, if the community represents nationally significant events or cultural values in design and construction. However, this conclusion has serious implications for the field of preservation and the state of suburban academic knowledge. How to objectively access the historic significance of these communities is a challenge that

⁴ Martinson, 179.
preservationists have recently undertaken. Chapter One is a review of selected literature discussing obstacles and challenges concerning the preservation of the recent past.

Although the debate over the preservation of works from our recent past has begun, there is still a need for critical thought. Hollin Hills emerges in this debate as an example of a postwar, mid century, modern community committed to preserving its design idiom.

Chapter Two examines the social and political framework in which postwar suburban communities like Hollin Hills emerged. Placing suburban communities into the richly complicated social context of postwar American is crucial to understanding their social significance. Understanding the forces that manipulated the American building industry during this period of history sheds light on how external factors had profound affect on the built environment. Much of what we see today is a result of specific policies. Chapter Two also examines the rise and popularization of Modern residential architecture and the influence it hoped to have on changing Americans living habits and environments.

Chapter Three will discuss the key players responsible for the Hollin Hills’ creation including developer Robert Davenport, architect Charles Goodman and landscape architect Dan Kiley. These men shared a common vision of a progressively unique design and communal environment. Hollin Hill’s master site plan responded to the irregularities of the land by embracing its contour lines and natural habitat. Charles Goodman designed a series of single-dwelling homes, sharing a vocabulary of Modern elements made popular through shelter magazines, exhibits and the design dialogue of the period. The result was a community at the forefront of what many thought to be the future of American housing.
Chapter Four will examine how Hollin Hills has managed change over the last fifty plus years. Since its creation, the community has recognized its unique qualities and has taken steps to regulate and manipulate future changes. Through a rigid process of design review, the community has ensured that all additional construction in the neighborhood harmonizes with an original vision. However, Hollin Hills has recently become old enough to be recognized as historic by the National Register of Historic Places. As the community faces its coming of age, new questions are raised over appropriate preservation strategies. This final chapter will assess the steps already taken and recommend future actions to aid Hollin Hills and other postwar communities in retaining their sense of the “future” while remaining rooted in the past.
CHAPTER ONE: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Preservation of the Recent Past

It would be impossible to examine the preservation issues surrounding Hollin Hills without first looking at literature concerning the preservation of the recent past. Architecture of the recent past refers to structures built during the second half of the twentieth-century. Not all preservationists recognize the importance of preserving architecture and landscapes from the recent past. However, for those who do, there is a shared understanding that the relics of the recent past require unique considerations and practices different from conventional preservation. The majority of the published literature concerning the preservation of the recent past has been a result of conferences held over the past twenty years. The focus of these meetings has been the principles, practices, and philosophical challenges of defining and protecting the built heritage of the recent past. The general sentiment expressed as a result of these conferences is one of urgency to address the issues surrounding the appropriate preservation of the recent past.

Richard Longstreth, in his article, “The Significance of the Recent Path,” is cautious concerning the substitution of criticism for history when determining significance. Instead, he advises that analysis should be based on as objective a viewpoint as possible and factual evidence. However, Longstreth recognized the biases associated with determining significance, the strongest of which he cites as being the concept of age. The bias of age can be particularly harmful because so much of our heritage, which is not very old, is quickly disappearing. As a result, one can no longer assume that the places created by our parent’s and grandparent’s generations will be intact and undisturbed for an extensive amount of time. There is a tendency to view a piece of work as “historic”
only when it differs significantly from present design trends and represents ones that were apparently better. Many works of the recent past are instilled with memories of a society people may be still working to improve. Changes in tastes also play a meaningful role in the determination of significance and have influence many people tend to ignore. Longstreth urges the removal of taste from the significance equation, and for preservationists to think less like critics and more like historians.⁵ Landscapes and buildings from the recent past must be seen as non-renewable sources that if given to neglect will become “carcasses” left to future generations to decipher.⁶

There is a particular interest expressed in the preservation and documentation of the domestic and suburban environments. Mike Jackson makes the point that over forty percent of all Americans live in suburbs, the majority of which were constructed post-World War II. Yet, few preservation inventories have been undertaken in such suburbs. According to Jackson, there is an inverse relationship between rate of change and the time it takes for something to be considered historic. The faster the rate of change, the less amount of time is needed for something to be thought of as historic. The rapid changes made in society and technology occurring between generations has accelerated to a pace greater than in any other time. Hence, structures less than fifty years old represent a dramatic shift in society not previously expressed in the built environment.⁷ Because of abrupt changes in technology, preservationists who attempt to work with buildings of the recent past will be faced with the challenge of dealing with technology

and production of early and mid-twentieth-century building materials. Furthermore, many materials, fittings, assemblies, as well as entire buildings of this period were consciously designed to be replaced after a limited lifespan. Andrew Saint addresses the challenges associated with the intended life cycle of modern buildings. There are two different types of conceived life cycles. The first is the life cycle anticipated by the architects and builders, and has to do with their intentions for the building. The second is the life cycle the building actually experiences and is related to the building’s performance in use. Some people claim that modern architects intended for their buildings to have a shorter life span.\(^8\) With the rapid rate of change of building systems, many buildings of the recent past are currently in a state of technical obsolescence. The appropriate and economically feasible conservation solutions are not as obvious as with earlier historic structures.\(^9\) Furthermore, in many instances buildings from the recent past derive their significance from their risky and experimental use of structure and material. This creates serious practical and philosophical challenges for preservationists who want to ensure the survival of interesting modern buildings.\(^10\)

Like Longstreth, Jackson is adamant about the preservation of the recent past, citing it as the future of preservation.\(^11\) Jackson defends the lack of attention given by preservationists towards the recent past claiming that it is not due to a lack of interest, but to limited resources and specific challenges. As preservationists struggle to protect earlier

---


\(^10\) Andrew Saint, 24.

\(^11\) Jackson, 7-11.
heritage, they fail to address more recent resources.\textsuperscript{12} Besides the challenge of changing technology, preservationists must also establish an accepted period and scope of resources included in the recent past. In addition to monumental architecture, there is also an increased interest in non-monumental resources, as well as new types of resources (gas stations, shopping centers, motels, etc.). Professionals have expressed the importance of inventories as a means of comparative analysis and evaluation of heritage sites. Specifically, the use of the “heritage inventory”, or “cultural-resource site survey,” as a tool has been developed since the 1970s and 1980s. To date, the United States does not have a nationwide inventory or framework for analyzing the resources of the recent past, and as a result methods differ from state to state.\textsuperscript{13} The extent to which resources of the recent past are protected against neglect, insensitive rehabilitation, and demolitions differ greatly from region to region. The discussion of these issues among preservation professionals is promising; however the necessity for further collaboration and dialogue between professionals and organizations is still apparent.

Recently particular attention has been made by professionals towards the buildings of the recent past located within, and around, the Washington D.C. metropolitan area. A \textit{Washington Post} article dated January 29, 2006, “Polishing the Relics of a Recent Past,” discusses the current preservation efforts being made in Washington D.C. The article mentions the “D.C. Modern” two-day conference held in 2006 under the leadership of the D.C. Preservation League and the city’s Historic Preservation Office. The goal of the conference was to raise awareness and to face the long ignored host of questions raised by the idea of preserving Washington D.C.’s ageing

\textsuperscript{12} Bronson and Jester, 4.
\textsuperscript{13} Bronson and Jester, 6.
Modernist architecture. The article, written by Benjamin Forgey, echoes many of the same concerns expressed at other preservation conferences. Forgey remains optimistic, concluding in his article that, “The whole range of issues concerning the renewal of our modern buildings should be viewed less as a problem than as a great opportunity.”14

The state of Virginia has also started its own initiative to preserve structures and landscapes of its recent past. The history of Virginia’s Fairfax County preservation efforts are outlined in Bruce M. Krivisky’s article “Saving the Suburban Sixties: Historic Preservation Planning in Fairfax County, Virginia.” Krivisky’s article was published in 1995, eleven years before the D.C. Modern conference was held. In many ways, Fairfax County, Virginia has surpassed other counties in their preservation efforts. As early as the 1960, a team of students from the urban architecture program at Virginia Polytechnic and State University conducted a photographic survey of Hollin Hills. Fairfax County has also taken advantage of a variety of preservation tools in their effort to preserve communities of the recent past, such as the use of Historic Overlay Districts. Krivisky cites the biggest challenge to preserving structures of the recent past in Fairfax County as overcoming the idea that it just isn’t past enough. The problem with Modern architecture is that there is so much of it around that it doesn’t seem special to people. However, preserving the recent past in Fairfax County is significant “because of what it can teach us about where we, not just our parents and grandparents, have come from and how we have coped, for better or for worse, with the opportunities, needs, and constraints of geometric growth.”15

Preservation of Recent Past Landscapes

Suburban environments of the recent part are not defined just by their architecture, but also by their designed landscapes. Hollin Hills, like many postwar planned suburbs, had professional landscape architects working with the community’s developer and property owners to create a unique environment. There are issues concerning the preservation of postwar landscapes that are distinct from architectural preservation. Recent literature has begun to address these issues and provide advice to landscape preservation professionals.

The collection of essays included in the book Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America deals directly with the challenges of preserving landscapes and asks the question how can something composed of natural elements, which grows, matures, dies and moves be preserved? The authors of the essays present questions and challenges encountered by landscape preservationists through examples and case studies. The domestic garden, according to editors Arnold Alanen and Robert Melnick, falls into a category of cultural landscapes sometimes referred to as “middle landscapes.” Human processes and actions into gardens, subdivisions, lawns, etc., transform these landscapes. Ordinary cultural landscapes are evident in suburban American and characterized by the yards and gardens people create to give order and shape to their environment.16

Many preservationists feel that the integrity of landscapes is crucial to determining their significance. Catherine Howett discusses the challenges associated with determining integrity in her essay “Integrity as a Value in Landscape Preservation.” She defines the integrity of things-in-the-world as “being rooted in the physical conditions of

soundness, completeness, or wholeness.” Integrity is a requirement of National Register nominations under all possible criteria of significance. No matter how historically important a site, landscape, or structure may be, if the current condition does not meet the standard of integrity set for by the National Register of Historic Places it can not qualify for listing. Charles Birnbaum’s essay “Preserving Contemporary Landscape Architecture: Is Nothing Permanent but Change itself?” also discusses integrity as a central issue in the preservation of recent past landscapes. Birnbaum makes the point that if features critical to the overall design of a landscape are removed or lost, than one can assume that the significance of the design and its integrity would be compromised. However, concept of integrity in historic landscapes has been challenged as professional begin to value process of evolution in historic landscapes.

“The Last Landscape,” written by Richard Longstreth, addresses the many challenges associated with the preservation of landscapes of the recent past. “Landscapes of the recent past are, too often, the last considered and the most threatened. As nearly the last thing we have done, they are often the first things we believe must be redone again.” The period following World War II was responsible for an array of innovative land settlement patterns characterized by low-density, de-centralized and polycentric forms in which landscape design played a crucial role. Longstreth specifically cites


18 Howett, 188.


Hollin Hills as an example of innovative residential landscape design. However, private gardens, including those at Hollin Hills, are fragile, as they are often the first thing to be created or destroyed as property moves in and out of private hands. As a result, many private gardens of the postwar era have been lost.  

“Preservation in the Age of Ecology: Post-World War II Built Landscapes,” written by Elizabeth K. Meyer, also discusses postwar suburban landscape design in the context of three emerging themes between the years 1945-1970: 1) the automobile, 2) age of ecology, and 3) the garden. Meyer discusses in particular postwar residential gardens. Usually the desire for community in suburbs resulted in ordinances against fences and walls. Thus the enclosed garden becomes open space located somewhere between the public and private realms. “Their lack of boundaries, rather than ambiguous boundaries, results in the proliferation of undifferentiated spaces, invisible landscapes, and ubiquitous open – that is, empty – spaces.” The garden was an endangered spaced during the late modern era, and generally lacked prestige during the postwar decades. The relationship between the garden and the modern home is problematic, and some critics argue that the first victim of Modern architecture was the garden.

There are strong arguments against the conservation of anything related to the automobile landscape – a landscape that consumes land, encourages sprawl, and is not sustainable. Meyer argues that we should vision these landscapes as embodying an unprecedented period of confidence in design, leadership, and the American economy. Landscape preservationists need to re-evaluate what features of the postwar suburban

---

21 Longstreth, “Last Landscape,” 120.
23 Meyer, 14-19.
landscape are worth preserving for future generations. Robert Bruegmann, in his essay “Preservation and the Public,” urges landscape preservationists to avoid the mistakes architectural preservationists have made when addressing the relics of the recent past. There are no principles that transcend multiple generations and no land use decision that benefits all citizens. Instead, landscape preservationists should be confident in the slow process of education and realize that they cannot restrict the land to any one notion of how the world should be.\textsuperscript{24}

CHAPTER TWO: SUBURBANIZATION OF POSTWAR AMERICA

The suburb as an American housing typology has existed for decades. However, it was during the mid-twentieth century that it entered the forefront of America’s building industry and became the norm living environment for the majority of Americans. Previous to this period the suburb was associated with the wealthy privileged residents able to afford the relief from the city. The development of the suburb has seen a fair share of scholarly attention. Dolores Hayden categorizes the history of suburban construction into distinct vernacular patterns. The construction of borderlands (residential communities on the edge of cities) began in 1820 followed by the appearance of the picturesque enclave during the 1850s. Next in the history of development was the streetcar driven build out of American cities during the 1870 leading way to the arrival of the self-built, mail-order suburban communities in 1900. Hayden terms mass-produced mid-twentieth century residential subdivisions “sitcom” suburbs beginning in the 1940s and extending through 1960. 25 Communities such as Hollin Hills characterize this period of suburban construction.

Hollin Hills was build during a pivotal period of suburbanization. American Society emerged from the depths of the depression and World War II with an unprecedented faith in the future and strength of the American economy. With that faith came the confidence that individuals could shape their future and create change for the better good. Scientists, doctors, sociologists and designers all faced the challenges of a better future. The government backed these individuals, and closer examination reveals

that policies implemented in Washington D.C. had a profound affect on shaping the built environment.

The period of America housing history that includes Hollin Hills is commonly referred to as the “Post War Housing Phenomenon.” The mixture of the demand for housing fueled by returning GIs, new building technology, and the upswing of a recovering depressed economy fueled by Federal building initiatives resulted in an unprecedented amount of new construction in the United States.26 A major factor in postwar development was the availability of land. Cities did not have the large open tracts of land necessary for large-scale domestic construction. Likewise, rural areas were too isolated from employment opportunities. Thus, the American suburbs became the development type of choice for builders and potential homebuyers.

There is a myth that the postwar suburb developed without forethought or planning. This is not the case. The reality is that a combination of politics and federal policy in the decades leading up to and following the war had profound influence on suburbs. America during World War II was plagued by a shortage of housing. 1945 was the sixth consecutive year that new construction did not meet the housing demand. In an attempt to remedy the shortage, the Federal Housing Administration, in partnership with the Veterans Administration, backed bank loans for the construction of ten million new homes between 1946 and 1953, thus creating an enormous building industry.27 Essentially, the FHA and VA insured long term mortgage loans made by private lenders for home construction and sale. Lenders with money were persuaded to invest in

---

residential mortgages by the assurance against loss on such investments.\textsuperscript{28} In addition, the FHA extended the repayment period for its guaranteed mortgages and mandated that all loans be amortized. Minimum standards for home construction were established by the FHA and instantly became standard in the industry. For the first time the goals were objective, uniform, and in writing. Interest rates dramatically lowered from six to eight percent to two or three percentage points as a reflection of the government guarantee on loans. These factors dramatically increased the number of Americans who were able to purchase a home. Almost immediately, builders went to work and home sales accelerated rapidly from 93,000 in 1939 to 619,000 in 1941. By the end of 1972, the FHA had facilitated eleven million American families to own houses, and another twenty-two million to improve their properties. Between 1934 and 1972, the percentage of American families living in owner-occupied residents increased from forty-four percent to sixty-three percent.\textsuperscript{29}

However, the benefits associated with FHA were not equally distributed across the nation. In the case of Washington D.C., outlying areas were thought to be more appropriate for federal assistance than older neighborhoods. The FHA was committed to the northwest areas of the District of Columbia dominated by prosperous white neighborhoods. A limited number of mortgage guarantees were issued in the southeastern areas of the district, which were predominantly black. More influential was the fact that the FHA committed at least two-thirds of their guarantees within the Washington D.C. metropolitan area to locations within suburbs. The suburban areas that received the most FHA assistance were Arlington and Alexandria in Virginia, and Silver Springs, Takoma

\textsuperscript{28} Kenneth T. Jackson, \textit{Crabgrass Frontier} (New York, Oxford University Press, 1985), 204.  
\textsuperscript{29} Jackson, 204-205.
Park, Chevy Chase, University Park, Westmoreland Hills, and West Haven in Maryland. By the end of 1960, the suburban counties surrounding Washington D.C. received more than seven times more mortgage insurance as the District. Arguably, this policy had an effect on the decline of Washington D.C., however in its defense, the FHA claimed that they were not created to help cities, but to “revive home building, stimulate homeownership, and to reduce unemployment.”

Between the years 1933 and 1960, the FHA had effectively met their goals. The foremost recipient of the $119 billion in FHA mortgage insurance issued was suburbia. Almost one half of the houses built in the 1950s and 1960s could claim FHA or VA financing assistance. And it was at this point in the history of suburbs that the suburban ideal changed from an affluent enclave to the normal expectation of the American middle class.

The location of new construction in the D.C. metropolitan area was also correlated to areas of increased population. Between 1940 and 1950, while the population of the District of Columbia grew twenty-one percent, the Virginia Suburbs grew one hundred and thirty percent. The location with the most population growth during this time was Fairfax County, Virginia, with a growth of one hundred forty-one percent. The following decade shows a seven percent population decrease in Washington D.C., (a reflection of urban renewal and the resulting “white flight” of residents), while Fairfax County continued to increase, this time by one hundred and fifty-three percent ranking it by the census as number one in growth.

30Jackson, 213.
31 Jackson, 215-216.
The FHA also had an affect on the development of suburban character. A technical bulletin published and distributed by the FHA, “Planning Profitable Neighborhoods” advised developers to focus on a specific market, based on age, income or race. The FHA encouraged the use of restrictive covenants to ensure neighborhood homogeneity and protect against future racial tension that would decrease property values. A 1947 FHA manual unapologetically reads,

If a mixture of user groups is found to exist, it must be determined whether the mixture will render the neighborhood less desirable to present and prospective occupants. Protective covenants are essential to the sound development of proposed residential areas, since they regulate the use of the land and provide bases for the development of harmonious, attractive neighborhoods.33

By 1950, the national suburban growth was ten times that of central cities. It was estimated in 1954 that nine million people had moved to suburban communities in the last decade. These new communities shared some common themes, including locations outside the edges of built up cities and their relatively low density. The third shared characteristic of postwar suburbs was their architectural similarity. This was a conscious decision among larger developers in an attempt to simplify their production methods and reduce design fees by offering approximately half a dozen house plans. The result was repetition and monotony that has given postwar suburbs a reputation for poor design and site planning.34 The suburban home also became associated with affordability and less so with the concept of wealth. The reality was that it was cheaper to buy a new house in the suburbs than it was to rent or to reinvest in properties located in the city. However,

34 Jackson, 238-239.
despite the increased affordability of new homes, postwar suburbs developed into economically and racial homogenous communities.\textsuperscript{35}

The entire nature of the American building industry transformed during these years. Before the war, one-third of all houses were built by their owners. Small contractors were responsible for the construction of the other third. By the late 1950s, two-thirds of all homes in America were built by large builders. At the forefront of these builders were large developer-builders who had the skills and capacity to handle the government’s paper work, and undersell small builders due to their large productions scale.\textsuperscript{36}

Manufacturers of basic materials were left with a surplus of goods and available capacity after the end of the war. Many manufacturers turned to the housing market to sell their goods. The federal government, eager to protect the growing economy, encouraged this transformation of markets by the creation of loan guarantees from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC). However, the use of wartime materials in the housing industry did not happen without some reluctance. Insurance companies did not know how to assess the risk associated with homes built from nontraditional materials. Furthermore, homebuyers had difficulty associating materials such as steel, aluminum, and other metals with domestic comfort and warmth.

During the war, prefabrication and onsite assembly of building parts had been utilized to meet the demands of fast, affordable housing in places without established building stock. The resulting prefabricated houses were simple, utilitarian, and often constructed with the intent of eventually being dismantled and re-built elsewhere.

\textsuperscript{35} Jackson, 240-241.
\textsuperscript{36} Hayden, \textit{Building Suburbia}, 132.
Although at the end of the war there had been large advances in the field of prefabrication construction, for the most part, the term prefabrication was associated with undesirable housing.\(^\text{37}\)

In general, there were mixed feelings concerning the use of modern materials in the housing markets. The large percentage of American’s able to purchase new homes fueled the creation of a mythological ideal dream home. This myth was perpetrated by architectural, interior design, and home periodicals such as *House and Home* and *House and Garden*. The recommendations of these magazines ranged, from high-tech electronically controlled home to the re-emergence of the traditional American colonial home.\(^\text{38}\) Among the leading “tastemakers” of the postwar period was Elizabeth Monk, author, and acting curator of the Museum of Modern Art’s Architectural Department. Mock explained the draw of the modern home in a 1946 *House and Garden* article writing,

> The key to the enjoyment of architecture, historical or contemporary, sophisticated or naïve, is the cultivation of an intense awareness of its elements. One must not reproach it for its differences from establishment customs without first looking to see whether those differences have justifiable cause and effect. Most of the “peculiarities” of modern houses come from the fact that they are designed from the inside out. Ideally at least, they start with the convenience and pleasure of their inhabitants and the nature of their building materials, not with a preconceived exterior pattern. Convenience and pleasure, for the house which is merely convenient and efficient is not a house by a machine.\(^\text{39}\)

Elizabeth Mock explored the modern home fully in the Museum of Modern Art’s catalog *Built in USA 1932-1944*, a follow up publication to the museum’s first architectural

\(^{37}\) Hunt, 41.  
exhibition in 1932. The catalog featured modest examples of Modern domestic architecture in a response to American’s housing shortage and to encourage the acceptance of modern architecture among the American public. The organizers behind Built in USA 1932-1944 felt that Modernism could no longer be defined by a set of specific design principles. Instead, the sentiment was that if the public was going to embrace Modernism, they would have to be shown what it could accomplish as well as what it aesthetically looked like.⁴⁰

One of the aspects of Modern architecture that Mock emphasized was the use of natural materials in non-traditional ways. The expressive qualities of materials, especially wood, were stressed for its economic and aesthetic qualities. The use of prefabrication was also addressed by Mock. She comments,

> Our experience with war housing has not proved that factory prefabrication as such has any economic advantages for general use, but it has proved that construction can be rationalized in many ways for many purposes, and that prefabrication is one of those possibilities.⁴¹

The second design principle addressed by Mock was the introduction of the open flexible plan.

The old convention of the symmetrical, rectangular plan, divided into immutable compartments, has finally been broken down, and the newer convention of the “open plan,” sometimes accomplished only at considerable sacrifice of quite and privacy, is being more thoughtfully approached…Modern houses are now more apt to be articulated on the basis of group function – living, sleeping, cooking – rather than on the basis of the real unit – the person. On the other hand, the constantly changing needs of family life must literally be met with flexibility, and a one-story house with an independently supported roof and readily adjustable full-length partitions would have many advantages.⁴²

Mock also addresses the use of glass in modern buildings. She addresses public complaints that too much light hurts their eyes and results in expensive loss of heat by

---

⁴⁰ Harrison, 9-10.
⁴² Mock, Built in USA 1932-1944, 20.
citing scientific experiments proving that too much light is only unbearable when there is sufficient contrast between light and shade. The advances of radiant heating are mentioned as a means of making large spans of glass feasible economically. However, Mock concludes her discussion of glass by warning readers, “let no one assume that a building is modern only if it has large areas of glass.”

According to Mock, the Modern home is characterized by a new more intimate relationship to its surrounding landscape and site. Living spaces extend into the garden and glass walls bring landscape into the home. The boundaries between house and landscape become disregarded and site irregularities embraced. Mock condemns recent site designs for suburban communities writing,

If a new community must be located on flat, unwooded ground, how can the result be anything but dreary? All we seem to know is that parallel, open-ended rows of houses are not the answer, that every natural feature of the site must be exploited, and that any already existing buildings of interest should be retained.

The success of planned communities depends on a cautious balance of repetition and variety and careful design and placement of community structures.

The design features discussed in *Built in USA 1932-1944* represented a softer interpretation of avant-garde Modernism. This subdued Modernism was more appealing to mass taste. The design for the small house soon came to represent an ideal means of communicating and experimenting with Modern design and the advances in material technology. Architects began to produce designs solutions for the small homes featured in books, articles, lectures and design competitions. The resulting publicity of these

\[43\] Mock. *Built in USA 1932-1944*, 21.
\[44\] Mock. *Built in USA 1932-1944*, 22.
\[45\] Mock. *Built in USA 1932-1944*, 23.
designs had similar intentions as the Museum of Modern Art, to provide a forum for modern architecture discussion, and also to educate and sell the public on the benefits of modern design.47

There were other reasons besides taste that explain why some home builders rejected high Modernism including, the “high level of construction complexity and associated costs, visual characteristics and their associated symbolism, the conservatism of the FHA guidelines, and the mass preference for traditional forms by consumers and most speculative builders.”48 The advances in material technology and mass production during the war gave the impression that Modernist designs could feasibly be constructed on the mass level. There was a plethora of literature produced during the postwar years aimed at influencing the individual consumer homeowner. There was not a shortage of prototypes for the “Modern home” during this period. These magazines had profound influence on shaping popular taste, and when asked, suburban homebuilders sited magazine articles as having the most influence on their design decisions during the 1950s.49

Although the FHA favored suburban growth, the organization was hesitant to support Modern design. Non-traditional style homes were viewed as potentially high risk because of uncertain marketability and re-sale probability. Insurance and lending biases where greater for speculative developments where the buyers were unknown. Architects refer to this prejudice as a major hindrance in getting the public to accept Modern

47 Harrison, 14.
48 Martin, 19.
design. Charles Goodman, the architect of Hollin Hills, lamented in a 1954 *House and Home* article that federal valuation policies gave the builder no incentive to produce better design and quality.\(^{51}\)

For Modern architecture to successfully influence the American housing tradition at large, it would have to team up with the speculative and merchant building industry, which dominated new construction during the years following the war. Despite the FHA discrimination, speculative builders began to increasingly embrace Modern design in the early half of the 1950s. The shelter magazine *House and Home* was a powerful supporter of Modern design for the speculative builder and reported numerous examples of Modern design being built in metropolitan areas across the nation.\(^{52}\) The most successful Modern speculative developments usually involved a professional architect or builder with professional design training. The increased popularity of modern elements in housing prompted the FHA to reconsider their conservative stance. In 1954 the organization made significant chances in their policy and became more sympathetic to “contemporary” design.\(^{53}\) This in turn paved the way for the acceptance and popularity of Modern domestic architecture as the 1950s progressed into the 1960s.

Builders needed to team up and cooperate with architects for a variety of reasons. Once the immediate panic of the housing shortage subdued during the 1950s, builders needed to differentiate their product in order to attract potential homebuyers. Contemporary designs were an ideal way to hone in on an increasingly popular trend.

---

\(^{50}\) Martin, 33, 35.

\(^{51}\) “Action Follows Fast After Round Table Protest to Hollyday and King on Valuations” *House and Home* (March 1954): 149.

\(^{52}\) Martin, 53.

Likewise, builders were fond of contemporary designs because of their potential to reduce costs, a feature often highlighted by shelter magazines. The elimination of the traditional basement and attic reduced building costs, but required a skilled architect to design additional storage space and placement of new mechanical systems. Landscape architects were also in demand as builders began to explore the appeal of the house site. The retention of natural landscape features not only heightened visual interest, but also eliminated the cost of excavation. Similarly, retention of natural landscape features reduced the cost of landscaping.

The architect’s role in postwar suburban development has been for the most part discredited by historians. Often literature assumes that the architect was rarely involved. However, building statistics reveal that the architect played a role in shaping suburbia. A 1949 study completed by the FHA estimated that five to ten percent of all privately built homes were constructed with the input of a professional architect. The collaboration between architect and builder continued to grow in popularity as the 1950s progressed.

Some Washington D.C. architectural firms were instrumental in promoting the architect-builder relationship. The firm of Charles Goodman and Associates produced the majority of progressive modern designed houses in the Washington D.C. area. Goodman worked with a number of builders to develop detached, single-family, speculative houses. However, he is best known for his award winning Hollin Hills. The community received international recognition, and featured in a variety of periodicals shortly after the projects initiation. In 1957, the AIA proclaimed Hollin Hills one of the

55 Martin, 110-114.
best ten projects representing the future of American Design. The community is Virginia’s most significant contribution to Modern architecture in the twentieth-century. Its continual presence is a place marker to this unique period in the history of Virginia’s, and the Nation’s, housing tradition.

CHAPTER THREE: HOLLIN HILLS, A SHARED VISION FOR THE FUTURE

The Site

The location of Hollin Hills, just south of the colonial city of Alexandria and near George Washington’s Mount Vernon, was an unlikely place for the breaking of housing tradition. Yet, the availability of land, it’s proximity to Washington D.C., and the increased need for housing in the Nation’s capital set the stage for a new type of speculative housing development.

Approaching Hollin Hills by automobile from Washington D.C. one is made aware of the dramatic shift in natural landscape. From the crowded off ramps of the George Washington Parkway and Reagan National Airport, one passes through historic Alexandria and the parkway narrows, the median disappears, and the Potomac River appears. Lost are the monuments that speck the Washington D.C. skyline and in their place are tall, dense trees giving way to a gentler, more approachable riverbank. To one’s right the land surges and homes dot the landscape taking full advantage of the awesome view of the Potomac River. To reach Hollin Hills one turns right and heads uphill to reach an eroded plateau covered by second growth hardwood forest. If one were to continue south on the George Washington Parkway they would reach historic Mount Vernon. Although Mount Vernon differs greatly from Hollin Hills, they both represent a landscape where the man’s cultural intervention on the natural landscape is visible.

The creation of Hollin Hills was in many ways a scripted event involving a cast of unique characters. The catalyst was Robert C. Davenport. While working for the Department of Agriculture in Washington D.C., Davenport helped to establish a

community one mile south of Hollin Hills on Fort Hunt Road called Tauxemont. What began as a cooperative community in the early 1940s eventually became completely commercialized during and after World War II. Although the design of Tauxemont was not particularly innovative, consisting of basic cinder block one-story, side-gable roofed homes, the experience was enough to motivate Davenport to pursue the development of another contemporary designed community. He felt there was a market for good design in Washington D.C. All he had to do was find a willing and competent architect.58

In 1946 Davenport and partners purchased 240 acres of land north of Tauxemont for approximately $500 an acre. Based on the positive recommendations from his friends at the Federal Housing Administration, Davenport hired Charles (Chuck) Goodman to create a master plan for the community. Davenport first met the architect Charles Goodman while developing Tauxemont when some residents wanted to hire Goodman to redesign their home. Goodman’s experience designing at Tauxemont is what brought him to Davenport’s attention when it came time to decide what style of houses to build at Hollin Hills.

According to Davenport, Goodman was not only a good designer, but also a good promoter. The partnership was ideal - Goodman had the imagination to create the type of innovative design Davenport aspired to build at a price young professionals could afford.59 Both Goodman and Davenport were highly motivated, business-minded perfectionists. While Goodman pushed the design envelope and functionality, Davenport

59 Tiger, 12-15.
worked the logistics, public relations and production.\textsuperscript{60} When discussing their partnership, Davenport commented:

Chuck Goodman is a very competent architect, but he is also a good promoter. He immediately sketched some plans for houses and said, ‘this is what you ought to do.’ Of course, you can’t use a conventional house on that land…we were able to work together because I wanted to do something different and I think it was hard at that time for any builder to conceive of doing anything basically different.\textsuperscript{61}

According to Davenport there were comparable houses on the market during the 1940s to the homes being built at Hollin Hills – homes of the same size with three bedrooms, one bath, a kitchen and dining area. However, the difference was that Davenport and Goodman “developed a new style of architecture and a new style of land planning.”\textsuperscript{62} The innovative use of the natural contours of the land stemmed from their desire to “develop fresh thinking on how to use land properly and humanely.”\textsuperscript{63}

Regardless of their design ideals, Hollin Hills was a moneymaking venture for both Davenport and Goodman. The profit margin on custom designed homes was much higher than for development of mass-produced builder houses.\textsuperscript{64} The goal of Hollin Hills was to provide an alternative to most speculative development by the inclusion of innovative design principles. However, the end result had to be priced to compete with other merchant housing developments. In this sense, Hollin Hills can be compared to
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\item \textsuperscript{61} Tiger, 13-14.
\item \textsuperscript{62} Tiger, 15.
\item \textsuperscript{63} Tiger, 15.
\item \textsuperscript{64} Cross, 32.
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other built-for-profit communities, like Levittown; however the approach and end result differed greatly.⁶⁵

The dominant element of Hollin Hills that set it apart from other developments was the land itself. Davenport described Fort Hunt Road as a rural, narrow, unpaved road isolated from any public utilities. Goodman saw the land as the “type homebuilders avoided”.⁶⁶ Other builders had rejected the land as being too expensive and too much trouble to develop. Goodman took the opposite approach to the challenge of the land and instead based his design on the complexities of the hilly site. He sited the houses to the fall of the land, rather than to the street. The individual house plans responded to the requirements of the land and to site irregularities (Figures 1 and 2).

Hollin Hill’s roads were consciously created to mirror the contours of the land (Figures 3 and 4). A look at present day street map of Hollin Hills reveals that roads like Glasgow, Paul Spring and Rebecca clearly follow the land contours. Other roads, such as Beechwood and Stafford, were created along ridges. Davenport and Goodman were able to win the fight against the county and eliminated the standard street gutters, cement curbs, and sidewalks that characterized other area subdivision.⁶⁷ However, Northern Virginia Federal Housing Administrative vetoed Goodman’s desire to leave the roads an unpaved mix of gravel and tar. Goodman remained content with his vision:

I regret the necessity for installing a paved road not only because it is a conspicuous expense but also because of its hard city-like character, reflecting great heat in the summer and creating ice hazards in the winter.⁶⁸

---

⁶⁷ Hunt, 48.
The use of the “cul-de-sac” was another innovative element in Hollin Hill’s road lay out. Prior to 1949, the cul-de-sac was rarely used in speculative developments.69 Local governments and establishments frowned upon their initial use at Hollin Hills. Dead end streets were a nuisance to those who wanted to move through neighborhoods quickly including firemen, milkmen, and delivery truck drivers. However, their inclusion in the final plan of Hollin Hills was hoped to provide more area devoted to green space, increased safety and a reduction of noise for residents.70

Park space was also strategically used to create open space within the community (Figures 5 and 6). Approximately thirty acres of open space out of a total 240 were set aside as five community parks and deeded over to a community organization.71 The plan for Hollin Hills utilized low-lying areas within suburban blocks that were susceptible to flooding by making them into open park space. The setting aside of land to be owned by the community and reserved for only park space was rare.72 However, the inclusion of park space had both social and financial benefits. Park space was integrated into blocks of homes to create space between houses and enforce privacy. By leaving flood areas undeveloped, roads were given a natural mode of drainage.73 While other developers were trying to maximize the use of land for the most profit, the developers at Hollin Hills opted to work with the land for long-term sustainability and communal benefit. Long time Hollin Hills resident and associate of Charles Goodman, Eason Cross, describes the
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placement of park space as an attempt to make some “intelligent choices of places to surrender land to natural needs rather than attempting to civilize it.”

In addition to the strategic placement of open space, Hollin Hill’s plan demonstrates other financially savvy features. Mid-century building practices avoided the placement of mixed valued homes along the same block under the assumption that lower priced homes would diminish the value of more expensive homes. Davenport and his team disagreed and made a point to place low, moderate, and high priced homes along the same road in Hollin Hills. Unlike in other conventional neighborhoods, the homes built in Hollin Hills would be of a uniform style and construction quality placed on similar lots throughout. It was hoped that as resident’s need and means changed they could move from one size house to another without having to leave the community. Goodman’s plan also went against planning norms by maximizing house’s back frontage and not the valued front-footage. As a result, many lots within Hollin Hills measure greater in rear-footage than on the front. Like the curvilinear streets and park space, the increased rear-footage reflected an increased value on private space.

The Architecture

Once the master plan for the community was secure, there remained the question of what to build and how to build it. The architect Charles Goodman came to Hollin Hills with experience designing single-family dwellings; however he also possessed a desire to push the limits of Modern domestic design. Born in 1906 in New York City, Goodman moved to Washington D.C. in 1934 at the age of 28 after graduating from Chicago’s

---
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Armour Institute of Technology (currently the Illinois Institute of Technology). Goodman and his wife moved to Alexandria and Goodman took a job as a designing architect in the Public Building Administration. After having a hand at designing numerous Modern federal buildings, Goodman was appointed to be the chief architect of Washington D.C.'s new National Airport. In 1943 Goodman took a position as the principle architect for the Army/Air Force’s Transport Command (ATC) and was given the responsibility for designing ATC facilities internationally. Goodman remained with the ATC until 1946 when he opened an architectural firm in Washington D.C. and received various commissions for custom designed houses. During his early career Goodman developed a systematic approach to design using modular construction that eased building processes, simplified expansion, and created an aesthetic based on repetitive building components. These elements would appear in his design for his custom homes and the homes included in Hollin Hills.

Although his early career was dedicated to mostly federal and commercial buildings, Goodman was anxious to demonstrate the economic advantages of good Modern design applied to residential architecture. From the very beginning in Hollin Hills, the relationship between the homes and the hilly characteristic of the land was exploited as the defining feature of the community. A 1953 sales brochure notes this characteristic:

Hollin Hills presents a variety of single and multi-level family dwellings, carefully sited to exploit the wooded, rolling character of the land. In placing each house on its large lot, careful consideration is given to solar orientation, the necessity for maximum privacy among neighboring houses and the positioning of the house to afford its owner a view as well as full landscaping.

---
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and recreational use of their lot. Provision is made for future additional structures such as breezeways, carports, workshops and rooms for living.78

However, Goodman’s idealistic goals for the design of Hollin Hills had to be realistically weighed against the constraint of business and the necessity of making a profit. To help maintain a flow of cash and increase buyer’s equity, Davenport conceived a merchandizing plan that reduced speculative risk. Prospective buyers purchased land separately at prices ranging from $1,800-$3,000. Based on the site conditions of the land purchased, buyers selected a house plan and made down payments – promising to make more payments as construction progressed.79

In response to the different site conditions - hilly, flat, or uphill - Goodman created a system of classifying his designs by number of “Unit House.” Each number unit house was designed to adapt to a specific site condition.80 The assignment by Goodman of elaborate, seemingly illogical, number and letter codes to house designs was “strictly technical” according to Goodman’s associate Eason Cross. The numbers and letters referenced the quality of the home and the number of bedrooms, floors and other “extra” features included in the model.81 There was a conscious desire not to name the homes “Malibu” or “Salem” like in other contemporary developed communities.82

The first design Goodman created was dubbed Unit House No. 1, and was a split-level, with a “car shelter” and utility room on the ground floor, bedrooms on the intermediate level, and kitchen and living space on the top most level. A variation of Unit
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House No.1, Unit House No.1B, became the dominant split-level model built for sloped sited (Figures 7 and 8). It was a three-bedroom, one bath, house priced at $14,800. Used brick enclosed the embedded portion of the structure, while the upper portion of the house was constructed of contrasting wood-frame. A large visually dominant fireplace anchored the home to the site. The Unit House No.1B, with its dominant roofline, vertical sided exterior and shield of fixed/operable windows set the stage for a highly contemporary design aesthetic within the community.

The second house type, Unit House No. 2, was designed in response to the flat sites and sold for $10,000. This house type was not built into the land with brick, but sat on a concrete slab and built up with conventional wood framing. Masonry units were limited to the chimney in the living room and two solid wall areas in two of the three bedrooms. The plan of the home was a simple rectangle divided into two parts – the kitchen/dining/living area and the bedroom/bath area (Figure 9). Although simplistic in plan, No. 2 homes contain one of the most distinctive and innovative feature of Hollin Hill's homes. The large glass windows used in the design for Unit House No.1 homes now became an un-interrupted dominant element of the house’s façade. The windows spanned 28’-6” of the façade and consisted of repeating floor to ceiling window units based on the commercially available 3’-1” window modular. The windows contained a lower ventilation unit and later became a basic design element found in Goodman designs.

The designs of Unit Houses No.1 and No.2 were basic, and Davenport and Goodman wanted to ensure costumer satisfaction and interest by supplying a variety of design options, or “extra” that could be added on to the basic design for an additional fee.
For example, an attic fan, hardwood floors throughout, or an extra glass door to the outside were typically purchased as extras. A carport or additional storage spaces were also offered as options and were connected to the main house by flat roofs or a trellised wall screen. Unit Houses No.1 and No. 2 were also easily transformed into similar House Unit models to meet buyer’s requirements of additional living space. House Unit No.1BE had an additional bedroom, bath, and storage space. An additional four feet in the kitchen space resulted in the design of Unit House No.2K4, and similarly, an extra four feet in the bedrooms was included in the design for No.2K4B4. Beyond meeting the needs of potential house buyers, Goodman also designed additional unit houses to meet the needs of rare site conditions, like the steep downhill slope of Drury Lane. One resulting design was the Unit House No.2B42LB, a longer model of No. 2B4 consisting of two levels. The lower level had an additional two bedrooms, a bath, recreation room, and storage area.

The first model home was completed on Drury Lane in November of 1949. By 1953, Goodman and Davenport had created five more unit house types consisting of a modified version of an earlier type or a completely new design. Unit House No.3 was similar to the single-level No.2 homes with three bedrooms, two baths, a study and redesigned living area. Another new design was No. 4, a two-level smaller version of No. 2B42LB. Differences included a rearrangement of interior spaces and the replacement of the large masonry fireplace with a much smaller chimney located within an interior wall.

Goodman described Hollin Hills as “an architectural laboratory”, and it is obvious that he felt free to allow his creative juices to flow beyond just meeting the needs of potential clients. The different models and many variants of models at Hollin Hills
suggest a freedom felt by Goodman to push the limits of Modern domestic architecture.

In his design for Unit House No. 5 Goodman created a new structural framing system consisting of dropped beams in the living/dining room and two-inch-thick wood decking as the finished ceiling material. The new framing system was visible from the exterior and resulted in a distinctive “frame and infill” aesthetic that would characterize a distinct phase of design at Hollin Hills different from the first four unit house designs. The façade was divided into a units each framed by the structural system and infilled with either wood siding or standard window modules, or a combination of the two. The interior plan of No. 5 homes was arranged around a central mechanical core consisting of a kitchen, bath, and utility room. Immediately after its design, the Unit House No. 5 was recognized for its innovations. A January 1954 edition of House and Home magazine commented on Goodman’s design:

The builder was daring indeed: for the amazing thing about this house is not only that it has such a well integrated plan and structure, or such a simple, expressive interior; it is just as amazing that Builder Robert Davenport let Architect Charles Goodman get away with a design that only 10 years ago might have been considered the most avant-garde house in the U.S. 83

Arguably the most progressive of the designs at Hollin Hills, the No. 5 house gave birth to a number of variations. Unit House No. 5A was the same design, but with a conventional framing system of 2x8 rafters. Version No. 5B responded to client’s desire for larger homes and the demands of a steep slope towards the east with a two-level design built into the slope on a cinder-block base (Figure 10). The first completely custom built home was Unit House 5CS built for Maurice and Minnie Odoroff. The design won the American Institute of Architects National Award of Merit in 1954. The
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final theme of Unit House No. 5 was No. 57, which was designed in 1955 and had a square plan instead of rectangular.

Debatably, the most unique of all of Goodman’s designs at Hollin Hills was the No 2 “Butterfly” house (Figures 11 and 12). The home had the same plan layout and dimensions of a typical No. 2, but a low-sloped “V” or “butterfly” roof that extended across the entire width of the house replacing the gable roof. Unit House No. 6 also utilized a “butterfly” roof but was larger in response to the client’s growing demand for increased living space. The living room expanded the full length of the house and the plan included three bedrooms and two baths.

Simultaneously to designing homes for Hollin Hills, Goodman was hired as a consulting architect to the National Homes Corporation of Lafayette, Indiana. At the time, National Homes Corporation was the largest industrial housing fabricator in the world. Goodman had a history of interest in prefabrication stemming back to his work with the Air Transport Command. He felt that intelligent application of prefabricated elements to a wood frame building could provide a more efficient, economical, and higher quality construction. The use of prefabricated elements was responsible for the affordability of homes at Hollin Hills. Goodman described his and Davenport’s logic in a 1956 *House and Home* article saying:

> We licked the cost problem by building our house in a shop instead of on the site. We had our finish men work under cover, with power tools and jig tables. And we used our rough men on the site to assemble the things our finish men had made in the shop.

---

The design for Unit House 7L was an opportunity for Goodman to experiment more-advanced prefabrication ideas (Figures 13 and 14). The entire design of the house was based on at 12-foot module. The one-level home consisted of a combination kitchen/family room space and an L-shaped dining/living/study area with optional folding partitions. Goodman designed two variation of the No. 7L home, however for the first time he named them with conventional names. The Main Line model was slightly larger than the No. 7L and had a dramatic spatial change as a result of cathedral ceilings. The Main Line 2L design took advantage of a sloped site and had the potential for five bedrooms (the most bedrooms ever made available in Hollin Hills). An elongated version of the Main Line was called the Custom Line and had an overall increased length of 66 feet.

The most expensive, complex, and spacious designed home became available in 1958 and was called Unit House No. 8. The design demonstrated Goodman’s continued desire to experiment with large spans of glass. Fixed glass panels measuring almost seven feet wide were used on the window modules of the living/dining room area, creating the largest glazing modules used at Hollin Hills. The design also incorporated bits and pieces of previously designed Hollin Hill's homes. For example, the chimney echoes the broad chimney used in Unit House No. 2 homes. Goodman again used cathedral ceilings like in his design for the Main Line 2L and a low-sloped roof with wide overhangs like in No. 7L homes.

Goodman designed his last home for Hollin Hills around 1960. The ultimate design was for Unit House No. 260. Remarkably, the design reverted back to the much earlier design of Unit House No. 2. However, unlike in his design for Unit House No. 2
where Goodman attempted to reduce the amount of masonry walls, masonry becomes the
dominant building material for the long walls. The shorter bedroom walls were
constructed totally of glass.

Goodman created two designs that were completely inconsistent with his Unit
House designs. The designs demonstrate Goodman’s experimentations with
unconventional materials and new modes of construction. The first was dubbed Alcoa 57
and was an all-aluminum house Goodman designed for the Aluminum Corporation of
America in 1957. The home consisted of exterior anodized aluminum wall panels,
interior aluminum frames, an aluminum sheet roof, and decorative grillwork. The
“Sonoma Ranger” design was also experimental in its use of prefabricated materials and
was built by Goodman for the National Homes Corporation. Robert Davenport had his
hand at design when he introduced his Decca model, which was very similar to
Goodman’s Unit House No. 2 design. Davenport also designed a square, two-story house
called the Atrium built around an interior courtyard.85

Goodman designed homes for Hollin Hills over a fourteen-year span. When his
designs are looked at sequentially one can see his designs move from a modern idiom
expressed in natural materials to increasingly radical modern designs pushing the
envelope on contemporary building materials. However, principles transcend all of
Goodman’s design and include a close attention to detail and a high level of
craftsmanship. Although the homes at Hollin Hill’s differ, there is a shared design
language and contextual relationship to their surroundings. The sense of unity and
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harmony between structures was, and still is, a defining feature of Hollin Hills, apparent to all visitors in or outside the design community.

Goodman was not just concerned with design he also took a hands-on approach for both interior and exterior finishes. Although his designs were progressive, his choice of materials remained fairly traditional. Goodman did not use new materials, (the exception being his aluminum houses), but he did invent non-traditional modes to use materials. Goodman’s stance on materials was “never skimp on imagination.”86 From the outset, Goodman encouraged the use of dark, rich earth tones that would contribute to the blending of the houses with their natural settings. Goodman worked with Alexandria, Virginia based interior designer and Hollin Hills resident Top Recker. An interview with Recker revealed that Goodman himself hand mixed the first few gallons of paint to create a palate of twelve colors. Goodman and Davenport’s commitment to modern design extended into interiors. The interior designers Florence and Hans Knoll first did the interiors of the No. 2. Butterfly house and soon their designs, including colors, drapes, furniture and accessories, were featured in Davenport’s personal office. Davenport also promoted the use of contemporary designed light fixtures by designer Kurt Versen.87 There was a strong desire to educate homeowners on the appropriate way to furnish a Goodman designed home. Promotional brochures were published along with model homes suggesting finishes and appliances. Davenport went so far as to extend his financing plan to cover modern furniture, something that was seldom done in subdivisions at the time. Homeowners were able to purchase contemporary designed
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pieces at a builder’s discount as a result of arrangement made by Davenport (Figure 15).

Goodman’s work at Hollin Hills was highlighted by a variety of design and living magazines for its successful use of progressive domestic design. Mock, and other critics mentioned many of Goodman’s design features, such as an open plan and use of large spans of glass, during this time. Goodman’s designs are indicative of a larger architectural movement-taking place nationally. A 1938 *Life* magazine article entitled, “Eight Houses for Modern Living” included examples of traditional and modern house designs for families of different income levels. Preeminent architects were selected to design either a traditional or modern home for a specific income level. Frank Lloyd Wright, Harrison and Fouilhoux, William Wurster and Edward Durrell Stone submitted the modern designs. Each design represented a spectrum of modern design possibilities, but nevertheless, they shared some common features including an informal plan and communal living areas fully integrated into the patio or garden through window wall units. These features are seen in the homes built in Hollin Hills. Goodman must have been aware of this article, and articles like it, published during the years leading up to the creation of Hollin Hills.

Other architects during this period were experimenting with the relationship between house and site. It is likely that Goodman was aware of and influenced by architects such as Frank Lloyd Wright and his designs for the Usonian houses that first appeared in the late 1930s. A key design element of Wright’s Usonian houses was the
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interrelation of house and site.\textsuperscript{90} Wright’s book, \textit{The Natural House}, published in 1954 discusses the Modern house’s relationship to the site saying,

We have no longer an outside and an inside as two separate things. Now the outside may come inside and the inside may and does go outside…it is in the nature of any organic building to grow from its site, come out of the ground into the light…A building dignified as a tree in the midst of nature.\textsuperscript{91}

However, Goodman’s successful implementation and promotion of these design principles in a suburban context is what placed Hollin Hills in the forefront of contemporary suburban design. Goodman’s ability to make progressive design available to the public on such a large scale is remarkable. There were other designers who played significant roles in shaping Hollin Hills who did not receive the same amount of critical and scholarly attention. The men responsible for the landscape design of Hollin Hills have left their own legacy.

\textbf{The Landscape}

The landscape of Hollin Hills was a shared vision by Davenport, Goodman, Voight, Kiley and Peapcke, The vision extended over a variety of features, from the large to minute level. Attention was given to elements of street design, house placement, parks space, plantings, and individual backyards. Referred by one author as a landscape of democracy, the overwhelming goal was to create a unified landscape unburdened by visual boundaries. The realms of private and public spaces were intended to be blurred. This sense of landscaped unity is a feature that separates Hollin Hills from other neighborhoods, both historic and contemporary.

\textsuperscript{90} Struble, 23.
Beyond the overall landscape plan of Hollin Hills, special attention was placed on the development of individual residential landscape plans. Specific residential landscapes were an integral part of the overall ambiance at Hollin Hills. Issues of harmony and continuity were resolved to create a landscape that “flowed sinuously across lot lines with the intent of breaking down the image of so many regularly-spaced dominoes one might ordinarily get through lawns and foundation plantings.”\(^{92}\) The landscape architect Lou Bernard Voight teamed up with Goodman and Davenport early on in the planning stages.\(^{93}\) After World War II, Voigt opened an architectural landscape practice in Bethesda, Maryland. In 1948, based on the recommendation of Dan Kiley, Voigt created a partnership with the office of Charles Goodman and Associates planning and designing for Hollin Hills and other Goodman projects. An individual landscape plan was included with each Hollin Hills house plan for a mandatory fee of $100 and included one personal consultation with Voight. “Barney” Voight envisioned a seamless landscape where property lines merged to create a uniformed community. “I have tried to tie one lot to the other to make the community look as if there were no individual lots, but a beautiful park.” Voigt continued to work with Davenport and Goodman for five years until his unexpected death in 1953 at the age of thirty-eight. Goodman requested that Dan Kiley take over Voigt’s role and almost immediately Kiley continued work at Hollin Hills.\(^{94}\) Both Kiley and his predecessor, Peapcke, continued to works towards Voigt’s original vision of seamless gardens. Each gave their own signature touch to their work. Peapcke’s work at Hollin Hills, more than Kiley, mimicked Voigt’s. Kiley, on the other hand,

\(^{92}\) Tiger, 21.  
\(^{93}\) Hunt, 49.  
moved beyond Voigt’s original concepts and began to experiment with other design themes.⁹⁵

Dan Kiley’s career after Hollin Hills flourished and placed him at the forefront of modern landscape design. He is arguably one of the most important American landscape architects of the second half of the twentieth-century. His early work, including his work at Hollin Hills, has been neglected until recently. Current analysis of Kiley’s individual garden designs at Hollin Hills reveal the important role they played in the development of Kiley’s unique design style.

Dan Kiley was born in 1912 in the Roxbury section of Boston. After graduating from Jamaica Plain High School, Kiley began an internship with the landscape architect Warren Manning. Manning exposed Kiley to the design, practice, and philosophy of the American landscape design tradition. Without any undergraduate education, Kiley enrolled in Harvard’s Graduate School of Design in 1936. Two years later Kiley left Harvard with out completing a degree. Shortly after, Kiley moved to Washington D. C. to work for the United States government on public housing projects. In 1942 Kiley joined the United States Army as a private and soon was promoted to a captain. While working with the Army Corps of Engineers, Kiley gained experience with landscape engineering, surveying, and earth moving. The most notable of Kiley’s wartime achievements was his design for the Nuremberg tribunals. After the completion of the war, Kiley returned to the United States and within two years was part of the Eero Saarinen’s design team for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Missouri.

⁹⁵ Carmichael, “Landscape of Democracy,” 76.
The Jefferson Memorial competition gave Kiley international attention and he found himself working on a range of projects, both architectural and landscape for a variety of clients both public and private. It was Kiley’s 1955 design for the Miller Garden in Columbus, Indiana that cemented his place among landscape royalty and expressed his most mature style. It was in the years leading up to the Miller Garden that Kiley worked on Hollin Hills. Recently, historians have suggested that the gardens Kiley designed for Hollin Hills served as “the experimental ground on which Kiley transformed his design language into the masterful modernist idiom for which he is known.” Kiley’s gardens at Hollin Hills represent a pivotal period in his career as well as a desire to create Modern community landscape for the masses.

Dan Kiley designed gardens for at least ninety-one residences between 1953 and 1955 in Hollin Hills. Work at Hollin Hills was given to Kiley suddenly and unexpectedly. In 1945 he had moved his office to Charlotte, Vermont, and as a result was forced to communicate long-distance with Virginia. He attempted to meet with some homeowners, but the majority of home purchasers picked up garden plans from the Hollin Hills sales office without a meeting. Kiley was given little time to complete as many as one hundred designs and he describes the experience saying, “I pulled out all the tricks…everything that came into my head. If I had a week, I probably would of spoiled them.” Although he was rushed, and perhaps because of it, Kiley pushed his design vocabulary and embraced a creative freedom not unlike Goodman and his “laboratory” of architectural
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designs at Hollin Hills. Kiley comments on the role of his work at Hollin Hills played in his career in his published complete works saying:

I had the propitious opportunity to do a number of small lot designs very quickly—close to one hundred residences at the rate of one a day—an experience that pushed me to the discovery of a compositional technique, which, while loose and open, established a consistent set of elements. What I feel provide the critical foundations of site-sensitivity to scale, resolution of relationships (including programme issues such as entry, screening and functional areas), the discovery of site structure and the selection of the most appropriate plant materials—began to coalesce into a discernible, highly flexible process. \(^{100}\)

Not only did Kiley’s gardens at Hollin Hills echo Voigt’s free-form gestures and shapes, but they also represented Kiley’s “signature allees, bosques, and grids of the Miller Garden, and of Kiley’s mature style.” \(^{101}\) Because each design commission related to an individual lot for sale, a unified design scheme was unlikely. Despite the varied topography of the land, Kiley opted not to base his designs on the irregularities of the land. Instead, his designs communicate an interest in geometry and the ordering of objects (Figures 16 and 17). \(^{102}\)

It’s not that everything comes out geometric; it depends on site conditions, program, and other concerns. Actually, even through much of our work is not geometric, most the work I show probably is. However, because it’s geometric in plan doesn’t mean that the space is static; hopefully the space continues to flow. \(^{103}\)

None of Kiley’s garden designs were installed in their entirety. Of the few design elements that were implicated few remnants remain. Why this is the case in unknown.
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\(^{101}\) Saunders, 45.
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Eason Cross hypothesis is that residents were discouraged from implementing the designs either because of the high purchase price of the plants or they felt the plants were too formal for Hollin Hills. Only bits and pieces of Kiley’s gardens remain as patios, retaining walls, or overgrown plantings. Often what might have originally been denoted to garden space has been taken over by architectural additions, storage sheds, and carports. If all of Kiley’s gardens had been installed as he had intended, the result no doubt would have been remarkable. Out of the three landscape architects who worked at Hollin Hills, it is Kiley’s landscape presence that has been the most dramatically altered by time partly because geometric forms require diligent upkeep and maintenance.

Residents claim they prefer how the woods have grown in to reclaim the land at Hollin Hills (Figure 18). Like most features of Hollin Hills, there is a tension between retaining the elements of the past and providing guidance for future change and expansion. The difficulty with preserving the landscape versus the built environment is that time distorts the original design intent and this can be seen by the thick veil of trees that clouds over the once modernistic landscape. However, residents have recently begun discussing the possibility of reintroducing elements of Kiley’s designs back into the landscape. The debate over the landscape is just one of many examples of residents attempting to manage changed and protect defining features of Hollin Hills.

104 “Historic District Preliminary Information Form,” 8.
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CHAPTER THREE: PRESERVING THE FUTURE THAT IS NOW THE PAST:

Tradition of Managing Change

A 1983 article devoted to Hollin Hills is cleverly entitled “Built to Beat Time”, and the name appropriately describes the community to this day. The fact that Hollin Hills is still standing almost entirely intact and has continued to appeal to a select niche of homebuyers, is remarkable and a testament to it’s resilience against the affects of time. However, Hollin Hills is by no means unchanged. The community has not been left to transform devoid of guiding principles.

Charles Goodman had his own opinion on change. He is quoted in a 1956 House and Home interview as saying,

To paraphrase a famous saying, the only thing we have to change is our attitude to change itself. US industry prospers by constant change. Unless we in home building become mentally and emotionally conditioned to constant change, we will never become an industry.$^{106}$

Although Goodman was referring to the business of home building, the same phrase applies to his attitude towards Hollin Hills. It seems, as if from its creation, Hollin Hills was built with the intent of accommodating change. This can be seen in the flexibility of Goodman’s designs, how well adapted they were to the topography, the many variations he produced, and his early acceptance to the necessity of architectural additions. Goodman’s attitude towards resident’s desire to build onto his designs was "anything they do can't hurt it. These houses were designed to be living things."$^{107}$ The ease of adaptability at Hollin Hills was a major selling point and highlighted in an article included in Better Homes and Gardens 1967 article. “The design makes it possible to add

---

on at the front, back, sides – anywhere more space is needed.” However, while Goodman anticipated change within Hollin Hills, he and Davenport also had the foresight to establish systems of managing that change, hence, the creation of the Civic Association of Hollin Hills and Architectural Review Committee.

Hollin Hills originally was a design laboratory for Goodman, but it would soon develop into a similar lab for other architects as homeowners hired new men and women to build additions to Goodman’s vision. The result was a transformation that resulted in streets of similar houses becoming streets of custom-built houses. Currently, only a handful of houses remain in their original “as built” condition. Forty-four percent of the homes remained additionless in 1981. Currently that percentage has shrunk to approximately twenty-five. The architectural additions range considerably in size, design skill, and construction quality. Some blend effortlessly into Goodman’s homes while others steal the attention and become the dominant design feature. Some architects have made a career out of commissions on additions in Hollin Hills. According to one resident and practicing architect, “the people who worked with Goodman and developer Bob Davenport and those who themselves lived in Hollin Hills have designed and constructed additions that have been very successful.” The role of architectural additions within Hollin Hills differs from other suburban communities. While additions still serve a functional purpose, there is an increased sense of architectural responsibility felt among residents to continue to create good architecture as well as increase the functionality of their homes.
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The necessity of architectural additions at Hollin Hills is a reflection on Goodman’s design as well as the changes in the American family after 1950. The majority of additions have included additional bedrooms in a response to the growth of original Hollin Hill families. The desire for additions also reflects changes in American living habits. The original Goodman Unit Houses were much smaller than the current average sized single-family dwelling. The three most common additions types made to homes at Hollin Hills include bedroom, family room, and bathroom. This trend reflects that Americans have become accustomed to more living space. Children no longer want to share rooms with each other or bathrooms with guests.

Other additions are in direct response to shortcomings in Goodman’s original design. In 1984 the Civic Association undertook a survey of the residence of Hollin Hills, to which 76% of the community responded. The survey asked residents what they liked and disliked about their homes. The three most frequently recorded complaints regarding Goodman’s original homes were, their lack of weatherability, inadequate storage space, and poor construction. In order to keep his homes relatively affordable, Goodman sacrificed the amount of available storage space. As a result, many homeowners have taken the initiative and created additional storage space in the form of breezeways, carports and workshops. Other additions have been designed to mitigate the open plan and congruent use of spaces. Once the multi-use room, such as a combined living/dining room, was seen as a practical solution to limited space and an innovative modernist design principle. However, homeowners have interpreted the multiple uses and open plan as resulting in a sense of confusion and directionless flow in the home. Goodman’s
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original open plan has proven to be easily and inexpensively converted into other more specific use spaces.\textsuperscript{112}

The architects creating additions at Hollin Hills do not have access to their full creative range like in Goodman’s case. Changes taking place occur within a controlled design environment. Similar to the community efforts at Tauxemont, Davenport sought to create a “cooperative community” at Hollin Hills. Part of sustaining such a community was the installation of a civic association, which would self-govern and address community concerns in a democratic manner. From the onset, there were grumblings among residents related to the strict design covenants. The property deeds at Hollin Hills each possess a protective covenant mandated by the Federal Housing Administration to reduce the risk of lending mortgage money as well as to protect and maintain property values. In the words of the Urban Land Institute 1950 Community Builders Handbook, protective covenants were intended to

\begin{quote}
Insure the best use and most appropriate development and improvements of each building site thereof; to protect the owners of building sites against such improper use of surrounding building site as will depreciate the value of the property; to preserve, as far as practicable, the natural beauty of said property; to guard against the erection thereon of poorly designed or proportioned structures, and structures built of improper or unsuitable materials; to obtain harmonious color schemes; to insure the highest and best development of said property; to encourage and secure the erection of attractive homes thereon, with appropriate locations thereof on building sites; to secure and maintain proper setbacks from streets, and adequate free space between structures; and in general to provide adequately for a high quality of improvement in said property, and thereby to enhance the values of investments made by purchasers of building sites therein.\textsuperscript{113}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{112} Cox, 81-84.  
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However, the protective covenants at Hollin Hills go beyond the maintenance of property values to ensure the protection of the visual appearance and character of the neighborhood.

No building shall be erected, placed, or altered on any premises in said development until the building plans, specifications, and plot plan showing the location of such building have been approved in writing as to the conformity and harmony of external design with existing structures in the development, and as to the location of the building with respect to topography and finished ground elevation.\textsuperscript{114}

Davenport founded an Architectural Control Committee in the early 1950s to regulate new structures in Hollin Hills and ensure they met standards of conformity and harmony among existing structures. In July of 1955 the Committee disbanded and their regulatory powers were passed on to the Architectural Review Committee, which was made up of residents appointed by the Civic Association Board. In the early years of their creation, the Architectural Review Committee kept no record, had no legal challenges, and enjoyed total autonomy and authority over design in the community. The main goals of the committee were to ensure that new construction be contemporary in feeling, consistent in scale, and comply with established materials and details within the community. Between the years 1958 and 1986 there were only five Architectural Review Committee chairmen and the community was characterized by a sense of architectural cooperation and commitment to good design.

During the summer of 1984 the Civic Association Board reorganized the Architectural Review Committee, increased membership to five, and mandated that the membership include two architects, a lawyer, and two lay members. The new committee was given the challenge of creating new standards, guidelines, and procedures.

\textsuperscript{114} Cox, 45.
Community members and residents challenged the design review process prompting the Civic Association to create the Design Review Committee to develop yet another set of guidelines. This time the committee communicated directly with the residents, assessing their views on the design review process. The committee also looked to other communities with successful design review boards. The Civic Association of Hollin Hills adopted design review guidelines in 1987 to clarify in writing what the protective covenants truly meant to homeowners. It was at this time that the Architectural Review Committee was renamed the Design Review Committee, (DRC). In 1988 the committee began formally placing a DRC Certificate of Approval next to county building permits. The design review process at Hollin Hills has not existed without resident complaint. During the 1990s a Design Review Study Group was organized to evaluate the review process. One member noted at the time,

A prime quality attracting us and sustaining us in our Hollin Hills community over the years has been its unique design character. The Design Review processes are essential elements in ensuring the Hollin Hills remains a visually attractive place…and in maintaining our property values.

All of the Committees that have existed over the years demonstrate a clear commitment, arguably obsession, with a standardized, organized, and justified design review process.

The opening paragraph of the current Design Review Guidelines reads as follows, “Our basic premise is that Hollin Hills should never be permitted to become just another suburban subdivision.” According to the Guidelines, all construction and alterations of existing structures and topography need approval by the design committee based on their
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conformity and harmony of external design with existing structures in the subdivision. New construction includes fences, decks, sheds, carports, pool/tennis enclosures, greenhouses, gazebos, trellises, awnings, retaining walls, and freestanding walls. Application for approval requires an informal and formal presentation of a schematic design. Residents applying for approval must also alert their adjacent neighbors as to their construction plans and allow time for them to voice any concerns or objections.119

The Guidelines include a section entitled “Standards of Original Design” where elements of Goodman’s designs are laid out and presented as “an historical benchmark against which future changes can be measured.” The standards can also serve as a “brief guide for homeowners interested in the original appearance of their homes.”120 Specifically, the guidelines describe elements of siting; plan arrangement, building scale, roofline, roof, exterior walls, windows, doors, materials and color. The design review process is not limited to private residences. The Committee must also approve landscape and design changes associated with the Hollin Hills parks, playground, and pool.

The issues presented by residents at monthly Design Review Committee meetings range widely in topic and scope of pending change. Residents requesting approval also vary in their length of tenure. One couple residing on Martha’s Road for ten years went before the committee to gain approval for a two-story addition on their home (Figure 19). The home already had a ten-year-old architectural addition on the rear of the house. Their house perches diagonally on a bend in Martha’s Road with a barely visible front door and steep driveway. The current owners wished to place an addition on the façade of the home, creating a clearly articulated entranceway leading to an art studio. The addition
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would give a “new face” to the parallel property line and likely would become the dominant feature of the home. The addition received conceptual approval from the Design Committee with a request for more detailed drawings. Most likely the design will be approved. However, with the completion of this second addition, the home will become a hardly recognizable fragment of Goodman’s original design.

The couple above hired former Goodman associate and long time Hollin Hills resident Eason Cross to design the proposed second addition. Eason Cross has a long architectural career including numerous Hollin Hills additions. His personal association with Goodman gives him first hand experience with Goodman’s design idiom and residents have sought his advice for decades. However, Cross has also given his own unique architectural legacy to the community. He is known for adding “tower” additions to Goodman’s original designs (Figure 20). His own house has such a tower was constructed to take full advantage of views of the Potomac River. His work is an example of the many architects who have shaped Hollin Hills over the years.

Another frequent request before the Design Review Board is the necessity for additional storage space. Many residents opt to construct sheds in the rear of their homes to help overcome the lack of available storage space inside their homes. Although these sheds are secondary, often prefabricated, structures, they still require approval from the Committee. The Civic Association it adamantly against plastic “cookie cutter” prefabricated sheds available for purchase from large bulk suppliers such as Home Depot and Loews. The Committee has recommended the use of materials that will compliment the dwelling, such as T1-11, wood siding, and a door that will seamlessly blend into the
facetade, (unlike prefabricated pre-hung doors). Skylights, not windows or clear doors, should be used to provide natural light to the shed.

Windows have been a major source of contention among Hollin Hills' residents. The design guidelines proscribe the predominant window type in Hollin Hills to be three feet wide and extending floor to ceiling, featuring a single fixed upper light and an operable lower sash approximately twenty-five inches high. The Committee will not approve any replacement windows with a width greater than the original window frames. Replacement exterior windows must be flush or fully glazed. The size and proportions of windows cannot be changed without permission from the committee. The glass windows are a major defining feature of Goodman’s residential design idiom, (responsible for giving Hollin Hillers the reputation for living in “glass boxes”). However, the reality is that for most residents, the large windows in their homes are a mechanical and economical strain. The original windows are not as energy efficient as new double pane windows currently on the market. In addition, the cost of heat energy has dramatically increased since the 1950s. Residents complain of the cost, and discomfort of drafty living spaces, especially in the bedrooms. In addition, living in walls made entirely of glass offers little in the way of privacy and encourages burglars. The mandatory retention of original fenestration pattern and window size presents a financial burden for some residents and raises a serious threat on the rights of property owners. One resident made the point that he was unable to find a window replacement company that would warranty the large spans of glass needed to meet the guidelines for more than one year. These are all issues the Design Review Committee regularly deals with.
An example of a requested window alteration is found on Rebecca Drive (Figure 21). The current resident would like to enclose four of the six exterior windows on her Unit House No. 2 façade, including the windows looking into her bedrooms. The owner claims that the poorly insulated windows combined with the cold brick and lack of privacy creates an unhealthy environment for her elderly parents and said she needed an immediate and economically feasible solution. The Committee commented that the reduction of her six windows to four would alter the appearance of the house and change its geometric massing. They recommended that the owner eliminate two of the six windows by infilling the window frames with an insulated material, such as tile or wood panels. The benefit of infilling versus complete removal of the windows is the reversibility.\textsuperscript{121} This “reversibility” factor stressed by the Design Review Committee may be thought to exemplify its concern with historic preservation; however, an evolution of the cases jogged shows that the Committee is more concerned with aesthetics than they with preservation.

These cases represent just some of the design issues the Design Review Committee is asked to rule on. Although the current committee strives for consistency in their judgment, as the years have past different committee members have interpreted the Guidelines in their own way. There have been rumors of corruption within the Committee and favoritism among community members. Yet when asked, the majority of residents felt the design process was a necessary evil. There seems to be a shared sense of fear among resident that without the design review process, Hollin Hills would change into “just another subdivision.”

\textsuperscript{121} Design Review Committee Meeting (March 7, 2007).
The Design Review Committee is at the moment looking for new members. Residents interested in serving on the Committee interview with the Civic Association and are then appointed. The Civic Association would like to have members with a variety of design expertise in the field of architecture and landscape. However, interestingly, the Civic Association is not recruiting a professional preservationist to join the Design Review Committee. A preservationist has sat on the Committee before, but the Committee does not see the inclusion of a preservationist’s input as a necessary. The Design Review Committee sees itself as an entity organized to manage change and to ensure that mediocre, incongruent architecture does threaten the architectural aesthetics of the homes in Hollin Hills. The Committee views preservation as stopping change and freezing things in time. The Design Review Committee has a valid mission, however, somewhat short sighted in its goals. Hollin Hills is more than just its architecture, and the inclusion of a professional preservationist on the Committee would no doubt help the Committee navigate the issues concerning the historical significance of Hollin Hills as a whole.

**National Register Historic District Nomination**

The design review process can be an effective preservation tool. However, the Hollin Hills Design Review Committee appears to have limited interest in preservation. This disconnect creates a conundrum, especially since the community has recently begun the process of district nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. After turning fifty years old in 1999 (the minimum age to be considered historic by the National Register), the community was faced with the option of a variety of designations.
Since there was already a strict code of enforced design regulations, the community did feel they needed another level of “bureaucracy”. If designated a local historic district or an overlay zone district residents would have to gain approval for changes to their property from Fairfax County’s review board in addition to the Hollin Hills Design Review Committee.

In the democratic tradition of the community, a committee was formed to pursue National Register Historic District status. Neighborhood volunteers completed the written survey and photographic portions of the nomination. A Washington D. C. - based preservation firm is going to prepare the formal nomination. According to the Hollin Hills National Register Nomination Committee, becoming a National Historic District would be instrumental in “enhancing value and appeal to our properties. It will expand knowledge of our community’s historic and unique value while encouraging preservation.” Hollin Hills hopes to join the ranks of other recently designated Virginia mid-century modern communities located in Fairfax County including their neighbors Tauxemont and Holmes Run Acres.122 Other Goodman designed communities in Montgomery County, Maryland have also been listed on the register.123 However, equally important to a majority of the community is the prestige and cachet gained from inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. The community takes a lot a pride in the many awards granted to Hollin Hills over the past fifty years, and inclusion on the National Register feels to many to be a natural step in a history or recognitions.

The nomination will be based on a period of significance between 1949, the date the first home was constructed and 1971, the year the final home was completed and the

Hollin Hills sales office closed. The district will include a total of 326 acres and 463 single-family dwellings. The identified areas of significance are architecture, community planning and development. Hollin Hills is recommended for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as a historic district under the criteria A, C, and consideration G.124

In 2002 the National Register published a bulletin to help clarify the nomination and evaluation process for historic suburban developments. The bulletin clearly defines each nomination criterion and how it would apply to a suburban community. A nomination based on Criteria A requires that the suburban community feature one or more of the below characteristics:

- Neighborhood reflects an important historic trend in the development and growth of a locality or metropolitan area
- Suburb represents an important event or association, such as the expansion of housing associated with wartime industries during World War II, or the racial integration of suburban neighborhood since the 1950s
- The suburb demonstrates conventions of community planning important in the history of suburbanization, such as zoning, deed restrictions, or subdivision regulations.
- Neighborhood is associated with the heritage of social, economic, racial, or ethnic groups important in the history of a locality of metropolitan area.
- Suburb is associated with a group of individuals, including merchant, industrialists, educators, and community leaders, important in the history or development of a locality or metropolitan area.125

Hollin Hills qualifies for criteria A based on its significant contribution to the growth of the Washington D.C. metropolitan area as well as its representation of the post WWII building phenomenon. Similarly, Hollin Hills demonstrates advancement in community

124 “Historic District Preliminary Information Form”, 9
planning and the use of restrictive regulations and land covenants. Criteria C includes the following criteria for nomination:

- Collection of residential architecture is an important example of distinctive period of construction, method of construction, or the work of one or more notable architects.
- Suburb reflects principles of design important to the history of community planning and landscape architecture, or is the work of a master landscape architect, site planner, or design firm.
- Subdivision embodies high artistic values through its overall plan or the design of entrance ways, streets, homes and community spaces.

Hollin Hills meets all of the listed requirements for nomination under Criteria C, especially its exemplification of a distinct period in design and construction history.

Criteria G refers to structures that do not meet the fifty year mandatory age requirement stipulated by the National Register. Neighborhoods less than fifty years old must meet criteria consideration G by demonstrating the possession of exception importance. The second way a suburban community can meet criteria G is if the majority of the homes were built fifty years ago. This clause acknowledges that communities are built over a period of time and that is why the period of significance for Hollin Hills can include homes built up until 1971. Typical types of built environments considered under criteria G include postwar development projects, growth of suburban subdivisions, commercial strips, and shopping malls. The National Register recognizes that the fifty-year minimum age requirement is not the only way of defining historic, but is used to make professional evaluation of historic value feasible. The term “exceptional” is
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purposely not defined, however, as it implies the existence of scholarly research and comparative analysis.\textsuperscript{127}

To meet any of the criteria set forth by the National Register a community must demonstrate historical integrity. Historic integrity is defined by the National Register as “the composite of seven qualities: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.” Historic integrity requires that the various features that made up the neighborhood in the historic period be presented today in the same configuration and similar condition.\textsuperscript{128} Integrity of location requires that the boundaries of the defined suburb remain intact and correspond with the proposed historic district boundaries, that the location and size of streets have remained constant as well as the size and shape of house lots. Design is defined as the “composition of elements comprising the form, plan, and spatial organization of a historic neighborhood.” Integrity of design is affected by the change in lot sizes by subdivision or consolidation, alterations in the form of additions, siding, windows replacements and other architectural changes. Changes in elevation height can alter the spatial relationship between house and street and thereby threaten integrity of design. Small-scale additions, such as porches and garages may not detract in a meaningful way from the original design intent. Setting is the physical environment within and surrounding a suburb. Integrity of setting implies the retention of street plantings, parks, and open space.

Integrity of materials refers to dwelling construction materials, roadways, walkways, fences, vegetation, lawns, shrubs, trees and gardens. The majority of
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structures must retain their original façade material. The National Register acknowledges the fragile lifespan of vegetation and other plantings be stating, “loss of plants does not necessarily detract from integrity. Vegetation similar in historic species scale, type, and visual effect will generally convey integrity of seeing although integrity of materials maybe lost.” Workmanship refers to the way in which materials have been fashioned for functional or decorative use. The original artistry and craftsmanship should be retained.

In reference to landscape, vegetation historically planted for decoration and aesthetic purposes should be maintained in an appropriate fashion and replaced in kind when damaged or destroyed. However, beyond the visual and tangible elements associated with suburban communities, the National Register lists integrity of feeling as a necessary feature. The feeling is defined as a community’s ability to “convey a sense of past time and place,” a sense achieved through the combined effect of setting, design, materials, and workmanship.129

Integrity of landscape specifically refers to whether or not the landscape conveys a sense of historic character and to what degree the original fabric has been retained.

When determining integrity one has to resolve whether or not changes in the landscape are irrevocable or if they can be corrected. Key landscape design features include spatial relationships, vegetation, property lines, topography, grading, site-furnishings, and architectural features circulation and design intent. Enough original features should remain to make the historic significance easily recognizable.130 However, the National Register realizes the delicate balance of change and integrity in natural landscapes
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saying, “A designed historic landscape need not exist today exactly as it was originally designed or first executed if integrity of location and visual effect has been preserved.” The absence of plant material does not automatically destroy the integrity of a designed landscape. Maintenance, replanting, restoration, and reconstruction can all enhance and restore integrity to a landscape.

The landscape at Hollin Hills has been allowed to evolve over time and the design intentions of the original landscape architects have been clouded by a veil of overgrown trees and shrubs. Yet, the National Register suggests that the proper implementation, replacement, rehabilitation and maintenance may restore the landscape’s integrity. Hollin Hills’ community members have asked, “what about the gardens?” Dennis Carmichael, resident and professional landscape architect, directly addresses this issue in his essay “Landscape of Democracy.” Carmichael recommends that residents of Hollin Hills, “protect, enhance, restore, and perhaps even recreate these modern gardens as a cultural landscape.” The landscape envisioned by Carmichael directly speaks to the 1950s. The essay suggests the reintroduction of a variety of original Hollin Hills' landscape design features such as:

- Informal character and asymmetry used to create visual balance over formal symmetry
- Free-flowing spaces, characterized by the flow of one private garden to the next uninterrupted by fences or other visual or physical barriers.
- Hierarchy of space achieved through varied sizes of elements
- Architectural extension of walls, steps, ramps, decks, patios etc. seamlessly into the garden space.
- Geometric patterns achieved through paving, plantings, or other elements abstractly created by man not nature.
- Layering of plantings to create hierarchy of scale, texture and color.
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Landscape as background – use of plantings as spatial definers so that they recede to the background rather than dominate viewer’s gaze.
 Specimen plants as sculpture – use of individual trees or plants with dramatic silhouettes, form, or color as featured pieces of art.134

In 1989 Carmichael was asked by the Civic Association to publish design guidelines for the landscape at Hollin Hills. Entitled, *a house in the Woods: A Landscape Aesthetic for Hollin Hills*, the brief booklet was intended to help homeowners who wished to restore or preserve original landscape design elements. Although the Civic Association does not regulate landscaping, the Association stresses a sense of stewardship, which they define as an owner’s obligation to the community not to damage the integrity of the landscape and be respectful in reinforcing the natural environment.135

Large-scale restoration of Hollin Hill’s original is unlikely due to the encroachment of architectural additions on garden space and the cost associated with landscape work. Residents could reintroduce the above-mentioned landscape features into their own lot’s landscape if they were willing. The smallest changes would have a powerful affect on restoring the landscape back to its appearance during its period of significance. However, the issue of “authenticity” comes into question when suggesting the recreation of Hollin Hills’ landscape. Arguably, a reconstructed garden would be a twentieth-century garden made to look like a 1950s garden, and thus a false representation of the past. Landscape, by its nature grows, matures, and dies. Authenticity as a value is almost impossible to maintain. The best course of action concerning the landscape at Hollin Hills is for residents to recognize the features they value - be they circa 1950 or 1990 – and strive to maintain them. The significance of the landscape is its

---

ability to unify the built environment and create a sense of place unique to Hollin Hills. This quality of unification and continuity is what residents should preserve.

The residents of Hollin Hills have made an impressive effort over the past fifty years to manage change in their community through the design review process. The process of design review was something both Goodman and Davenport wanted for the community. But the process has become too restrictive and has strayed from Goodman’s wishes for his designs to change and evolve like living creatures. In contrast, the landscape has been allowed to change and evolve unrestricted by guidelines. The changes in the landscape have not weakened the significance of the community. Many of the changes, such as tree growth, have actually become defining features of the community and added layers of significance to the landscape beyond the period of the 1950s. The standards of landscape integrity set forth by the National Register ignore the ability of landscape to evolve and gain a variety of periods of significance.

National Register listing will likely be added to Hollin Hills’ long list of recognitions. The majority of the community supports the nomination and volunteers have been substantial help in completing the survey and photographic portions of the nomination. Once Hollin Hills gains listing, there will be no added regulations against changes made to the community, nor will there be protection from demolition. There needs to be a larger vision for Hollin Hills aside from the regulations, awards and recognitions. The community once was, and should still be about looking forwards towards the future.
**Goals for the Future**

Preservationists do not dismiss the benefits associated with district nomination. According to Richard Longstreth, historic district designation can be an effective preservation tool because it generates confidence that the desired qualities of the neighborhood will remain. Designation also enables residents to take an active part in the process of influencing future change, can safeguard communities from decline, and can give a voice for shaping the future better than other governmental mechanisms.¹³⁶ District nomination can be an effective way of raising awareness of the significance of architectural design of the recent past. To meet the challenge of preserving communities of the recent past there must be a renewed sense of responsibility by community members and the recognition that they can shape the future of their environment. Values must be identified, interpreted, evaluated and protected by people in their own neighborhood, and on their own terms. Hollin Hills has been committed to governing themselves and because of that; the limited regulatory nature of National Register listing is excusable. However, if the community is going to continue to regulate themselves, they need to introduce preservation into their discussions and goals.

A strong sense of community is an important characteristic that differentiates Hollin Hills from other mid-century suburban developments. Blaise DeFranceaux has lived in Hollin Hills for over twenty years and is a professional realtor responsible for approximately 65% of the Hollin Hills properties listed on the market annually. According to DeFranceaux, perspective buyers are drawn to Hollin Hills by the distinct sense of community and active involvement by residents. The community is experiencing

a shift in demographics as original Hollin Hills residents retire and move out of the community. The incoming buyers are young professionals with families keenly intrigued by and committed to contemporary design.

Hollin Hills’ nomination for the National Register has caused new attention to be placed on the community. There have been a number of newspaper and magazine articles published since the community turned fifty years old in 1999 highlighting the neighborhood’s unique sense of place and community. An article in *The Washington City Paper*, entitled “Heart of Glass” describes the original Hollin Hill residents as artists and political progressives.137 Similarly, a 2002 article in *The Washington Magazine* describes Hollin Hills as an enclave separated from Washington D.C. where “Republicans were few. Blacks Were Welcome.”138 There is a sense of nostalgia in these articles and others for a utopian like community committed to progressive living in all aspects life. Even though times have changed, and as one resident candidly phrased it, an artist can only afford to live in Hollin Hills today if their spouse is a lawyer; residents are still attracted to Hollin Hills for the progressive ideals it is associated with. A more recent article in *The Washington Magazine* calls Hollin Hills a collection of contemporary homes perfect for homebuyers “wishing to cute against the grain.”139

For many homebuyers, it is not what Hollin Hills looks like, but what it stands for that is important. Historians have commented on the American desire to define themselves and society through the built environment saying,

The history of American houses show how Americans have tried to embody social issues in domestic architecture, and how they have tried, as the same time,
to use the imagery to escape a social reality that is always more complex and
diverse than the symbols constructed to capture it.140

The dwelling as necessary and instrumental for self-fulfillment has become a vital
cOMPOnent to American popular culture. The choices Americans make concerning their
home serve a larger significance and are integral to maintaining a cohesive social
order.141 The popularity of the homes in Hollin Hills and the community’s continual
commitment to managing change is no doubt influenced by a desire to define them selves
based on a sense of place.

The design review process has been critical in maintaining a “sense of place”
within the community. DeFranceaux points out, without the restrictions, Hollin Hills’
unique sense of place and character may not have survived.142 There are several working
definitions of the terms “design guideline”, including “a general set of design principles
and standards required by the local authority and applying to a wide area and not just a
particular site.”143 The result of design guidelines is often tension between residents who
wish to personalize their homes and local authorities that want to control change. This
tension reveals an unresolved conflict with the under-developed aesthetic of
conservation. There are two design philosophies concerning the nature of design
guidelines, the first directs that new construction be physically distinct from the original,
and be readily identifiable, thus leaving the historic identity and merit of the original
structure visually obvious. The second, and the approach adopted by the Hollin Hills
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Design Review Committee, is that new construction should match the existing structure in size, scale, details, and materials. By blending new additions with original structures, extensions are only visible through subtle differences in weathering and the paper trail building permits and construction documents.\textsuperscript{144} While both of these approaches are valid, they represent distinctly different visions for the future of a suburban community.

There needs to be a substitution of vision for control at Hollin Hills. Focus needs to move away from object preservation by design regulations. In turn, the community needs to move towards a vision for the future that recognizes elements of design significance beyond the period of Charles Goodman. The passage of time has proven that retention of Goodman’s architecture in its as-built form is not practical, nor does it contribute to the continuity of use of his structures as single-dwelling homes. The real strength of Hollin Hills does not come from its Goodman designs, but instead from the community’s integrity of use.

The \textit{Encarta World English Dictionary} defines Integrity as the state of being complete or undivided. Three synonyms listed by the dictionary included honesty, truth, and truthfulness. Hollin Hills has been, and remains honest to its purpose. People move in and out, families separate, residents die, but Hollin Hills has remained a community of single-dwelling homes. Hollin Hills is honest about their sense of community, but the residents are being less than honest about their home’s architecture. When asked about the Hollin Hills community, Goodman once commented,

\textit{Let’s say these houses attract the kind of people who don’t think the world is perfect. Actually, the setting that people live in can create the climate for provocative living – living as dignified human beings…an ingredient of this blind faith of mine was me feeling that in a community of this kind there should never}

\textsuperscript{144} Larkham, 254-255.
appear intolerance – intellectual or otherwise. Tolerance, if course, is a civilized quality. I’m interested in civilized architecture.\textsuperscript{145}

There is good architecture in Hollin Hills that was not designed by Goodman. There is also good architecture that was not built between the years 1949 -1971. However, many of the homes built during the past couple of decades have had a hostile reception from the community even though the Design Review Committee approved their designs. The non-Goodman architecture does not detract from the historical integrity of the community. Good design transcends all periods of significance. The community should be encouraging good design, and not just good “Goodman-like” designs.

The National Register Bulletin 15 defines integrity as “the ability if a property to convey its significance.”\textsuperscript{146} Hollin Hills can continue to convey its unique sense of place and history while still allowing its architecture to evolve and change. Goodman wanted his designs to be “living creatures” and to transform in order to meet the needs of the owner in the spirit of progressive architecture and provocative living. Currently the Design Guidelines promote a Goodman aesthetic that often results in inauthentic Goodman knock-off designs. There are examples in the community of contemporary designs that are obviously circa 2005 and non-Goodman, yet still respect and pay homage to Modernists design (Figures 22 and 23). The design review process needs to be revised and made more liberal in their guidelines to ensure that additions to Hollin Hills’ architecture are not dishonest representations of 1950s design.

\textsuperscript{146} Alanen and Melnick, 188.
All one has to do is stand in a Goodman designed house with two walls of floor to ceiling windows, to experience the awe of living in a home integrated with nature. The awe transcends all time periods and all design trends. Yet, someone may drive through the neighborhood without knowing Goodman’s original designs, see the multi-layered additions harmoniously blending in with the original homes and believe this was how suburbanites from the 1950s lived. Hollin Hills runs the risk of being a time warp, where layers of time have been blurred and a false sense of reality enforced.

The risk of encroachment of McMansions and sub-bar suburban homes is real for Hollin Hill residents as they hear the hum of bulldozers working in their neighboring communities. The suburb as a living environment has only gained significance as the years have passed becoming the norm for most American’s. It is true that current suburb designers can learn a lot from Hollin Hills about site planning, home placement, design, and the importance of open space. But these lessons lose their significance as the community gradually becomes more and more disconnected from the twenty-first century. The real challenge of Hollin Hills is not protecting its architecture aesthetic, but how to make Davenport’s, Goodman’s, and Kiley’s vision of a better life a reality through the promotion of good progressive design. The integrity of the community depends on a balance of protecting the past while being open to the future.
CONCLUSION

The preservation community has gradually begun to recognize the significance of buildings, landscapes, and designed communities from the recent past. However, there is still uncertainty regarding the best preservation practices necessary for preserving historic resources from the recent past. Examination of Hollin Hills demonstrates that there are no transcending rules on how to correctly preserve a historic suburban community. Each community must be examined for its individual strengths and weaknesses. However, there is an over-riding need for community members to identify shared values and goals for the future. The residents of Hollin Hills are an example of a community deeply invested and committed to managing change. Communities like Hollin Hills are able to rely less on enforced regulations by national, state and local authorities. However, the residents of Hollin Hills, as well as other postwar suburban communities, must be willing to address preservation issues. The guidelines presented by the National Register are just that, guidelines, and communities should use them as a starting point for the identification of their own values.

There is a difficult relationship between preservation and design guidelines that preservationists are working to resolve. In 1989 Hollin Hills was awarded the Design Award for Continuing Contributions to Community Appearance, by the Northern Virginia Community Appearance Alliance. The community’s recognition is not without merit, for it has successfully sustained a tradition of design review within the community. However, now that the community has been identified for its historical significance, the goals of the design review process need to be re-examined. No longer should the design review process only be about preserving a design aesthetic. The process has a larger
responsibility to the history of Hollin Hills and the representation of the community to future generations. The unique sense of place associated with Hollin Hills has been maintained. However, Hollin Hills should not survive as a theme park to the past. That is not the goal of preservation and would be a disservice to the progressive ideals of Modern architecture. Perhaps the greatest lesson to be learned from Hollin Hills is the necessity to look towards the future with hope, and confidence in our ability to create and enhance one’s own living environment.

People have valued heritage as a way to better understand their identity and often seek authenticity as a means of discovering an honest representation of America’s diversified past. It is this goal of “honest presentation” that the community of Hollin Hills should strive to incorporate into their vision for the future of the community. The ultimate goal of preservation is didactic – to convey messages about the meaning of the past. This didactic nature of preservation assumes that the past is something worth preserving, and that some periods of time are more important than others. This desire for understanding of the past is described by one author as “the restless search for the identity that characterizes Americans as they make the transition from the twentieth to the twentieth-first century.”

Hollin Hills exemplifies this search for suburban identity as Americans begin to reflect on the domestic environments of the recent past. The significance of Hollin Hills lies not wholly in what it can tell us about mid-century America suburban life, but also for what it can tell us about the future of American suburbs. The reality is that we are still

---
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living in postwar America and are faced with the challenges of shaping a better suburban reality on the bones of the recent past.
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Figure 1: Topography map of land surrounding Hollin Hills, United States Geological Survey’s Topography Series, 1891

Figure 2: Topography Map of Hollin Hills c.1987 (Fairfax Co. Maps Division)

Figure 3: Aerial view of Hollin Hills looking north shows Recard Lane and Martha’s Road in the foreground, with Popkins Lane, Glasgow and Beechwood Roads in the background, c.1950

Figure 4: Site Plan of Hollin Hills c.1950

Figure 5: Entrance to Voigt Park, Hollin Hills, 2000


Figure 6: Entrance to Charles Goodman Park, Martha’s Road, Hollin Hills

Photograph by Gabriela A. Gutowski, April 2007
Figure 7: Floor plans, Unit House No. 1B, upper-level plans (above), lower-level plan (below)
The plan is organized in three zones: the kitchen and multipurpose room at the lowest level; bedrooms and bath at an intermediate level; and the living room/study area at the uppermost level.

Figure 8: Exterior view of Unit House No. 1B c.1950

Figure 9: Floor plan, Unit House No. 2
This plan is an efficient one-level plan with minimal hallways and a centralized utility closet at the core. It also introduces a long row of window modules in the open living/dining area.

The design for Unit House No. 5A was adapted to sloped sites in Unit House No. 5B by setting the home on a masonry base and including short entry ramps adaptable to uphill or downhill sites.

Figure 11: Exterior view, Unit House No. 2 Butterfly, c.1952
The plan of this home is identical to that of Unit House No. 2 but features sloped ceilings.


Figure 12: Unit House No. 2 Butterfly, 2208 Martha’s Road,
Photography by Gabriela A. Gutowski, April 2007
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Figure 13: Floor plan, Unit House No. 7L
This one-story home has three bedrooms and a large eat-in kitchen and L-shaped living/dining/stuffy area.


Figure 14: Exterior view, Unit House No. 7L c.1954

Figure 15: The Jansons in the living room of their Unit House No. 2 in 1952
Notice the inclusion of Modern furniture and how the heavy brick fireplace wall contrasts with the transparency of the adjacent glass wall.

Figure 16: Dan Kiley’s design for the Kenen Garden, Hollin Hills, February 1954


Figure 17: Dan Kiley’s design for the D.P. Hill Garden, Hollin Hills, April 1954

Figure 18: View of the mature trees that sweep over and unify the landscape at Hollin Hills, c.2000


Figure 19: 1924 Martha’s Road, Hollin Hills
The owners of this home wish to build an architectural addition on the façade of the home.
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Figure 20: 2205 Martha’s Road, Hollin Hills
This home is an example of the “tower” feature added to many Hollin Hills homes by architect Eason Cross
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Figure 21: 7305 Rebecca Lane, Hollin Hills
This home is an example of a Unit House No.2 design. The current owner would like to partially enclose the wall of window modules.
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Figure 22: 2304 Glasgow Road, Hollin Hills
The Goodman designed home at this site was demolished and this home was built in its place by a former chair of the Design Review Board. Many residents feel that the current home’s design is not in keeping with the Hollin Hill’s architectural aesthetic.
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Figure 23: 2007 Paul Spring Road, Hollin Hills
This is an example of a Goodman designed home with a large architectural addition. Residents feel that the dark exterior trim does not harmonize with the original Hollin Hills color palate.
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Hollin Hills Awards

1950  Revere Quality Houses; Southwest Research Institute, Housing Research Foundation, Certificate of Merit.

1950-51  *Parents’ Magazine* “Best Home for Family Living.”

1951  Chosen by *Life* as one of the “Best Houses under $15,000.”


1954  Award of Merit, American Institute of Architects National Award Program for the Odoroff residence, 7322 Rebecca Drive.

1955  Washington, D.C., Chapter, AIA, National Award and *Evening Star* Award for Residential Architecture.

1956  *Evening Star* Award for Excellence in Architecture.


1957  Merchant Built winners of Homes for Better Living Awards: Sponsored by AIA in cooperation with *House and Home, Better Homes and Gardens*, and NBC.

1977  The community of Hollin Hills was included in a listing of 217 historic sites and structures on Fairfax County’s Inventory of Historic Sites.

1982  Test of Time Award, Virginia Society of the American Institute of Architects.

1989  Design Award for Continuing Contributions to Community Appearance, Northern Virginia Community Appearance Alliance.

1997  Award for Excellence from both the Northern Virginia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects and the Virginia Society of Architects for an addition to the Killpatrick residence, 2117 Paul Spring Road, designed by architect Matt Poe.
Civic Association of Hollin Hills (CAHH)
Design Review Guidelines

Introduction Philosophy and Overview
A prime quality attracting us and sustaining us in our Hollin Hills community over the years has been its unique design character—a virtue that both enhances our daily lives and contributes to the value of our property. Our basic premise is that Hollin Hills should never be permitted to become just another suburban subdivision. As the Guidelines Study Committee began its work, we realized that, as a group, we shared this common philosophy. We felt that this philosophy was an extension of the commonly held beliefs of our neighbors. The next step was to determine the means by which this philosophy could be revitalized and updated with a more comprehensive understanding of the community values on the critical design questions. The Guidelines Committee accepts the presence, need and importance of the protective covenant and its enforcement. In addition the only acceptable means of utilizing the covenant to achieve its purpose fairly, consistently and comprehensively is the use of a community Design Review Committee (DRC). The protective covenants and the DRC process, despite their long-established legal basis, will only succeed with broad-based community support. It is the opinion of this committee, that such support can only be created and maintained through a continuing process, which tests community values and opinions on key design questions and review committee operations and adjusts the implementation of the covenant accordingly. The specific purpose then of this committee is a first step in that process. With this in mind, considerable effort was given to surveying community opinion on basic architectural review issues and applying these results in revised guidelines and recommendations. Community input, in addition to the survey results, included comments at CAHH meetings and written suggestions addressed to the Committee. Based on these inputs and committee discussions, the following conceptual framework evolved which we hope accurately reflects the views of the majority of Hollin Hills homeowners. This framework includes: Some type of architectural and/or design review, primarily of additions to existing homes, is necessary to maintain and/or enhance property values and to maintain the quality of our environment, i.e. the attractive ambiance which results from a unique combination of architecture, topography, woodlands and landscape. Maintaining the quality of life normally associated with living in Hollin Hills involves some matters which are not the proper subject for a Guidelines Study Committee but, nevertheless, may require community attention, e.g. landscape, unkempt yards, ongoing buildings and site maintenance practices. The basic Goodman design features, i.e. roof shapes, wall types, window shapes, color palettes, siting concepts and construction details should be used as the starting point for new design which can be sympathetically adapted to meet contemporary needs and technological advances while not maintaining complete adherence to the original design. The design review function and process should be as open and facilitative as possible. This can be accomplished by providing homeowners with information and assistance, creating a community awareness, starting the review process at an earlier conceptual stage, and by providing the DRC with both subjective and objective guidelines with which to function.
Greater efforts toward avoiding and resolving grievances between homeowners and the DRC must be made by providing an additional avenue for appeal as well as changing the image and substance of the DRC's role from one of adversarial control to one of advice and control. The DRC should basically be seen as assisting homeowners in developing residential designs that reflect the applicant's individual needs and desires as well as the community's objectives. The composition of the DRC should reflect a broader representation of the community with professional design membership in balance with membership at large. Specific design features of critical importance identified by the community are building scale, siting, and materials. The Design Review process and the covenants which support that process are essential elements in ensuring that Hollin Hills remains a visually attractive place in which to live and in maintaining our property values.

**Section 1 - The Covenant**

The legal basis for the existence of a design review process lies in our Deeds of Dedication which include several covenants. A restrictive covenant is basically a contractual agreement to refrain from building without prior approval of the DRC, formerly known as the Architectural Review Committee. In our case, the authority of the DRC comes from the covenant included in each deed. A sample of the covenant is shown in Appendix A, Sec c. The covenant further allows that both community and individual landowners have the right to enforce this covenant. The authority of the DRC is automatic for all sections of Hollin Hills except homes in sections 13-18 whose owners chose not to renew the covenant as it applies to their property. This means that the covenant is automatically extended for successive periods of ten years, unless by vote of a majority of the then owners of the lots it is agreed to change said covenants in whole or in part.

**Section II – Standards of Original Design**

The purpose of this section is to describe some of the characteristics and reasons why Hollin Hills has attracted attention throughout its history. These “Standards of Original Designs” set an historical benchmark against which future changes can be measured. They can also serve as a brief guide for homeowners interested in the original appearance of their house. A more complete history is *Hollin Hills: A History into the 4th Decade*, compiled by Marion Tiger and is available from the Civic Association of Hollin Hills. Hollin Hills houses have distinctive features that define the character of our community and set it apart from other developments. The character defining features for any house include the site, plan arrangements, facade designs, windows and doors, roofs, and materials. By examining these features on Hollin Hills homes, you can begin to see similar features appearing again and again. The unique character of Hollin Hills is defined by our collective perception of these features. An important fact to remember is that the various designs for Hollin Hills homes evolved over the twenty year construction history of the community. There are basic features common to all Hollin Hills houses, but there are variations in the way the elements fit together. The earliest homes were simple rectangular and split level plans with low-slope gable roofs. Some of the split levels had low slope shed roofs. Later, square plans with flat roofs were added as well as butterfly
roofs on existing plans. Later homes of all plan types were constructed from standardized modular wall panels, further giving design cohesiveness to the community. Thus, any evaluation of the "harmony and conformity" of proposed changes to a Hollin Hills home must take into account both the design similarities and the design dissimilarities that have existed in our community from the beginning. Design features that occur, or, conversely, do not occur, in a significant percentage of Hollin Hills homes are of primary importance in evaluating proposed changes.

SITING
Hollin Hills houses are sited to take advantage of the topography and sun. They do not sit in orderly rows, each parallel to the street. The topography was not well suited to subdivision development, placing extra demands on the developer, his architects and landscape architects. Certain house plans evolved, for instance, in response to the topography to allow a minimum of regrading in order to retain a natural appearance. Views from our homes "borrow" vistas from adjacent yards, making our yards appear more spacious. Driveways were gravel to reduce their visual impact. The plantings are lush and mature a benefit of living in thirty year old homes. There is variety in the placement of the different house plans, further diminishing the similarities to other subdivisions. Hollin Hills is distinctly different from other subdivisions, whether one is driving through or flying overhead. That distinctiveness is an important benchmark in evaluating proposed changes.

PLAN ARRANGEMENT
The plan arrangements are "open" with the public spaces flowing into one another rather than always being separated by doors. In many homes you can walk from the kitchen through the dining rooms and into the living room without passing through a door. The bed and bathrooms, by contrast, all have doors for privacy. The spaces requiring water - bathrooms, kitchens, washing machines, water heaters – are clustered together in utility cores to minimize the plumbing required to serve them. Frequently, the utility spaces are located in the center of the house, where skylights substitute for bathroom windows and a roof monitor contains the furnace flue and whole house fan. While interior changes are not considered in reviewing plans, owners should understand that interior arrangements are invariably reflected in the window and door pattern. One cannot plan the interior of a proposed addition without considering the size and placement of exterior openings.

BUILDING SCALE, FORM AND ROOFLINE
Hollin Hills houses are small scale, in keeping with typical house sizes in the 1950s. They take the form of rectangular boxes that sit lightly in the landscape. They are neither heavy nor imposing. The large windows give the houses an open and transparent quality, literally allowing one to look through them. Garages, which by their very nature are not light or transparent, originally were virtually unknown. Carports, also not original, have been a successful compromise that provides shelter from the elements while maintaining a light an open character. The
rooflines provide a strong horizontal emphasis that, especially in the single story plans, make our homes seem to hug the ground.

EXTERIOR WALLS
Hollin Hills houses are very simply detailed. There are no brackets or cornices or elaborate moldings around window or door frames. The resulting clean, uncluttered lines are characteristic of the entire community. The walls of Hollin Hills houses are unornamented, planar surfaces with tall, rectangular openings. Early plans gave little indication on the exterior of interior partitions. The small, atypical windows in the bathrooms hinted at the function of the room inside for instance, but there was no exterior manifestation of the placement of interior partitions. Later plans utilized modular wall panels, manufactured on site, that were twelve feet long, most commonly in a window panel-window arrangement. Interior partitions were invariably placed to coincide with the joint between adjacent modular panels, making a strong correlation between the interior plan and exterior fenestration. The facades are primarily wood with used brick fireplace walls and some used brick or concrete block panels without windows. The fireplace walls and masonry panels serve a secondary function of providing bracing against lateral (wind) loads. The short wing walls at the fireplace end of the first floor of some two story homes serve the same purpose. Foundation walls, where they are visible above ground are generally concrete block. What have become known as Hollin Hills windows are a fixed upper light of plate glass with a lower operable sash, both set in thin (two inch wide) wooden frames or muntins. They are approximately three feet wide by eight feet high. Some plans use banks of these windows, actually using the muntins for structural support of the roof. Where banks of windows are used on the first floor of two story houses, the muntin width is increased to three inches to support the extra weight of the second Key elements of the esthetic design of Hollin Hills windows are the thin profile of the frames and muntins and the fixed upper and operable lower sash.

WINDOWS AND DOORS
The windows are universally large, most frequently with a large fixed upper sash and a lower, operable sash. The upper sash are glazed with a single thickness of plate glass. The operable sash is approximately 25" high, although some window walls have taller lower sash to line up with the sill height of the kitchen windows. The lower sash were either steel casement windows (early) or steel awning windows (later). The switch to awning windows removed the vertical bar from the center of the lower sash, giving the windows a cleaner design. A key aspect of the window design is that the frames are unusually thin and unobtrusive. The rabbeted wooden frames are just two inches wide, while the steel lower sash only project in 1-1/4” from the wooden frames, minimizing the change in the Window profile. Exterior doors are flush, without panels or small glass lights. Where glass doors are used, they are either one full size glass opening or two, with the horizontal cross bar the same size as and aligned with the cross bat in adjacent windows.

ROOFS
Hollin Hills roofs are either low-slope or flat. The low-slope roofs are most commonly gable roofs with some butterfly and shed roofs. Gutters, if any, are simply rectangular box gutters that seem to be a part of the roof edge rather than attached ornament. The roofs typically have large overhangs that provide shade for our large windows in the summer but allow the low winter sun to penetrate deeply into our homes. A second important feature of the overhangs is to keep rainwater off our wooden walls, prolonging their lives. The large overhangs are supported by thin outriggers, 2” by 3” extensions of the roof joists, that allow the roof edge to appear to thing and light. The full structural thickness of the roof is this hidden. Compare the size of the space above both the inside and outside of a Hollin Hills window to see the difference. Not all house plans have large overhangs, however. The square, flat roof plans have no overhangs, making them more susceptible to damage from splashed water and to heat gains from the summer sun. The original built-up roofs were asphalt, felt and slag/cinders with few penetrations such as skylights.

**MATERIALS AND COLOR**
The most common exterior material is painted wood: tongue-and-groove siding (vertical butted boards), T-1-11 panels (plywood with grooves cut every 4”), and some clapboard, wood window and door frames that are also structural, solid panel wood doors, etc. The original palettes of exterior colors were earth tones in keeping with the setting. Interestingly, interior colors were similar: warm gray, gray-brown, deep brown, clay red, black, gray-green and cadmium yellow. Trim, window and door frames, eaves and soffits, was white. The white trim around the windows provided a seemingly unbroken plane from the interior to the exterior, further minimizing the window detail. The lack of ornament is another distinguishing characteristic. Instead of applied ornament, the texture of the building elements gives variety to the various planar surfaces as in the used brick and painted concrete block panel walls and used brick fireplaces, the regular pattern of t-11 or clapboard siding, and the gravelly texture of the built-up roofs. Exterior hardware was simple and modern, following the overall design philosophy.

**Section III – What Needs Approval?**
All new construction and all alterations of existing structures and topography requires approval by the Design Review Committee. Since all such construction must be approved "as to conformity and harmony of external design with existing structures in the subdivision", it is necessary that all alterations that affect the visual appearance of the house and its topography should be reviewed. Although the covenant refers to "building" and "structure" this is interpreted to mean "that which is built or constructed" (Fairfax Zoning Code). Accordingly, fences, decks, detached, accessory structures (sheds, carports, pool/tennis enclosures, greenhouses, etc.) gazebos, trellises, awnings and retaining walls and free-standing walls should be included as constructions that require approval. In-kind replacements of the parts of the structures do not have to come before the Design Review Committee. However, when considering, for example, replacement windows, the size and proportion of original Hollin Hills windows should not be changed without design review approval. In addition to DRC approval, there are Fairfax County
Codes which relate to decks, fences, sheds and other accessory structures which must be met. It is the homeowner’s responsibility to be aware of such Code requirements and to comply with them. No DRC approval is needed in matters of minor exterior lighting from incandescent sources (normal bulbs). Satellite dishes and free-standing antennae towers require approval. Where minor construction is occurring, the DRC Chairman may use his/her discretionary authority to waive submission of an application for approval. This authority to waive review should encourage applicants to inquire prior to action if there is any question of applicability. One purpose of guidelines such as those contained in this report is to encourage homeowners to meet and strive toward community design standards. Obviously there are many examples in Hollin Hills of departures from these recommendations. You don’t need to feel compelled to tear down all your ogee gutters or replace expensive doors, sheds, etc. But, when the opportunity for replacement of gutters, windows, roofs, fences does occur, you should move toward the guidelines. As these improvements are made, the appearance of our community is maintained and enhanced.

Section IV – Procedures for Approval
The DRC can serve as a valuable resource for Hollin Hills homeowners interested in altering their homes. Homeowners, who are planning to make changes on the exterior of their homes or property, are encouraged to submit concept sketches prior to official submission of their full application package. This could be done informally prior to the development of the design and specifications.

APPLYING FOR APPROVAL
The following procedures are for homeowners who are applying for change:
1. Applicants will be encouraged to present their design to the committee with a two-stage process: (The applicant is encouraged to have his/her architect or designer present at these discussions.)
   Stage 1: The early concept sketch presented informally.
   Stage 2: The more formal presentation of a schematic and final package.
2. The homeowner should submit two sets of building plans, specifications and plot plan showing the location of the proposed structure with respect to topography, street and neighbor’s structures. One set will be returned to the homeowner and one set is kept by the DRC.
3. The DRC must meet a minimum of every 30 days to review all applications. The DRC will decide if any additional meetings are necessary. With prior arrangement with the homeowner, any or all committee members may visit the premises of an applicant for a site review.
4. The DRC should inform the responsible party of approval or non-approval by a written letter dated no more than 30 days after receipt of the final building plans, etc. The letter shall indicate whether the plans are approved, approved as noted or disapproved with some notation about where the applicant's submission fails to comply with the design guidelines covenants. A sign similar in size to the building permit but of a different color shall be provided to the homeowner by the DRC when the design has been approved. During construction this sign must be posted near (or adjacent) to the building permit clearly visible from the street.
5. The DRC should maintain a record of its actions for each application. This should be part of the public record.

6. The homeowner may submit, at any time, a revised submittal package that takes into account the DRC concerns. The DRC may review resubmissions prior to the next scheduled meeting and make approvals or rejections. If not received by that cut-off day, the resubmission must be considered by the following regularly scheduled meeting.

7. The homeowner's adjacent (contiguous) neighbors and those directly across the street shall be notified by postcard or letter BY THE HOMEOWNER at least 3 days prior to the project's review by the DRC. The letter needs only a brief description of the scope of the project, its location, and the date it will be reviewed. It is simply to inform the neighbors and provides them with the opportunity to voice an opinion if they have one. The DRC should develop and disseminate procedures for design review based on this report as endorsed by CAHH.

**ACTIONS REQUIRED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION**

1. The homeowner is responsible for obtaining all required local building permits.
2. Building materials may not be placed on the premises nor grading or construction begun unless DRC approval has been made.
3. The record shall indicate where the applicant's submission fails to comply with the guidelines and when the applicant resubmits a revised package. At no time within two years from the original application may the DRC reverse itself on any unchanged feature previously approved.
4. Building construction should commence within two years of design approval or a resubmission of the application must be made.

**ACTIONS DURING CONSTRUCTION**

1. Approval may be followed by inspection for compliance. The applicant will be notified in advance of such an inspection.
2. When construction is started at variance with approval or without approval, the DRC should report to the Board with its recommendations for action.
3. If an apparently unauthorized building gets under way, any homeowner can notify the DRC at once.

**APPEAL PROCEDURE**

It is important for the community to provide its members with a process for dealing with grievances or disagreement with DRC’s rulings. Accordingly, if a building plan is denied by the DRC, an appeal process consist of the following:

1. DRC - the homeowner has the right to present his/her case before the DRC with his/her architect or building contractor attending.
2. CAHH BOARD - should the DRC reject a homeowner’s building plans, the homeowner has the right to present his/her case to the Board of Directors of the Civic Association. A 2/3 vote of Board members present is required to overturn a DRC decision. The Board is empowered to uphold or overturn a DRC decision both in matters of procedure as well as design content.
3. ARBITRATION - should the CAHH Board uphold the DRC's decision, Arbitration would be the next step in the appeals process. An arbitrator supplied by the American Arbitration Association should be made available and expenses shall be shared equally.

4. THE COURTS - are the final means of enforcing the covenants. While lawsuits may on occasion be necessary, they are the last resort.

Section V – Design Guidelines
Design Guidelines The following standards are meant to give direction to homeowners and the Design Review Committee in evaluating whether proposed designs are in harmony and conformity with other structures in Hollin Hills.

A. SITING
Place
The placement on the site of any occupied or accessory structure(s) should achieve a natural extension of the original conditions of the site and existing house.

Grading and Drainage
Avoid any extensive grading, cut or fill. Use existing elevations of the ground as the floor elevations of any structures to the extent possible. Structures should blend with the slope of the topography. Structures should step with the slope to fit the natural terrain. Contain runoff water drainage to the site or adjacent streets. Use of site retaining walls should be minimized.

Orientation
Orientation of the structures should be made to achieve privacy, views, good sun exposure for the site under consideration as well as protecting all the same features for the neighbors' site. Sensitivity to Neighbors: Sensitivity of the above issues for the neighboring sites' needs are critical particularly in relation to meeting the needs of any public right-of-ways (e.g. sidewalks, paths) to achieve a harmonious blend of the woodland spaces that characterize the entire community as well as each house site. For example, property boundaries which are clear legal demarcation lines and have precise set backs to establish construction position, do not in Hollin Hills establish design and spatial intent and are not noticeable in the Hollin Hills siting patterns. This results in free-flowing spaces of a semi-cleared woodland character that should be conserved. Additions, fences, accessory structures, decks, etc. should avoid reinforcing property lines or any other geometric pattern not associated with the house.

Patios
Patios should be distinguishable from sidewalks, parking pads, or driveways. Care should be given to maintaining the unpaved quality of the Hollin Hills landscape. Any one patio should not be bigger than 50 percent of the square footage of the first floor of the house even if the patio has several split levels.

Driveways and Parking Pads
Such car areas should be kept to a minimum size.

Garden Structures
Such structures as arbors attached or detached from the house are encouraged if their specific design and size of members, etc. conform to the house design and appear as a natural extension of the house.
Other
Other subjects such as mail boxes, certain minor exterior lighting, overhead vs. underground utility lines, flagpoles, tennis courts or pools do not require guidance; however, in the future the community may feel a need to address these items. See recommendation for Landscape and Maintenance Program Committee in Section VII

Decks: Decks are an excellent design solution to integrate the house with the ground immediately adjacent. Care should be taken in the following areas of deck design:
· Avoid second floor decks on the front of the house which are visible from the street.
· Any one deck (counting any split levels) should not exceed in size more than 50 percent of the floor area of the first floor of the house.
· Planting should be provided at post foundations and on low decks to screen structural elements and to soften visual impact.
· The materials in terms of color and size of members should appear as a natural extension of the house.
· Deck railings should be of a minimal size and, if possible, be integrated with a continuous bench. If the deck is low to the ground, which is preferred, railings can be eliminated totally. County codes must be met.
· Other deck features such as hot tubs should not be visible to neighbors or from streets.

Fences and Walls
Fences are discouraged. If absolutely necessary, the more transparent or open the fence the better. Fences are especially discouraged in the front yard or side yards next to streets. Chain link, stockade, western, split rail, snow, chicken, or wind gate fences are not compatible with Hollin Hills design. The open grid metal farm fence variety is better, but all fending is discouraged. When fences are permitted, the following guidelines apply: fence posts should be on the inside face of the fence; planting should be used in conjunction with the transparent fence to minimize the appearance; retaining walls should be kept to a minimum; and screen or garden walls - typical of the original Hollin Hills design are acceptable if kept in short distances and low in height. If fences are required for dog runs, they should be sited as not to be border fences or visible from the street.

B. BUILDING SCALE, FORM, AND ROOFLINE
Proposed additions should not overwhelm the scale of the original house. Proposed building designs should be composed of simple geometric shapes, following the small scale, light and transparent character, and strong rooflines used in the original houses. Proposed plans should accommodate site constraints, that is, not every kind of addition can go on every lot.
The design of alterations and additions should be in harmony and conformity primarily with the particular plan type (Customline, Decca, etc.) of the house being modified.

C. MATERIALS, CONSTRUCTION DETAILS, AND COLOR
Wood siding should be either vertical tongue and groove, vertical T-1-11 plywood or horizontal clapboard. Wood siding should be painted or stained.
Brick walls should maintain the visual appearance of existing brick used in the house. The material and color of roofs should be in harmony with the rest of the house. Exterior colors should be earth tones or white. Loud or highly contrasting colors are discouraged. Construction details such as door and window frames, joints between adjacent surfaces and other trim should be simple and without ornament.

D. EXTERIOR WALLS
Walls should be unornamented, planar surfaces with tall, rectangular openings. The use of modular wall panels is encouraged in additions and alterations to houses that were originally constructed with modular wall panels.

E. WINDOWS AND DOORS
Window and door frames should be rabbeted 2x6’s with the glass, sash or, door set in. Other door and window frame treatments are permissible as long as they maintain harmony and conformity with the existing windows and doors. The predominant window type in Hollin Hills is three feet wide and extends from floor to ceiling. It features a single fixed upper light and an operable lower sash approximately 25" high. For reference, this will be called a "Hollin Hills window." The size and proportion of original Hollin Hills windows should not be changed without design review approval. This is not to suggest that in new construction the size and proportion of the original Hollin Hills windows must be used. The exterior doors should be either flush (a flat surface not broken into smaller panels or windows) or fully glazed.

F. ROOFS
Roofs should be either flat or low-slope gable, low-slope butterfly or low-slope shed. Large roof overhangs with thin edge profiles are encouraged except on the flat roof plan. Roofing materials that retain the visual appearance of the original built-up roofs are encouraged. Gutters should be plain box gutters with a rectangular profile.

G. GARAGES, CARPORTS, AND NONATTACHED STRUCTURES
Garages are not encouraged. Carports and garages are permissible when they can be integrated with the house and site. All non-attached structures should be in harmony with house and site.

Section VI – Composition and Role of the Design Review Committee
The name of the building reviewing committee shall be the Design Review Committee (DRC) (formerly the Architectural Review Committee). The DRC shall consist of five members - It should be a balanced group of men and women. All members must be Hollin Hills homeowners and non-members of the CAHH Board. DRC should represent a cross section of the community. There shall be up to 3 members who are either architects or design professionals, one of which must be an architect. Members of the DRC shall serve two-year terms, staggered to assure continuity, and no member may serve for more
than two consecutive terms. The CAHH Board shall appoint members to the DRC to the extent possible based on these criteria. The DRC shall elect its own Chairman. No member of the DRC may participate in the deliberation of his/her own or client's building plans. All DRC members shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The role of the DRC should consist of the following:

- Provides advice on design concepts;
- Approves Design Plans and monitors construction;
- Recommends Action when non approved construction is commenced or departs from approval;
- Updates Guidelines for community approval; and revises procedures as necessary.

**APPENDIX A - Covenants**

Appearing of record in Liber 754 page 482, recorded 4/4/1950, Fairfax County, Virginia Section_(Sample)_ Hollin Hills

This dedication, is made, however upon the express conditions that each and every part thereof shall be subject to the following conditions, limitations and restrictions, which shall be construed as covenants running with the land and which shall be binding upon all parties and all persons claiming under them until (Note 1 at which time said covenants shall be automatically extended for successive periods of ten years, unless by vote of a majority of the then owners of the lots it is agreed to change said covenants in whole or in part. If the parties hereto, or any of them, or their heirs or assigns, shall violate or attempt to violate any of the covenants herein, it shall be lawful for any other person or persons owning any real property situated in said development or subdivision to prosecute any proceedings at law or in equity against the person or persons violating or attempting to violate any such covenant and either to prevent him or them from so doing or to recover damages or other dues for such violation. Invalidation of anyone of these covenants by judgment or Court Order shall in no wise affect any of the other provisions, which shall remain in full force and effect.

(a) All the numbered lots in the subdivision shall be known and described as residential lots. Facilities for community use may be provided on sites indicated on recorded plat at "reserved for drainage and utility easements and community park purposes and services," but party of the first part for itself, its successors and assigns expressly reserves the right to extend any street or widen any street upon and over this area so marked "Reserved for drainage and utility easements and community park purposes and services," and further also reserves the right to lease or sell portions in fee of this area so designated as "Reserved for drainage and utility easements and community park purposes and services," where it is necessary in the opinion of party of the first part, its successors or assigns that such portion so leased or sold in fee be used to provide or aid in providing location for some one or several public utility services, such as, but not limited to gas, water, sewer disposal plant, electricity, either in main or substation.

(b) No structure shall be erected, altered, placed or permitted to remain on any residential building plot other than one detached single-family dwelling and a private garage for not more than two cars and other structures incidental to residential use.
(c) No building shall be erected, placed or altered on any building plot in this subdivision until the building plans, specifications and plot plan showing the location of such building have been approved in writing as to conformity and harmony of external design with existing structures in the subdivision, and as to the location of the building with respect to topography, and finished ground elevation, by a committee composed of Morris Rodman, Samuel J. Rodman, and Robert C. Davenport, or by a representative designated by a majority of the members of said committee. In the event of death or registration of any member of said committee, the remaining member or members shall have full authority to approve or disapprove, such design and location, or to designate a representative with like authority. In the event such committee or its designated representative fails to approve or disapprove such design and location within thirty days after said plans and Specifications have been submitted to it, or in any event if no suit to enjoin the erection of such building or the making of such alterations has been commenced prior to completion thereof, such approval will not be required and this covenant shall be deemed to have been fully complied with. The powers and duties of such committee, and of its designated representative, shall cease on and after (Note 1) Thereafter the approval described in this covenant shall not be required unless, prior to said date and effective thereon, a written instrument shall be executed by the then record owners of a majority of the lots of this subdivision and duly recorded, appointing a representative or representatives, who shall thereafter exercise the said powers previously exercised by said committee.

(d) No building shall be located on any residential building plot nearer than 25 feet to the front lot line, nor nearer than 10 feet to any side street line. No building, except a detached garage or other outbuilding located 60 feet or more from the front lot line, shall be located nearer than 5 feet to any side lot line.

(e) No residential structure shall be erected or placed on any building plot, which plot has an area of less than 7,000 square feet with sewer, or an area of less than 14,000 square feet with septic tank and a width of less than 60 feet at the front building setback line.

(f) No noxious or offensive trade or activity shall be carried on upon any lot nor shall anything be done thereon which may be or become an annoyance or nuisance to the neighborhood.

(g) No trailer, basement, tent, shack, garage, barn or other outbuilding erected in the tract shall at any time be used as a residence, temporarily or permanently, nor shall any structure of a temporary character be used as a residence.

(h) The ground floor area of the main structure, exclusive of one-story open porches and garages, shall not be less than 700 square feet in the case of a one-story structure nor less than 500 square feet in the case of a one and one-half, two or two and one-half story structure.

(i) An easement is reserved over the rear and side five feet of each lot for utility installation and maintenance.

AMENDMENT IN LIBER 1455, PAGE 271 TO RESTRICTIONS IN LIBER 754, PAGE 482, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VIRGINIA LAND RECORDS, APPLICABLE TO SECTION, HOLLIN HILLS SUBDIVISION.
Said restrictive covenants provide that no building shall be erected, placed or altered on any building plot in the aforesaid sections of this subdivision until the building plans, specifications and plot plan showing the location of such building have been approved in writing as to conformity and harmony of external design with existing structures in the subdivision and as to the location of the building with respect to topography and finished ground elevation, by a committee composed of Morris Rodman, Samuel J. Rodman and Robert C. Davenport.

Said covenants provide that the powers and duties of such Committee shall cease on and after (Note_1), unless prior to said date and effective thereon, a written instrument shall be executed by the then record owners of a majority of the lots of Section_ of this Subdivision and duly recorded appointing a representative or representative who shall there after exercise the said powers previously exercised by aforesaid committee. It is the desire of the undersigned record owners of lots in Section_ of Hollin Hills to continue the powers and duties of such committee by appointing a representative or representatives pursuant to the provisions of the covenant, as recited in the foregoing premise.

Now, therefore, we the undersigned record owners of a majority of the lots in Section Hollin Hills do hereby appoint the Hollin Hills Community Association, Incorporated, or any committee duly designated by it, to exercise, on and after (Note 1) the powers previously granted to and exercised by the aforesaid committee designated in the aforesaid restrictive covenants. Note 1: Dates vary with Section.
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