

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK NOMINATION

NPS Form 10-900

USDI/NPS NRHP Registration Form (Rev. 8-86)

OMB No. 1024-0018

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: Radburn

Other Name/Site Number:

2. LOCATION

Street & Number: N/A

Not for publication: N/A

City/Town: Borough of Fair Lawn

Vicinity: N/A

State: New Jersey County: Bergen

Code: 003

Zip Code: 07410

3. CLASSIFICATION

Ownership of Property

Private: X
Public-Local:
Public-State:
Public-Federal:

Category of Property

Building(s):
District: X
Site:
Structure:
Object:

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing
314
2
4
320

Noncontributing
188 Buildings
Sites
Structures
Objects
188 Total

Number of Contributing Resources Previously Listed in the National Register: 320

Name of Related Multiple Property Listing: N/A

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

4. STATE/FEDERAL AGENCY CERTIFICATION

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this ____ nomination ____ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property ____ meets ____ does not meet the National Register Criteria.

Signature of Certifying Official

Date

State or Federal Agency and Bureau

In my opinion, the property ____ meets ____ does not meet the National Register criteria.

Signature of Certifying Official

Date

State or Federal Agency and Bureau

5. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this property is:

- ____ Entered in the National Register
- ____ Determined eligible for the National Register
- ____ Determined not eligible for the National Register
- ____ Removed from the National Register
- ____ Other (explain):

Signature of Keeper

Date of Action

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 3

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

6. FUNCTION OR USE

<p>Historic: Domestic Landscape</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>Education Recreation and Culture Commerce</p>	<p>Sub: Single Dwelling, Multiple Dwelling Park, Plaza, Garden, Street Furniture Road-related, Pedestrian-related, Rail-Related School Sports Facility, Auditorium Specialty Store, Organizational</p>
<p>Current: Domestic Landscape</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>Education Recreation and Culture Commerce</p>	<p>Sub: Single Dwelling, Multiple Dwelling Park, Plaza, Garden, Street Furniture Road-Related, Pedestrian-related, Rail-related School Sports Facility Specialty Store, Business</p>

7. DESCRIPTION

ARCHITECTURAL CLASSIFICATION: LATE 19th & 20th Century Revivals/ Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, Classical Revival
Modern Movement/ Art Deco

MATERIALS:

Foundation: Concrete
Walls: Brick, Wood, Stone,
Metal, Synthetics
Roof: Asphalt, Slate
Other: Wood, Brick, Glass,
Concrete, Metal, Stone,
Copper

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 4

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Describe Present and Historic Physical Appearance.

Amid the spinach fields of northern New Jersey the experimental community of Radburn germinated and established roots in 1928. Approximately 12 miles west of New York City, the open fields of the sparsely populated rural borough of Fair Lawn were well suited for the development of a large-scale “new town” by the City Housing Corporation, headed by Alexander Bing, and a team of talented designers, led by Clarence S. Stein and Henry Wright. By 1934, Radburn had reached the size of a single neighborhood unit with construction begun on a second, slightly less than half of the size envisioned in the original plan. All of the necessary elements were in place: a variety of housing types, an elementary school, a community center, a commercial plaza, and interior parks providing safe and healthy recreational space for the residents. Tangibly visible on the ground, the plan for the new community included a hierarchy of roads from perimeter roads to short cul-de-sacs, the division of land into superblocks, an interconnected system of pedestrian walkways, and spacious interior parks. The financial collapse of the City Housing Corporation in 1934, caused by the Great Depression, resulted in an incomplete town plan and the eventual sale of the surrounding land. The portion of the whole town plan that was completed remains intact and is clearly discernable from its surroundings. Originally Radburn appeared as an island of planned development surrounded by farmland. Surrounded by suburban development typical of the postwar period, the community today remains an island dominated by open parkland, mature trees and shrubs, and unified clusters of small dwellings. Although its setting has changed drastically, Radburn stands out because of the clearly defined and distinctive plan that remains imprinted on the land and its fulfillment of the garden ideal in the midst of the growing metropolis of New York City. Although derived from English garden city planning, Radburn’s distinctive plan reflects an innovation in community design that, responding to the increasing presence of the mass-produced automobile in daily life, is characteristically American. Its creation, furthermore, reflects the forward-thinking vision of the Regional Planning Association of America (RPAA) and what scholar Kermit C. Parsons has called the “collaborative genius” of Stein and Wright and an interdisciplinary team of economic advisors and designers that represented town planning, engineering, architecture, and landscape architecture.¹

Located in Bergen County, New Jersey, Radburn is situated just east of the Erie Railroad and straddles Fair Lawn Avenue, a road established prior to the development of Radburn. As it exists today, Radburn is bounded generally on the west by the railroad, Owen Avenue on the northwest, Radburn Road on the northeast, Sandford Road on the southeast and Berdan Avenue on the south. The National Historic Landmark boundaries lie within this area and are limited to the three superblocks, system of streets and roads, and associated areas that had been laid out according to the “Radburn Idea” between 1928 and 1934. The boundary extends west along Fair Lawn Avenue to include the Radburn-Fair Lawn Passenger Station (1930), which was designed by Clarence Stein to serve the community and harmonize with the new town’s Colonial revival architecture. Although the community represents only a portion of the plan originally envisioned in 1928 by the RPAA, it strongly reflects the essential features for which Radburn would become internationally known: the “Town for the Motor Age”-- a unified plan featuring an innovative circulation network of roads and separate pedestrian paths, the subdivision of land into superblocks, and the clustering of reverse-fronted houses on short cul-de-sacs so that homes faced open parks and pedestrian walkways. Twenty years later in *Toward New Towns for America*, Clarence Stein would refer to this as the “Radburn Idea,” a concept in planning he remained a proponent of throughout

¹ Kermit C. Parsons, “Collaborative Genius: The Regional Planning Association of America,” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 60, no. 4 (Autumn 1994): 462-82; Lewis Mumford, “Introduction,” in *Toward New Towns for America* by Clarence S. Stein (1957; repr., Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1966), 11-17. Together these sources provide a close look at the leadership, varied talents, and interactions of the members of the RPAA and the City Housing Corporation.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 5

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

his career, advocating voraciously in the 1930s for its adoption as a basis for federal housing policy and continual expansion of its application to modern housing design.²

The original plan for Radburn called for the development of three neighborhood units, each based on the Neighborhood Unit Formula developed by Clarence Perry for the Russell Sage Foundation and promoted by the Committee on the Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs.³ Each neighborhood was to be made up of two superblocks, 30-50 acres in size, having its own elementary school and recreational facilities.⁴ Development occurred in stages, with the perimeter roads being laid out and construction of the first neighborhood (Parks A and B) north of Fair Lawn Avenue beginning in 1928. By 1934 when the City Housing Corporation went bankrupt and the original plan was abandoned, most of the house lots in Parks A and B had been developed according to the Radburn Idea, but only the perimeter roads and a small portion of Park R had been completed in the neighborhood planned south of Fair Lawn Avenue. After 1934, the development of vacant land within the original layout of roads and streets departed from the Radburn Idea and followed the conventional pattern of American suburbs, where homes fronted on the street and were centrally sited on their lot with open lawns and private driveways. Homes built after 1934 reflected the conventional house types of the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s, including Cape Cod, two-story brick colonials, and split-level houses.

Radburn Chronology

1928 – Radburn construction begins.

1929 – Declaration of Restrictions established in March as a legal attachment to Radburn property deeds. Approximately 78 single-family houses and duplexes and 2 multi-story apartment buildings on the ground, first houses are sold in May.⁵ New York stock market crash occurs in October.

1930 – Approximately 62 more single-family detached and multiple-family group dwellings constructed (see accompanying aerial photo); Radburn Plaza Building, telephone building, school, and brick supply co. also visible in the photograph. The Radburn-Fair Lawn Passenger Station, designed by Clarence Stein for the Erie Railroad, constructed.

1931 to 32 – Approximately 51 additional houses are constructed over these two years, all apparently the larger Tudor and Colonial Revivals of the northeast cul-de-sacs of Park B.⁶

² The term, “Radburn Idea,” as used in this document follows Stein’s definition of the term in *Toward New Towns* for the plan’s organization into superblocks where the interior is developed as commonly accessible parkland and the periphery of each block is developed with clusters of “reverse-front” dwellings that face private gardens and parkland and back on short cul-de-sacs, that provide automobile access and function as service courts.

³ Clarence A. Perry’s Neighborhood Unit concept was well-formulated by the time Radburn was planned, having been based on Forest Hills Gardens (1909-1914), the garden-city community developed by the Russell Sage Foundation on Long Island. Although not a member of the RPAA, Perry contributed to the early planning of Radburn and featured the new town in his 1929 monograph, “The Neighborhood Unit,” *Neighborhood and Community Planning*, vol. 7, *Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs* (New York: Regional Plan of New York, 1929) pp. 20-89. Although no formal relationship existed between the RPAA and the Sage Foundation which sponsored the New York Regional Plan, both Perry and Thomas Adams, the Plan’s General Director of Plans and Survey, recognized Radburn’s importance as a model for residential planning in the age of automobiles and an antidote to the typical pattern of unplanned, speculative home building.

⁴ Stein, *Toward New Towns for America*, 9.

⁵ From a 1929 aerial photo in Stein’s *Toward New Towns for America*, 46, and text on 37.

⁶ These are the remaining houses built according to the Radburn Plan, minus the twelve noted by Stein as having been built in 1933; they appear on the 1940 photograph but not on the c. 1930 photograph (see attached photos).

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 6

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

1933 – Twelve houses built, presumably the last constructed by the City Housing Corporation.⁷

1934 – The City Housing Corporation goes bankrupt. It is replaced by the Radburn Corporation (not to be confused with the Radburn Association). The Radburn Association retains ownership of the common interior parks, but the vacant land that had been slated for development is sold off, presumably through the Radburn Corporation.

Today Radburn's site plan is defined by a hierarchy of roads that encompass three superblocks, named Parks A, B, and R; as well as a number of adjoining blocks where the Plaza Building, tennis courts, and additional housing are located. Several main thoroughfares carry the heaviest traffic: Fair Lawn Avenue runs east and west and divides the northern and southern sections of the community; to the east, Radburn Road, forms a curvilinear arc roughly running north and south; on the west, Plaza Road, North and South, is laid out perpendicular to Fair Lawn Avenue. These roads are interconnected by a series of more lightly traveled secondary roads that divide the interior of the Radburn site-plan and define the edges of the three superblocks. Howard Avenue, a curvilinear road extending northeast from Plaza Road North, defines the northern edge of Park A and the southern edge of Park B, while Owen Avenue, drawn north of and parallel to Howard defines the northern edge of Park B. High Street and Warren Road run parallel to Fair Lawn Avenue forming an axial east-west corridor, with High Street forming the southern edge of Park A and Warren Road the northern edge of Park R. Park R is further bounded by Plaza Road South to the west and the less traveled streets to the east and south (Sandford Road, Rutgers Terrace, and Ramsey Terrace). The periphery of each superblock is pierced by a series of short, narrow cul-de-sacs that function as service entrances and provide vehicular access to each home. With the exception of Plaza Road North that was spaciously laid out in the form of a parkway with a planted median, the width of most Radburn roads was determined solely by economics and limited to the needs of the traffic it was intended to serve.

Each of Radburn's superblocks is named alphabetically for its interior landscaped park; Park A forms the central section between High Street and Howard Avenue; Park B to the north between Howard Avenue and Owen Avenue, and Park R south of Warren Road. Each cul-de-sac begins with the same letter as the park it adjoins; those on Park A with names such as Audubon Place and Ashburn Place; those on Park B with names such as Burnham Place and Berkeley Place, and those on Park R with names such as Randolph Terrace and Ramsey Terrace. The cul-de-sacs function as service entrances for automobiles, connecting homes, many with built-in garages, with the lateral and perimeter streets. No two cul-de-sacs are identical in either plan or overall design; some, such as Burnham Place, feature a one-way turning circle to facilitate the movement of traffic. Sharing common architectural elements, houses on the individual cul-de-sacs are closely arranged in irregular, staggered clusters to provide both unity and variety in sharp contrast to the monotonous rows of speculative housing typical of the period. Backing on a service court, or cul-de-sac, each home faces a small private yard or garden that opens directly onto an interior park or one of the carefully planted pedestrian walkways leading to the park. Many private gardens are screened from public view by hedges, plantings of shrubbery and trees, and garden fences.

Designed as open parkland and planted with lawns, shade trees, and shrubbery, the interior of each block functions as a community park and provides various forms of outdoor recreation. The interior parks are interlaced with gently meandering paths that provide pedestrian circulation throughout the community and connect to the walkways leading to and from the small private gardens that form the front yard of each house. Passing through the parks, pedestrians can reach the neighborhood school, swimming

⁷ Stein, *Toward New Towns for America*, 37.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 7

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

pools, and community facilities. The secondary roads for the most part do not have sidewalks or connecting paths, giving pedestrians little opportunity to move between the system of walkways and major vehicular streets and further emphasizing the separation of pedestrian and automobile traffic, a key element of the Radburn Idea.

Several other features contribute to Radburn's innovative circulation network. To further enhance the park experience and ensure safety, the designers incorporated a pedestrian underpass below Howard Avenue to connect Parks A and B in the vicinity of the neighborhood school and community pool. Echoing Olmsted & Vaux's design of "arches" for the carriage roads of New York City's Central Park, the underpass was faced with native stone to blend with the surrounding naturalistic park setting; today it continues to enable pedestrians to pass safely below the grade of Howard Avenue. A footbridge with connecting pathways originally connected Parks A and R, crossing over Fair Lawn Avenue east of the Radburn Plaza Building and Abbott Court (now Eldorado Village Apartments); both the paths and the bridge are now gone and pedestrians must cross at the grade of the road. The first of a number of multiple-family dwellings to provide rental housing at a reasonable cost for lower-income residents, Abbott Court was built at the western edge of Park A not far from the Plaza Building. Consisting of two multi-story apartment houses, each in the form of an elongated and somewhat irregularly shaped "L," are arranged to face onto a diagonal pedestrian pathway leading from the street corner to the western entrance of the block's interior park. Abbott Court was laid out and planted with trees and shrubbery to anchor the western edge of Park A and function architecturally as an entrance to Radburn's first neighborhood. The community was conveniently bordered on the west by the Erie Railroad and easy commuting by train became a promised amenity. By 1930, an attractive passenger station, designed by Clarence Stein, with a parking lot and pedestrian waiting areas and paths, had replaced the former freight depot and become the western terminus for what was envisioned but never realized as a spacious civic center. Today passengers reach the station by car, parking in one of several large lots surrounding the station, or on foot along Fair Lawn Avenue.

Radburn defines itself, both historically and currently, by its parks. Covering 23 acres, the parks are a highly significant element of the Radburn Plan and form the backbone of the community. Conceived as the agricultural greenbelt in Ebenezer Howard's theoretical diagram for ideal garden city turned inward, Radburn's interior parks reflected not only the example of the English garden cities at Letchworth and Hampstead Gardens by Barry Parker and Raymond Unwin but moreover a blending of influences from the naturalistic American urban parks of the late nineteenth century, such as Brooklyn Park, and the nation's Colonial heritage as embodied in the New England village green. In the form of long, meandering grassy meadows, the parks were designed to mirror the native landscape of the surrounding region by presenting a naturalistic landform of gently rolling hills and streams and plantings of indigenous trees, shrubs, and ground covers. Despite their naturalism, the parks resulted from a careful study of existing conditions as well as conscious adherence to the principles of unity, variety, and harmony. In the design process, close attention was given to spatial organization, the contouring of the land, the placement and selection of plant materials, and recreational pleasures of Radburn's prospective residents. Although the native oaks have matured and some specimen trees have been added, the interior parks retain their spaciousness and meadow like quality with copses of trees and shrubs. Flowering trees and shrubs are intermingled with stands of large deciduous hardwood trees and clusters of evergreens.

With original plantings now more than 70 years old, trees have matured and low shrubs and bushes have in many instances been replaced. While replacement plants have not necessarily replicated the original material, ornamental and flowering trees and shrubs are the most frequent replacement choice. Parks A

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 8

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

and B were designed in the naturalistic landscape style practiced by Frederick Law Olmsted and his associates in America in the mid- and late nineteenth century. The emphasis was on creating a natural appearance with curvilinear pathways and open expanses of lawn with clusters of trees and shrubs. The broad views of the open interior parks give way to the intimate private gardens around the individual houses. Hedges and occasional fences indicate property lines, their height dependent on the owner's desire for privacy although restrictions require that no hedge or fence may obstruct a neighbor's view of the interior park.⁸ Although designed plantings were placed around every building prior to sale, residents retained the right to change plantings. Each private yard is clearly the personal space of the occupants, some with flowering gardens, some with flagstone or brick patios, and others with children's play equipment.

Marjorie Sewell Cautley, the landscape architect responsible for Radburn's planting and the interior design of the parks, intentionally selected plants native to northern New Jersey and common to the bottomlands of the nearby creeks for which Radburn was named intending that, once developed, the new community might evoke images of the site's original setting. Her selections included hawthorn, dogwood, willow, birch, viburnum, azalea, spirea, wild roses, pine, hemlock, oak and maple. Despite her selection of native species, Cautley arranged the plantings in a highly organized fashion to achieve artistic effect and attractiveness as part of an overall program of planting themes. Cul-de-sacs and public walkways were given different flowering or foliage schemes, such as sweet mockorange on Ashburn walk or hawthorne on Berkeley Place. Today many of the oaks, maples, and sycamores transplanted from nearby woods and fields and planted under Cautley's supervision between 1929 and 1933 have achieved considerable height and form a dense canopy. Scattered remnants of her other plantings, including flowering dogwoods and hemlock hedges, are visible along Radburn's walkways and paths.⁹

Incorporated into the parks are both recreational and reposeful areas designed to encourage healthful recreation, relaxation, and neighborly interaction. Parks B and R include permanent play areas with equipment for small children, and in-ground concrete swimming pools with attendant pool houses. Park B features a terrace known as the "stage" having a low wall of stone masonry and a permanent table and bench, which serves as a quiet spot for conversation or a game of chess; a curvilinear stone wall lies at the eastern end of Park B. At the head of Park R, where the grade rises toward the front yards of the rows houses along Randolph Terrace, lies an elaborate terrace with a wall and deck of stone masonry, a long built-in stone bench, and concrete steps with a pebbled surface (this area was designed by Cautley); an original octagonal shelter, designed in the rustic Adirondacks style, stands in the park. Park A, which has no play equipment, is provided with a small replacement wood-frame gazebo near its center, set within an outcropping of bedrock. Tennis courts constructed by the City Housing Corporation are located on the west side of Plaza Road near the Foster Garage complex. Daly Field forms the southwestern boundary of the district; although, originally planned to accommodate industrial use, the site appears to have been used for outdoor recreation since the 1930s. The earliest playing fields were located midway along Plaza Road; these blocks were later sold and developed for multiple family housing and commercial use.

⁸ "Declaration of Restrictions No. 1 Affecting Radburn, Property of City Housing Corporation," March 15, 1929, (The Radburn Association, Radburn, N.J.), 6.

⁹ Information about Radburn's plantings comes from, Marjorie Sewell Cautley, "Planting at Radburn," *Landscape Architecture* 21, no. 1 (October 1930): 23-29. Cautley's professional practice in the 1920s was centered in and around Ridgewood, New Jersey, where she designed the gardens and grounds of suburban homes. A Cornell graduate, she is best known for her work at Radburn and several of Stein's other projects, Sunnyside, Hillside Homes, and the Phipps Apartments.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 9

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Houses designed for Radburn are identifiable by their signature, reverse-front designs. This simply means that the front door faces the interior park rather than the street and that the interior of each house has been arranged so that the living room at the front provides a view of the private yard and park or walkways beyond it. The kitchen and laundry, as well as garage, were located at the rear of the house near the entrance from the cul-de-sac. Houses were built in various sizes, ranging from two to four bedrooms and having a total of six or eight rooms. Typically the single family houses are two story dwellings with a living room, dining room and kitchen on the first floor and bedrooms on the second floor. Some houses are free-standing while others are semi-detached, sharing a common garage wall with an adjoining house. Some of the houses on Burnham Place are interconnected in groups of three. The largest houses with the largest lots are located in Park B; here Tudor Revival style buildings dominate, but there are also Colonial Revival houses. Park A has smaller, more tightly arranged houses, mostly in the Colonial Revival Style. The Tudor Revival houses are primarily of brick with implied half-timbering and steeply pitched roofs. Some are partly wood sided with dark stained or painted lapped weatherboard. Colonial Revival styled dwellings are constructed of brick or frame with weatherboard or clapboard siding; their front (park side) facades generally reflect symmetrical designs with three-bay fenestration and decorative elements, such as elliptical fanlights, pediments, door surrounds, and other millwork typical of early twentieth-century Colonial Revival domestic architecture. While some of the Colonial Revival houses distinctly recall the region's Dutch Colonial origins, others reflect the popular and stylized elements that become associated with Colonial Revival domestic design in the first three decades of the twentieth century. Many of the front entrance porches have been enclosed with screens. Those houses with siding are generally white or "Williamsburg" colors. Several houses have replacement aluminum or vinyl siding. Garages on all houses are attached to the house structure and face the street; although many garage doors have been replaced, the few original ones that have survived indicate that a wide variety of designs were used.

Abbott Court (now Eldorado Village Apartments) lies at the head of Park A, on the corner of High Street and Abbott Court, and consists of two three-story apartment buildings carefully arranged on spacious, irregularly shaped grounds designed with paths, trees and shrubs to form a principal entrance to the interior park as well as provide rental accommodations that, airy and light-filled, were set in a gardenlike environment. The complex was designed by Andrew J. Thomas, a New York architect known for the progressive design of multi-story urban apartment communities offering sunlight, fresh air, and a park-like setting.¹⁰ Irregular in their massing and Tudor Gothic Revival in style, the two buildings are constructed of brick, three and a half stories in height, with steeply pitched slate roofs and a below ground level. They house 93 apartment units and are arranged in an opposing double "L" pattern to form an open courtyard, which can be accessed through central, arched passageways that pierce the ground level of each building. The arched passageways of each building are paved with brick laid in a herringbone pattern; they are reached through arched portals and low steps laid in brick and designed to curve inward toward each side of the portal. A diagonal path that radiates from Radburn's commercial center and railroad station on the west leads through the courtyard and connects with the pedestrian loop in Park A. Although much of the original shrubbery planted along the foundations is gone, the grounds today are shaded by towering sycamores, being native to the streams of northern New Jersey, were part of the original planting plans for the community.

Abbott Court reflects the commitment of Radburn's designers to provide a variety of housing types to

¹⁰ Andrew J. Thomas's most notable projects in the 1920s were the large-scale Metropolitan Life project in Queens and the Paul Lawrence Dunbar Apartments in Harlem, a philanthropic project of the John D. Rockefeller II Foundation. Both projects drew considerable attention in the New York Regional Plan and at the 1931 President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 10

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

meet the needs and incomes of a broad range of prospective residents and demonstrates how multi-story apartment buildings can be designed to reflect garden city principles. A row of brick-faced duplexes and interconnected multiple family groups on Plaza Road, North, also provided rental housing. Designed by Clarence Stein, the multiple family groups were innovative in their interior layout which offered four sets of two-family flats, and exterior elevations that integrated staggered setbacks and varied roof types to avoid the monotony usually associated with row-housing. The dwellings featured a variety of architectural details in the Colonial Revival style, including doorways, windows, and moulded cornices, and were situated to overlook that portion of Plaza Road designed as a parkway with a shrub-lined, grassy median.

The houses forming Radburn's first neighborhood (Parks A and B) were designed through the collaboration of architect-planners Clarence Stein and Henry Wright, architect Frederick Ackerman, and engineer Ralph Eberlin. Ackerman, an RPAA member, was particularly instrumental in the design of the unified groups of detached and semi-detached houses that lined the cul-de-sacs.¹¹ As the Great Depression worsened, Stein and Wright revised the plan for the neighborhood south of Fair Lawn Avenue to accommodate less expensive row house groups. A new style of row housing was introduced for Park R along Randolph and Reading Terraces. Similar in concept to the City Housing Corporation's housing groups at Sunnyside on Long Island, the houses also were influenced by the arrangement of brick-faced row houses in cities such as Philadelphia and Baltimore. Designed by architect James Renwick Thomson, the buildings are three-story Colonial Revival attached row houses built into a sloping terrain with park-like terraces alternating with service courts between each group. The dwellings within each group were designed to face the common green, with the main entrance leading to the house's second level. Another entrance was located on the lowest level of each house leading from the service road and a basement garage.

Rows along Randolph, Reading, Ramapo, and Townley were completed by 1934. Although most Park R rows have brick walls or a combination of wooden shingles and brick, the exterior walls of the houses on Reading Terrace are a combination of wooden shingles and clapboards. The brick rows on the west side of Townley Road echoes the massing and architectural details of the rows of rental units designed by Clarence Stein for Plaza Road North, and are likely to be his design also. The multiple-family rows are constructed in groups of four with generally six to eight units per building in each group and every two units sharing a common entrance porch having either frame or brick piers and a pedimented gable. Bay windows, semi-circular fanlights and panels, wooden shutters, gabled porches, and the occasional garage with forged-iron hinges and latches reflect original architectural details and add to the unified yet varied Colonial Revival design. The row buildings are built into the terraces and an exterior system of brick garden walls, end piers, and steps between each group makes it possible for pedestrians to move from the lower service roads to the upper elevation of the terrace where the gardens, walks, park entrance are located. The design of the exterior stairways harmonizes with the Colonial Revival style of the adjoining houses, and exhibits a high degree of workmanship and design. The brick piers framing each corner or set of stairs are topped with concrete pyramidal caps.

¹¹ Frederick Lee Ackerman (1878-1950) was a well-established New York architect with an extensive knowledge of small house design and garden city planning. He graduated in architecture from Cornell in 1901 and became a partner in the firm of Trowbridge & Ackerman. In 1917 Charles Harris Whitaker of the AIA sponsored Ackerman's study of English garden cities and defense communities. Through this study and his leadership as chief of housing and planning for the U.S. Shipping Board under Robert Kohn, Ackerman influenced World War I emergency housing programs in the United States. His independent small house designs frequented the pages of the *New York Sunday Tribune* in the 1920s and appeared in Henry Atterbury Smith's *Books of a Thousand Homes* (vol. 1). He assisted Stein and Wright in the design of Sunnyside before working at Radburn, and in the 1930s he became a technical consultant for the New York Housing Authority.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 11

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

In keeping with Perry's Neighborhood Unit formula, Radburn's plan called for the integration of commercial, community, and other facilities that directly supported the predominantly residential land use. Most prominent among the facilities constructed in the formative period of construction is the Radburn Plaza Building, a large, multi-story brick commercial building in the Colonial Revival style, fronting on Plaza Road, between Fair Lawn Avenue and High Street. The building wraps around the west end of the block facing Plaza Road North between Fair Lawn Avenue and High Street. Designed by architect Frederick Ackerman, the building is highlighted with cast-stone quoins and decorative horizontal bands, copper gutters and downspouts, and contrasting painted millwork and mouldings. The steeply pitched roof is sheathed with slate and has regularly spaced hip-roofed dormers. A central three-story projecting section of the building has a steep hipped roof topped with a clock tower and cupola. The Plaza Building dominates the townscape and provides a focal point for those approaching Radburn by train from the west or by automobile along Plaza Road North and South and Fair Lawn Avenue. The building contains multiple commercial spaces, each with its own entrance doorway and display windows (appropriating/imitating the scale of a village --) on the first story fronting toward Plaza Road. The principal corners are beveled and designed with attractive Colonial Revival entrances with elliptical fanlights. The treatment of the corners was intended to alleviate the effects of the building's large scale and guide shoppers easily from the front to the shops on the side streets. Radburn's designers included off-street parking along the front of the building, further reflecting the community's role as a "Town for the Motor Age" as well as the emerging national trend for shopping centers designed to accommodate the automobile. Upper stories of the building were originally designed to house the offices and community rooms of the Radburn Association (since moved to the Grange Hall) as well as the community library and meeting hall. These rooms are now leased for office space. A fire in October 2002 destroyed the roof and gutted the upper story of the south wing of the building which extends from the south wall of the central clock tower and wraps around the corner onto Fair Lawn Avenue. The building is currently being rehabilitated according to plans mutually agreed upon by the property owners and the Radburn Association. Due to the structural damage caused by the fire, the structural ironwork and masonry walls of the south wing have been rebuilt. The slate roof, copper gutters and downspouts, and many architectural details have been replicated.¹²

West along Fair Lawn Avenue on the far side of the railroad right of way, lies the Radburn-Fair Lawn Passenger Station (1930). Designed by Clarence Stein, the station was built by the Erie Railroad to replace the wooden rural freight depot that had served the surrounding agricultural region for several decades. Intended to be an efficient, "modern" station, the building was designed in the Dutch Colonial Revival style to harmonize, in scale and character, with the Radburn architecture and to recall the region's colonial heritage. Its compact design has three parts: a central pavilion, having a steeply sloping, overhanging roof and gambrel gables, houses the waiting room and ticket office; a side wing to the south provides restrooms for men and women; and a side wing to the north accommodates the track supervisor's office, a baggage room, and an open porch. The exterior walls are constructed of load-bearing sandstone set upon a foundation of concrete blocks. The roof is constructed of quarried slate, and the gables of the frame roof have clapboard siding. On the interior, fourteen-foot ceilings give the rectangular, 640-square-foot waiting room a sense of spaciousness, while the buff-colored common bond, brick walls, light-colored terrazzo floors, multi-paned windows and doors, and a rock-faced ashlar fireplace at the south end brought warmth and light to the interior. A rock-faced chimney pierces the slate roof at the south end of central pavilion. Off the waiting room are separate restrooms for men and women (each consisting of a lounge and toilet and having tan terrazzo floors, buff-colored brick walls, marble partitions, wood molded surrounds, and cast-iron radiators. A ticket office in the form of a

¹² Information about the October 2002 fire and subsequent rehabilitation was provided in a telephone interview with Louise Orlando, Radburn Association, 7 June 2004.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 12

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

projecting wooden bay faces the train platforms and tracks. The train station was listed on the National Register in 1984, and an interpretive plaque on the wall of the waiting room recalls its association with the planned community of Radburn and architect Clarence Stein. Historically the station was located on the Erie Railroad's Bergen Cut-off and provided service between Suffern and Hoboken. Rehabilitation work in the 1980s replaced the clapboard siding in the gable ends and returned the woodwork and other painted surfaces to white in keeping with its Colonial Revival style. The outbound and inbound platforms are surfaced with asphalt and flanked by macadam paths that provide access to commuters on foot. A narrow landscaped corridor extends south of the station building alongside the train platform and path and connects the station and Fair Lawn Ave; today containing shade trees, a grassy lawn, and benches today, this area originally served as the automobile entrance and was planted with shade trees. The area immediately west of the building has recently been improved with a concrete entrance and curb and historical lighting (approximating the original incandescent lights). Although parking has always been integral to the station's design and purpose, the parking lot has been expanded and reconfigured and is not included in the NHL boundary.¹³

The Art Deco Bell Telephone Building, built about 1930, at 2702 Fair Lawn Avenue provided telephone service for the community and continues to operate in that capacity today. Fronting on the south side of Fair Lawn Avenue, the brick building is distinctive in its Art Deco design, with vertical three light window sash and bands of vertical brick corbelling. It represents the designs for public service buildings deemed suitable for the business center of a residential neighborhood by the New York Regional Plan and were being designed for various locations in the metropolitan region by the architectural firm, Voorhees, Gmelin and Walker. A later addition to the building follows the original brick design and does not detract from its original appearance.

The Grange Hall (1909) located at 2920 Fair Lawn Avenue today serves as a community center and houses the library and offices of the Radburn Association. It is a two-story, three-bay gable front frame building set on a cobblestone foundation. Although its original construction predates the Radburn Plan, the Grange Hall, built in 1909 as a cooperative for local farmers, was adapted for use as a community gymnasium when Radburn was built. Since 1953, it has housed the Radburn Association office and community center. A two-story stucco addition from a later period, houses a new gymnasium.

At the eastern edge of Park B lies Radburn Elementary School. Representing the key element used in the Radburn Plan (and in Perry's Neighborhood Unit formula) to define neighborhood size, the school was originally built to serve the children who lived in Parks A and B. Designed by James O. Betelle of the Newark architectural firm, Guilbert & Betelle, well-known for school design, the building was constructed by the borough of Fair Lawn on land donated by the City Housing Corporation. The multi-story building is of brick construction with cast stone detailing and reflects the Classical Revival style and an institutional character typical of American school construction in the 1920s and 30s. Semi-circular fanlights above the door entrances are representative of the school's rich architectural details. Although the original town plan called for the development of three complete neighborhoods, each

¹³ The description of the passenger station comes from several sources, including Richard Meyer, Radburn-Fair Lawn Station, National Register of Historic Places Inventory Form, 22 June 1984, in "Operating Passenger Railroad Stations in New Jersey TR;" and information provided by Louise Orlando of the Radburn Association in October 2004, and Radburn residents Felice and Laurence Koplik in correspondence to the National Historic Landmarks Survey, 12 September 2004. The "Plan of Development Completed by 1930" (Stein, fig. 26, p. 49) indicates that the block between the passenger station and the Radburn Plaza Building to the east, was originally intended to be open parkland affording commuters a broad sweeping view of the new community from the train platform and forming a western terminus to the Radburn civic center, which envisioned by the town's planners was never fully realized. This block was later sold and developed for commercial purposes, including a grocery store with a large parking area, and is therefore excluded from the NHL boundary.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 13

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

having its own elementary school and sharing a high school, the Radburn Elementary School was the only school constructed within the original Radburn town plan. It still functions as a neighborhood elementary school.

Brick is the predominant building material used throughout Radburn during the early years of construction. Many of Radburn's homes are faced with brick, sometimes in combination with clapboards, shingles, or weatherboards. Brick, load-bearing walls make up the structural system of the Radburn Plaza Building, Abbott Court Apartments, and the Radburn Elementary School. The Radburn Brick and Supply Company, a brick manufactory, was located between Plaza Road, South, and the railroad right-of-way. Photographs and plans from the 1930s indicate that it was in active production during the early stages of Radburn's development, and, although not verified by documentary evidence, it is believed to have supplied the building materials for the Radburn buildings. The company building was demolished in the 1980s, but the industrial site remains undisturbed, retaining the potential to provide important information about building materials and construction methods used at Radburn and elsewhere in suburban New Jersey.

A substantial number of homes and other buildings were built at Radburn after 1934, the closing date of the period of national significance recognized by the National Historic Landmark. Classified as "noncontributing," they consist of single family dwellings, several low-rise apartment complexes (some now condominiums), and commercial buildings, and are included in the boundaries because they lie within that portion of the Radburn Plan that was laid out during the years between 1928 and 1934. Of the original six superblocs envisioned in 1928, only Park A and Park B were substantially completed. Although the perimeter streets for Park R were laid out, only a portion of the superblock was built according to the Radburn Idea. As a result, many noncontributing houses fill lots within the original layout of streets that had not yet been developed when the City Housing Corporation went bankrupt in 1934 and the Radburn Idea was abandoned. Several dozen single-family frame dwellings, reflecting a mix of two-story Colonial Revival and one-and-one-half-story Cape Cod houses with an occasional bungalow, were built in the late 1930s and early 1940s on Addison Terrace and Andover Terrace in Park A and on the streets bounding Park R to the south, east, and west (Rampo, Ramsey, Rutgers, Sandford, and Townley, west side). Along Plaza Road, South, are a series of c. 1940 Bungalows and FHA-influenced, c. 1940s-1950s brick Cape Cods. The postwar houses built along Radburn Road, Alden Terrace, and Fair Lawn Avenue are primarily c. 1955 frame, split-level single-family dwellings, intermixed with houses in the Ranch, late Colonial Revival, and contemporary styles.

Low-rise apartment and condominium buildings fill the blocks along High Street, Fair Lawn Avenue, and Warren Road and the block originally set aside for playing fields north of the Plaza Building and west of Abbott Court. These buildings appear in the 1955 aerial photograph of Radburn (attached) and were constructed in the late 1940s. These are primarily utilitarian brick two-story garden apartment buildings with minimal Colonial Revival detailing. Several clusters of garden apartments in the vicinity of Warren Road and Fair Lawn Avenue were developed in the late 1940s by Gustave Ring, one of the nation's most successful operative builders to capitalize on FHA-insured loans for large-scale rental housing in the 1930s and 1940s. Designed in the Georgian Revival style and arranged in courts with landscaped grounds, they blend well with the Radburn landscape, some even occupying land originally intended for garden-type apartments. Because they were constructed after the period of national significance, they are classified as noncontributing buildings.¹⁴ On the west side of Plaza Road, the

¹⁴ Paradoxically they represent a later generation of FHA-approved rental housing directly influenced by the RPAA projects at Radburn and Chatham Village; for this reason they would be considered "contributing" to the local and statewide significance of the Radburn National Register district.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 14

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Foster Garage Complex was originally built as a complex of one-story brick garages for Radburn residents not having built-in garages; it has recently been remodeled into a 10-unit two-story condominium and is now classified as a noncontributing building. Several noncontributing commercial shopping strips along Fair Lawn Avenue and the Post Office building date from c. 1940 to the 1960s. They are typical one-story brick and metal buildings, with plate glass storefronts. A two-story, beige brick office building, c. 1980, is also located on Fair Lawn Avenue. The Methodist Church, located at the intersection of High Street and Craig Road, was constructed in 1948 (date on cornerstone) and therefore is classified as noncontributing. It is a brick Gothic Revival church building and is adjoined by a c. 1960s two-story brick parish hall. Associated with the church property is a two-story frame Late Victorian farmhouse, c. 1900, currently used as the parsonage. Although remarkably intact, a c. 1790 Dutch vernacular stone and frame farmhouse, located on Fair Lawn Avenue behind the Plaza Building, is classified as noncontributing because, although present on the site, it was not incorporated into the Radburn Plan.

The formal count recognizes 320 resources as “contributing” and 188 as “noncontributing.” The count includes the 153-acre landscape that makes up the Radburn National Historic Landmark as one contributing site. Single family homes--detached, semi-detached, and interconnected to form rows--make up the majority of Radburn’s 314 contributing buildings; the count also includes several multiple-family dwellings, commercial buildings, the railroad station, a former grange hall, and two pool houses. The stone and concrete underpass below Howard Avenue, the tennis courts on Plaza Road, North, and the swimming pools in Park B and Park R are included as four contributing structures. The industrial site once housing the Radburn Brick and Supply Co. is included as a contributing site.

The 153-acre site represents the Radburn town plan and corresponds to that portion of Stein and Wright’s original Radburn Plan as laid out between 1928 and 1934, the year when the RPAA-influenced City Housing Corporation went bankrupt and development according to the Radburn Idea was abandoned. Defined by perimeter roads, the site encompasses the hierarchy of roads that form the vehicular circulation network, the two fully laid out and nearly completed superblocks forming Parks A and B, that portion of Park R laid out according to Wright and Stein’s plans, and adjacent associated blocks that form the approaches along North and South Plaza Road and Fair Lawn avenue. Many of the component elements that formed the Radburn town plan in its early years remain intact and add to the community’s significance as a planned community and an historic designed landscape; these include the interior parks, house lots with service areas and gardens, the pedestrian circulation network, and small-scale elements such as vegetation, paths, gazebos, stone steps, benches, and walls. These features are all considered important historic elements of the Radburn National Historic Landmark and collectively contribute to its historic significance and integrity.

Within the National Historic Landmark boundaries, the few buildings and structures dating from before the construction of Radburn in 1928 are considered “noncontributing” unless like the Grange, they were incorporated into the community plan. Buildings constructed after 1934, when construction according to the Radburn Idea ceased, are also considered “noncontributing.” Roads and blocks laid out by the City Housing Corporation remained in place and new construction took place on the remaining unbuilt lots. Unlike the “reverse-front” design of the original Radburn houses, the houses built after 1934 are single-family, detached modest one and two-story houses designed to be centered on their lot facing the street; they reflect popular house types of the 1930s and 1940s that qualified for FHA mortgage insurance. In addition some infill has occurred along perimeter roads and in what was originally intended as a small park between Brearly Crescent in Park B and Howard Avenue. Later construction consisted of ca. 1950 to 1960 split-level and two-story Colonial Revival houses.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 15

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Although the number of noncontributing resources appears high, the Radburn Plan represented as a single contributing site remains intact and its component parts -- interior parks, pedestrian walkways, housing clusters, and thoroughfares -- retain a high degree of integrity throughout. It forms a clearly distinguishable entity that represents the ideals of the RPAA, the plans of Radburn's many designers, and the innovative and influential methods of large-scale residential development and neighborhood unit planning practiced by the City Housing Corporation. Later additions reflect similar land uses, scale, materials, and park-like setting and for this reason they do not detract significantly from the overall integrity of Radburn's historic design, materials, setting, feeling, and association, which is best experienced from the interior of each superblock and the pedestrian pathways, and short private cul-de-sacs. In addition, the community reflects a high degree of integrity in the shrubs and trees that were planted under the supervision of landscape architect Marjorie Sewell Cautley.

The count for contributing and noncontributing buildings by general type and location is described below. Unless otherwise indicated, resources are classified as "contributing." Most of the single-family dwellings classified as contributing form housing groups laid out according to the Radburn Idea; they may be detached or semi-detached. Apartment houses, duplexes, and rows of interconnected dwellings are described as "multiple-family dwellings." A more detailed inventory is found in Appendix A.

Park B

Radburn Road: 8 noncontributing 1950s split-level infill; Barry Place: 13 Colonial Revivals; Ballard Place: 15 Tudor Revivals and 1 Colonial Revival; Bristol Place: 13 Tudor Revivals, 1 Colonial Revival; Bedford Place: 15 Colonial Revivals and Tudor Revivals; Beckman Place: 17 Colonial Revivals; Bolton Place: 20 Colonial Revivals; Burnham Place, 18 Colonial Revivals; Brighton Place: 16 Colonial Revivals; Brearly Crescent: 10 Colonial Revivals, 3 noncontributing 1940s-1960s infill; Burlington Place: 15 Colonial Revivals; Bancroft Place: 20 Colonial Revivals; Berkeley Place, 17 Colonial Revivals; 300-315 Plaza Road, North: 7 Colonial Revivals; Radburn Elementary School; one swimming pool (structure) and one pool house.

West side of Plaza Road, North

5 Colonial Revival duplexes, 2 Colonial Revival multiple-family attached dwellings, one noncontributing condominium building (formerly the Foster Garages); tennis courts (one contributing structure).

Park A:

Howard Ave, one pedestrian underpass (structure), 2 noncontributing 1950s split-levels; Allen Place: 16 Colonial Revivals; Aberdeen Place: 20 Colonial Revivals; Arlington Place: 15 Colonial Revivals; Ashburn Place: 10 Colonial Revivals; Abbott Court (later called Eldorado Village Apartments): 2 Tudor Gothic Revival multiple-family dwellings; Audubon Place: 10 Colonial Revivals; Addison Place: 12 noncontributing late 1930s Colonial Revivals; Andover Place: 13 noncontributing late 1930s Colonial Revivals; Alden Terrace: 30 noncontributing 1950s split-levels; Radburn Road: 18 noncontributing 1950s split-levels; Block bordered by High St./Plaza Rd. North/Howard Ave./Abbott Rd.: 2 noncontributing c.1950 apartment/condominium buildings, 3 noncontributing duplexes.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 16

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Fair Lawn Avenue, north side

Radburn-Fair Lawn Passenger Station: one contributing Dutch-Colonial Revival building; Radburn Plaza Building: one contributing Colonial Revival commercial block; one noncontributing 1960s Post Office building; 2 noncontributing 1940s multiple-unit shopping strips; one noncontributing c. 1790 Dutch-Colonial farmhouse; 6 noncontributing c. 1950 condominium buildings; one noncontributing 1980s commercial building; one noncontributing c. 1900 farmhouse; one noncontributing 1948 church building; one noncontributing 1960s parish house; 16 noncontributing 1950s-60s split-level and ranch houses; one noncontributing 1980s Colonial Revival; one noncontributing 1970s contemporary house.

Fair Lawn Avenue, south side

One noncontributing 1960s shopping center; 8 noncontributing c. 1950 apartment/condominium buildings; one c. 1930 Art Deco commercial building (telephone company); one community building (formerly the Grange Hall).

Park R

Randolph Terrace: 8 multiple-family attached dwellings; Reading Terrace: 8 multiple-family attached dwellings; Townley Road: 3 multiple-family attached dwellings, 9 noncontributing c. 1940 Colonial Revivals; Ramapo Terrace: 6 Colonial Revivals (pairs attached by garage), 10 noncontributing Cape Cods; Ramsey Terrace (north side): 9 noncontributing c. 1940 Colonial Revivals; Ryder/Rutgers Road: 11 noncontributing 1940s Colonial Revivals; Sandford Road: 4 Colonial Revivals (reverse-front), 5 noncontributing 1940s Colonial Revivals; one swimming pool (structure), one pool house.

West side of Plaza Road, South

Five noncontributing 1940s/1950s Cape Cods, 6 noncontributing c. 1940 Bungalows, one contributing industrial site.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 17

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties:
 Nationally: X Statewide: Locally:

Applicable National

Register Criteria: A X B C X D

Criteria Considerations

(Exceptions): A B C D E F G

NHL Criteria:

Criteria 1 and 4

NHL Theme(s):

Peopling Places

4. community and neighborhood

Expressing Cultural Values

5. architecture, landscape architecture, and urban design

Areas of Significance:

Social History

Politics and Government

Community Planning and Development

Landscape Architecture

Architecture

Period(s) of Significance:

1928-1934

Significant Dates:

1928, 1934

Significant Person(s):

N/A

Cultural Affiliation:

N/A

Architect/Builder:

Stein, Clarence S.; Wright, Henry; Ackerman, Frederick L.; Cautley, Marjorie Sewell; Eberlin, Ralph; Thomas, Andrew J.; Thomson, James Renwick; and The City Housing Corporation – builder.

Historic Contexts:

XVI. Architecture

M. Period Revivals (1870-1940)

3. Tudor (1890-1940)

T. Moderne-Art Deco (1920-1945)

V. Historic District

W. Regional and Urban Planning

2. Suburban Areas

XVII. Landscape Architecture

State Significance of Property, and Justify Criteria, Criteria Considerations, and Areas and Periods of Significance Noted Above.

Summary and Introduction

Designed as “The Town for the Motor Age” for the City Housing Corporation, the community of Radburn, New Jersey, begun in 1928, is significant under National Historic Landmark Criterion 1 as the origin of the internationally acclaimed model of community design known as the “Radburn Idea.” It is also associated with efforts of the Regional Planning Association of America (RPAA) to promote social reform and improvement in housing for Americans of moderate income derived from the principles of English Garden City planning. Radburn is also significant under Criterion 1 for its demonstration of the Neighborhood Unit formula, a concept in community planning that was overwhelmingly endorsed by the President’s Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership in 1931, directly affected national housing policy during the Great Depression, and had far-reaching influence on suburbanization in the United States. Radburn is also significant under National Historic Landmark Criterion 4 (Architectural Distinction) as a distinctive and exceptional example of garden city planning applied to the needs and conditions of metropolitan growth in the United States, including the increasing presence of the mass-produced automobile in American daily life. The carefully orchestrated, multi-faceted design and distinctive community plan make Radburn an outstanding example of American suburban design planning – one that continues to influence community design nationally and internationally. Radburn is also significant under Criterion 4 as the most innovative and influential project to result from the highly creative, ten-year collaboration of planner-architects Clarence S. Stein and Henry Wright, leading members of the RPAA. Innovations in subdivision design introduced at Radburn include superblock planning, the accommodation of the automobile through a hierarchical system of roads from perimeter roads to short cul-de-sacs, interplay of spacious interior parks and private gardens, reverse-front house design, separate system of pedestrian paths, and inclusion of recreational facilities and a shopping plaza. Radburn’s significance under Criteria 1 and 4 relates to the National Historic Landmark themes Peopling Places and Expressing Cultural Values.

The Radburn Idea, with its hierarchy of roads and pedestrian pathways, dealt directly and successfully with automobile safety issues of congestion and pedestrian deaths and provided a model for economical large-scale development and collaborative planning. Built during a time of rapid technological change, the “reverse-front” design of the Colonial Revival and Tudor Revival style houses, facing the open greens or pedestrian walkways, evoked the comfort of the traditional early American village. With their careful arrangement of dwellings and overall landscape design, the superblocks provided the healthy environment thought to be necessary for modern living. Rapidly expanding automobile ownership ensured the success of the Radburn experiment; located miles from New York City, the community effectively attracted moderate-income residents whose employment was in the city. The superblock design, central to the Radburn Idea, produced cost-savings in reduced infrastructure investment, which held the housing costs at an affordable level while providing a park setting previously thought to be too costly for moderate-income working families. Taken together, the distinctive elements that identified Radburn as innovative produced the embodiment of the ideal suburban development.

The Radburn Idea had substantial impact on the development of city and suburban planning in the United States and directly influenced the design of several private and philanthropic large-scale housing communities in the early 1930s, the three Greenbelt towns of the New Deal, the Norris town plan by the Tennessee Valley Authority, numerous FHA-insured large-scale rental communities of the 1930 to 1950s, and new towns of the 1960s. These planned communities include Chatham Village in Pittsburgh, and two previously designated

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 19

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

NHLs, Greenbelt and Baldwin Hills Village.¹⁵ Radburn's distinctive design included the neighborhood unit, superblocks with interior parks, cul-de-sacs, and the complete separation of automobile and pedestrian traffic. The Great Depression of the 1930s, which made the fulfillment of the complete Radburn design impossible, also enabled the use of the Radburn Idea in the Federal government's three greenbelt towns begun in 1935. Constructed specifically to provide quality housing for low-income displaced workers, the greenbelt town designs drew heavily on Stein and Wright's plan for Radburn and the design philosophy of the RPAA. Some of Radburn's design elements, used in combination with the cost-analysis developed by its designers impacted the Federal Housing Administration design guidelines for moderate-income neighborhoods of the 1930s, 40s, and 50s. As metropolitan expansion continued at an astonishing rate after World War II, regional planning through Radburn-influenced "new town" development was revived in the 1960s and influenced the town plans for Reston in Virginia, Columbia in Maryland, and other "new towns" in the United States. Internationally, the Radburn Idea influenced the design of New Earswick and Wythenshawe in the United Kingdom, Vallingby in Sweden, Chandigarh in India, and Kitimat in British Columbia.

Radburn was immediately recognized for its demonstration of Neighborhood Unit planning and its innovative methods of large-scale community development. The Neighborhood Unit idea was formulated by Clarence A. Perry of the Russell Sage Foundation and described in detail in *Neighborhood and Community Planning* (1929), the seventh volume of the *Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs*, as a solution for the expansion and suburbanization of metropolitan New York. Two years later, the concept was overwhelmingly endorsed at the 1931 President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, which had monumental influence on housing policy and suburban development in the United States. Radburn exemplified the ideal neighborhood unit through the variety of moderate-priced homes, the physical beauty and spaciousness of its interior parks, a hierarchy of automobile roads and separate circulation network for pedestrians, and community amenities such as a neighborhood school, shopping plaza, and recreational facilities. Gaining considerable attention at the 1931 housing conference, Radburn established an ideal for community planning and influenced the thinking of planning professionals, designers, and public officials nationwide. The concept of neighborhood planning guided the design of "greenbelt" and other communities by the Resettlement Administration as well as influenced the design policies of other federal agencies during the 1930s, including the Public Works Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, and United States Housing Authority. Most far reaching and extensive, however, was the influence of Neighborhood Unit concept on the standards issued by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) for the design of residential neighborhoods, which were used by private builders and developers nationwide to qualify their projects for FHA-insured builders' loans as well as enable home buyers to secure FHA-insured mortgages, under the financing and mortgage reforms established by the Federal Home Loan Board Act of 1932 and the National Housing Act of 1934.¹⁶ To government officials concerned with stimulating the home building industry and bringing long-term stability to the real estate market during the Great Depression, the Neighborhood Unit concept promised not only attractive, livable communities for families in a variety of socio-economic groups, but also sound, reasonable returns for developers and private investors. In tandem with the financial reforms of the nation's home mortgage system in the decade preceding World War II, the Neighborhood Unit concept and with it the example of Radburn, profoundly affected American attitudes about home ownership and neighborhood planning, setting the stage for the massive suburbanization of the United States that occurred in the postwar period.

¹⁵ Chatham Village, Pittsburgh, a philanthropic project of the Buhl Foundation for which Stein and Wright served as planning consultants beginning in 1929, is concurrently being considered for NHL designation. Two other projects for which Stein served as a technical consultant have been designated National Historic Landmarks: Greenbelt, Maryland, one of the three New Deal greenbelt towns constructed under the Resettlement Administration, and Baldwin Hills Village, Los Angeles, a privately financed large-scale community of apartments and homes.

¹⁶ 47 Stat. 725; 48 Stat. 1246.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 20

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Integrity

Today Radburn retains a high degree of integrity in location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. To the extent it was completed by 1934, the historic plan remains intact and, with few exceptions, the buildings and land areas developed in the period 1928 to 1934 remain in their original use. Integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling and association extends throughout and is reflected in the layout of housing groups on the cul-de-sacs, the circulation network with separate systems for automobile roads and pedestrian paths, plantings of native trees and shrubs, interior parks with open lawns and recreational facilities. It also extends to areas having specialized functions such as the Abbott Court apartments (now Eldorado Village Apartments), the Radburn Plaza Building,¹⁷ and the rowhouse groups on Plaza Road, North, with its park-like grassy median. The hierarchy of roads that defined the historic plan remains in place and continues to function as originally intended. To include as much of the original plan and road system, a number of buildings built after the period of significance (1928-1934) have been included within the boundaries of the historic district but are classified as noncontributing resources.

Particularly important to Radburn's historic integrity are the superblocks with cul-de-sacs of clustered homes and interior parks; these maintain their original spatial organization and function according to the original design, successfully separating pedestrian traffic from the vehicular traffic and providing open space and recreational facilities. Houses associated with the original construction period of Radburn, 1928 to 1934, reflect their unique "reverse-front" plan and without exception retain their historic character, despite minor changes such as the loss of original porch railings, or the replacement of siding or garage doors. Architectural and open space restrictions have been in place since 1929, protecting the Radburn design from intrusions such as high fences and major additions to the buildings. Some residents have applied aluminum or vinyl siding to their frame houses, but this does not impact the community's overall integrity and for the most part is in keeping with the original house designs. The original landscape design is intact and many details such as paths, stone walls, rock gardens, and plantings remain as well. Native deciduous trees have matured and provide shade and beauty in the parks, and hedges and shrubs provide privacy for the houses and enclose carefully tended private gardens. Although some species have been lost and others added in the intervening years, Cautley's intent that the native plants of New Jersey dominate the design of parks, cul-de-sacs, and pedestrian pathways remains visible. Walking through the interior parks of Radburn, one experiences the original vision intended by Stein and Wright for a neighborhood untrammelled by roads and automobiles and unified by harmonious groupings of garden homes, a naturalistic park setting, and community facilities. The feeling of an early American village with narrow, tree-shaded paths and views of distant meadows prevails. The community continues to operate as a neighborhood unit. The Radburn Association has administered restrictions, maintained the commonly owned property, and managed the recreational facilities since its creation in 1929. Residents are involved in community organizations and activities, and Radburn children still attend the elementary school.

The setting of the land surrounding Radburn has changed significantly since its construction in 1928, former farms and fields having given way in the post-World-War-II period to residential subdivisions. Some encroachment extends into Radburn in the form of more recent suburban homes, apartment and condominium complexes, and commercial strips. Seen from the air, the adjoining developments contrast markedly, illustrating the difference between their standardized tract-house concept and the innovative

¹⁷ The upper story and roof of the southern wing of the Radburn Plaza Building, at the community's commercial center, were gutted by fire in October 2002; the building has undergone rehabilitation and continues to contribute to the district's significance.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 21

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

social-minded plan of Radburn. Several blocks within the Radburn street plan were sold and developed after the bankruptcy of the City Housing Corporation in 1934. Houses and apartment buildings constructed on these blocks, dating from the 1940s-1960s primarily, are not considered contributing to the historic significance of Radburn. Lacking the signature “reverse-front” orientation characteristic of historic Radburn buildings, later noncontributing buildings in Radburn are easily recognizable. However, the streets on which these later buildings are located are considered significant elements of the historic town plan and are therefore included within the NHL boundaries of Radburn.

Peopling Places: Community and Neighborhood

The planned community of Radburn was a demonstration of the community planning theories of the members of the Regional Planning Association of America developed in the 1920s in response to the growing national problems of insufficient low and middle-income housing and the unplanned growth of cities. Although housing reforms associated with the Progressive movement had effectively improved basic housing needs through building codes and zoning, the additional construction costs associated with these improvements made low-income housing unprofitable for the commercial building industry. Through the same period, a growing middle class sought escape from the deepening squalor associated with the slums and industrial concentrations of the cities. The speculative real estate market was rapidly developing the edges of already over-crowded cities with monotonous grid-iron rows of tightly packed houses, an equally unappealing solution for housing moderate income working families.

The product of two of America’s most forward-looking town-planners, Henry Wright and Clarence Stein, Radburn was central to the nation’s recognition of the value of comprehensive planning and subdivision regulation and the adoption of planning principles and practices that would have monumental and far-reaching influence on suburbanization in the twentieth century. Foremost was the shaping of a model for neighborhood planning that integrated a variety of housing types, schools, parks and playgrounds, a shopping center, and community facilities. Second was the demonstration of practices of real estate development that encompassed the idea of a master plan, of large-scale operations, of interdisciplinary collaboration in design as well as the overall development process from financing to long-term protections (deed restrictions). This came at the end of a decade of progress in the design of comfortable, small homes and in the search for solutions for neighborhood planning by professional groups of planners, architects, and landscape architects; real estate developers and community builders; and community-based Better Homes organizations. By the 1920s the use of professional designers, building standards, planning controls, and deed restrictions, became widespread for upper middle income suburbs modeled after developer Edward Bouton’s Roland Park or J.C. Nichols’s “country club” suburbs. Apart from the successful communities built during World War I through the short-lived Emergency Fleet Corporation and the United States Housing Corporation, few lower and moderate-income neighborhoods attained the “garden” ideal or the park-like setting of more expensive neighborhoods. For models, the RPAA and supporters of the Russell Sage Foundation-sponsored New York Regional Plan, including planner Thomas Adams, looked to the English garden cities of Raymond Unwin and Howard Parker and the American garden-city influenced examples including Forest Hills Garden on Long Island, Mariemont near Cincinnati, and World War I-era communities such as Yorkship in Camden, New Jersey, and Seaside Village in Bridgeport, Connecticut. The Radburn town plan combined many of the design and community-building ideas associated with the Garden City movement in England with cost-saving innovations aimed at producing a healthy and desirable community environment for middle income American families.

Located 12 miles from New York City, Radburn was designed to illustrate the feasibility of regional satellite towns, which would be self-supporting with decentralized industries and would ease the

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 22

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

congestion and growth of the cities. Radburn built upon the RPAA's experience and success in designing Sunnyside on Long Island, a community in which rowhouses were interconnected and grouped to form pleasing entry courts and a central interior green with private gardens and common recreational facilities. Following the Neighborhood Unit formula developed by Clarence Perry (*Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs*, 1929), the Radburn Plan was organized in three neighborhood units, each neighborhood designed to house up to 10,000 people, to reflect a carefully planned hierarchy of roads, and to have its own elementary school, centrally-located parks, and recreational facilities. A commercial center, designed to serve the entire community, would be located outside the neighborhoods near major arterial roads. Of foremost interest were the solutions the Radburn Plan offered for accommodating the automobile, which, increasingly present in American life posed serious issues for planning residential areas. Radburn's designers offered an innovative approach to the problem by providing a hierarchy of roads, service courts with garages, and off-street parking for shoppers, while at the same time ensuring pedestrian safety, maintaining the tranquility of suburban living, and reducing construction costs.

The Great Depression of the 1930s forced the end of the Radburn experiment and the full town plan never reached completion. The Radburn Idea, however, had a lasting influence on American community and neighborhood design, most tangibly on the Resettlement Administration's 'greenbelt' towns and New Towns of the 1960s. Furthermore, as a demonstration of both the efficiencies and economies of large-scale planning and the Neighborhood Unit formula, two concepts examined and overwhelmingly endorsed by the 1931 President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, Radburn would have far-reaching influence on the construction practices and the standards for neighborhood design established in the mid-1930s by the new Federal Housing Administration (FHA) for the approval of FHA-insured mortgages.

Expressing Cultural Values: The Automobile, Architecture, Landscape Architecture and Subdivision Design

The Radburn town plan was designed to respond to the needs and values of the growing and broadening middle class of the 1920s in the United States. Rising construction costs following World War I accelerated the already deepening crises of affordable housing stock. Speculative subdivisions, aimed at producing the most profit on the least amount of land, were increasingly monotonous. The tightly packed houses provided only the minimum of amenities considered necessary for quality of life, sunlight, fresh air, open space, and accommodation for, and safety from, the automobile.

Described as the "Town for the Motor Age," Radburn was designed specifically to accommodate increasing automobile ownership and use, while at the same time maintain suburban values for safe, quiet, and convenient neighborhoods. The hierarchy of roads, cul-de-sacs and pedestrian paths not only separated the auto from the pedestrian, but they were designed to slow the driver down. Service lanes provided automobile access to the garages that were built into the design of each home. The central parks and paths provided play spaces free of traffic, and provided pedestrian access to the school and commercial center. Additionally, the landscaped parks were designed to provide sunlight, fresh air, and a garden-like setting for the surrounding houses.

Radburn houses were designed to reflect the prevailing stylistic trends in architect-designed dwellings, while maintaining lower construction costs. The Colonial Revival and Tudor Revival architectural styles of the small single and multi-family dwellings were not elaborate but were sufficiently elegant to imply some level of status. Equally important, a variety of house designs were interspersed and simple

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 23

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

variations incorporated in building materials, architectural details, and massing to avoid the repetitive monotony common in large-scale home building operations. The signature “reverse-front” design of the Radburn houses turned the front of the house toward the interior park away from the hustle, dirt and danger of traffic. The service (kitchen) side, or rear of the house which incorporated a garage, then faced the street.

Radburn successfully included all of those elements considered necessary by the emerging middle class – the open space with light and air, safety, automobile accommodation, park-like setting and recreational facilities, and modern kitchens, but most importantly, Radburn was successful in incorporating these amenities while maintaining costs at a level affordable for the working families yearning to escape the city. Through exhaustive cost-analysis of large-scale construction including land purchase, building design and construction cost, and infrastructure placement, the designers Clarence Stein and Henry Wright were able to realize construction savings that allowed for the desired amenities without the necessity of raising prices.

The Radburn Idea continues to represent an expression of the American cultural value placed on open space and garden living for middle class families. Elements of the Radburn Plan, such as cul-de-sacs, community parks, and large-scale methods of design and construction, would influence the Federal Housing Administration’s small house and neighborhood standards beginning in the mid-1930s.

Historic Context

The historic significance of the Radburn community lies in the growth of American cities, the expansion of the middle class, and the evolution of suburban development beginning in the mid-nineteenth century and continuing through the first half of the twentieth century. The housing needs for upper income families in the suburbs had long been met through the principles of naturalistic landscape gardening and rural architecture espoused in the writings of Andrew Jackson Downing and the “progressive” designs of men such as Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr., and Calvert Vaux. A housing crisis for low to middle income families, however, came to a head following WWI. Rising construction costs after the war made low-cost housing unprofitable for the established residential building industry.¹⁸ Experiments with community building by federal government agencies during the war, as well as the successful “New Towns” and “Garden Cities” developed in Europe and Great Britain, laid the groundwork for solutions to the post-war housing crises. A generation of architects, landscape architects, city planners, and engineers were influenced by the designs of Olmsted and Vaux, the community vision of Ebenezer Howard’s Garden City model, and the evolving planning theories of the early 20th century. The resulting work of these men and women, considered by many to be most completely represented in the town plan of Radburn, influenced city planning and suburban design in the United States and the world throughout the twentieth century.

In the United States, the migration of the upper class to designed subdivisions beyond city limits began in the second half of the nineteenth century. Specifically designed for wealthy families, these early developments often employed the curvilinear street pattern, community parks, and building restrictions found in many modern subdivisions.¹⁹ Significant projects from this period include Olmsted and Vaux’s

¹⁸ Roy Lubove, *Community Planning in the 1920’s: The Contribution of the Regional Planning Association of America* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963), 17-18. This book provides a detailed discussion of the factors which influenced the regional and community planning ideas of the RPAA.

¹⁹ Donald A. Krueckeberg, ed., *Introduction to Planning History in the United States* (New Brunswick, NJ: The

Riverside, Illinois (1869) and Llewellyn Haskell's Llewellyn Park, New Jersey (1857).

Throughout the late nineteenth century, as suburban design for the wealthy focused on large lots and healthy surroundings, working class housing suffered the degradations of the speculative market. In the United States, government action to ensure 'healthy' housing for the poor was limited to restrictive building codes that tended to increase building costs. While these measures improved building construction they did little to improve the environment in which lower-income families lived.²⁰

In Europe and Great Britain a more active government approach to meeting low-income housing needs was developing, described as "constructive" rather than "restrictive" legislation, "including public housing, municipal land purchase, low-interest loans to individuals and limited-dividend companies, and tax exemptions..."²¹ Planners were influenced by the writings of Camillo Sitte of Austria (1889) and Ebenezer Howard in Great Britain (1898). Howard's social reform plan, laid out in *To-morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* (republished in 1902 as *Garden Cities of Tomorrow*), envisioned the establishment of planned satellite cities surrounded by an agricultural greenbelt. Known as Garden Cities, they would be community-owned (non-speculative), provide employment for a diverse population, and be limited in size. Such cities would create a 'new' (traditional) sense of community through planning. Construction of several new towns based on Howard's community-building theory began quickly. Designed by Raymond Unwin and Barry Parker, the English garden cities of Letchworth (1902), Hampstead Gardens (1905), and later Welwyn (1919) had a lasting impact on city planning both in Great Britain and the United States. In addition to the use of Howard's concept of a self-contained satellite town, Unwin and Parker established the practices of subdividing land into superblocks and grouping houses with a unified architectural style on cul-de-sacs that provided privacy from the busier main streets.²²

The influence of the English Garden City movement in the United States was more sporadic. Unwin's 1909 publication *Town Planning in Practice*, which explained much of his planning and design theory through the example of his Garden Cities served as a resource for American planners, architects, and landscape architects. New communities reflecting the influence of English garden cities included Forest Hills Gardens (1909-1911), New York, a philanthropic project of the Russell Sage Foundation to provide model housing for low-income families, which was planned by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., and Kingsport (1915) in Tennessee and Mariemont (1923) in Ohio, both planned by John Nolen.²³ The majority of working-class subdivisions built during this period, however, was based on speculative profit and continued the sprawling expansion of the cities where industrial employment was centered, with rows of identical, closely spaced bungalows and duplexes built on narrow lots within a rectangular grid of cross-streets.

Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, 1983), 28-29.

²⁰ Lubove, *Community Planning in the 1920s*, 18.

²¹ Ibid. See Lubove, 17-29, for a detailed discussion of the relative effects of restrictive vs. constructive legislation on housing quality and supply in the U.S. in the first two decades of the twentieth century.

²² Walter L. Creese, *The Search for Environment; The Garden City, Before and After* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966), provides a comprehensive study of Howard's Garden City idea and its applications in England and elsewhere. Raymond Unwin, *Town Planning in Practice* (New York, NY: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994, reprint of original 1909 publication) provides a complete discussion of the principles and practices of English Garden City planning.

²³ See Ames and McClelland, *Historic Residential Suburbs* (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 2003), 41-46. See Unwin, *Town Planning in Practice*. See Creese, 302, for a discussion of the influence of the English garden cities on the work of John Nolen.

A pivotal period of Garden City-influenced building in the United States occurred during World War I when the United States government established two programs for designing and constructing the much-needed housing for workers in defense industries, the United States Housing Authority in the Department of Labor and the Emergency Fleet Corporation under the U.S. Shipping Board. These short-lived programs flourished under the leadership of preeminent planners and architects Frederick Law Olmsted Jr., Robert Kohn, and John Nolen. In addition, Charles Harris Whitaker, editor of the AIA's journal, sent architect Frederick Ackerman to England to study the English garden cities designed by Unwin and Parker and the defense-worker communities being built by the British government. The resulting American planned communities, including Yorkship in Camden, New Jersey, and Seaside Village in Bridgeport, Connecticut, were designed by multi-disciplinary teams of town planners, architects, landscape architects, and engineers.²⁴ Designed specifically for the working-class employed in defense industries, these communities demonstrated the possibilities of collaborative planning and "constructive" government action, considered necessary components in the construction of new communities and the improvement of lower and middle class housing.²⁵

Collaborative planning, developed through Garden City theory and demonstrated by the wartime defense housing program, found application as well in the evolution of city and regional planning. The problems of rapidly expanding cities without plans had become a focus of attention following Chicago's 1893 Columbian Exposition. The elegant Beaux-Arts design of the fair grounds and buildings, under the supervision of Chicago architect Daniel Burnham and with the expertise of Frederick Law Olmsted Sr., ignited an American desire for orderly city function and growth. Burnham's 1906 *Plan for Chicago* marked the beginning of an era dedicated to developing city growth-planning strategies, which culminated in the publication of the *Regional Survey of New York and its Environs*. These plans attempted to address the issues of privately funded speculative building, the expansion of public utilities and transportation systems, and the growing shortage of decent low and middle class housing. In the United States, housing needs reached crisis proportions following WWI when rising construction costs resulted in the collapse of the speculative housing industry.²⁶ It was apparent that a new way to provide housing for working-class families was needed.

With the rise of city planning in the United States, the value of professional training in the fields of planning, civil engineering, architecture, and landscape architecture became readily recognized. Architects expanded their role into the design of houses, and landscape architects into the platting and design of residential neighborhoods. The World War I defense housing communities had provided the formative experience of many designers practicing in the 1920s, including Henry Wright; the return of normalcy, however, also meant a return to the typical practices where subdivisions were platted, streets and utilities laid out, and individual lots sold for completion by a variety of home builders. Higher income suburbs had the best amenities and were promoted as "garden" or "country club" suburbs, frequently offering landscaped entrances and parks, curvilinear tree-lined streets, sidewalks, spacious yards, and a variety of architectural styles. Home-builders and home-owners in these subdivisions were bound by deed restrictions which controlled land use, the price of housing, the status of homeowners, setbacks, and, in some cases, the architectural style. Less expensive neighborhoods were generally unregulated and crowded, made up of rectangular grid of streets and rows of uniform houses on small lots with limited light, fresh air, and greenery.

²⁴ Creese, *Search for Environment*, 302-03; Ames and McClelland, *Historic Residential Suburbs*, 45.

²⁵ Lubove, *Community Planning in the 1920s*, 17.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 17-18.

In 1923, an eclectic group of professionals dedicated to the principles of garden city planning and reforms in community-building gathered to form the Regional Planning Association of America (RPAA). Among the founding members were architects Clarence S. Stein and Frederick L. Ackerman, landscape architect Henry Wright, social theorists Benton MacKaye and Lewis Mumford, Editor of the AIA journal Charles Harris Whitaker, and real estate investor/philanthropist Alexander M. Bing. Unhappy with the focus of the city-centered regional plans being developed, the RPAA's Preamble described their vision:

A regional plan calls for new population centers, where natural resources will be preserved for the community, where industry may be conducted efficiently, and where an adequate equipment of houses, gardens, and recreation grounds will ensure a healthy and stimulating environment.²⁷

The RPAA's regional vision sought to change the social organization of burgeoning metropolitan centers, combining the diverse components of both urban and rural community in smaller centers spread throughout a region.²⁸ Rather than continuing what they saw as unhealthy and unattractive speculative growth around the industrial city centers, members of the RPAA envisioned the development of outlying new towns where the local population would be supported economically through the establishment of local industries. Their vision also included the redesign of developments on the edge of cities and the reconstruction of blighted neighborhoods within the city through comprehensive planning.²⁹ Free of the restrictive zoning and rectilinear grid of existing cities and built on a large-scale (rather than the piecemeal building of speculative builders), innovative, well-planned communities could potentially reduce overall construction and land costs and provide a quality of life and neighborhood environment for low and moderate income families that was typically only attainable to those with higher incomes.

Primary to the philosophy of the RPAA was the suggestion that the housing problem following World War I was a crisis of funding, not a crisis of supply.³⁰ The example of successes by the government-funded planned communities both in British and U.S. defense housing convinced members of the RPAA that a stable source of funding or credit, and detailed comprehensive planning could result in affordable, healthy, and safe housing for low and middle income families. Reductions in construction costs, first demonstrated by Unwin in his use of cul-de-sacs and attached houses and later the focus of Henry Wright's exhaustive cost-analyses, were critical to achieving successful community design.

In order to demonstrate their planning theory, the RPAA established the City Housing Corporation, a limited dividend corporation dedicated to the construction of affordable housing and Garden City style community planning. Their two planned communities, Sunnyside Gardens (1924) and Radburn (1928), demonstrated and refined many of the RPAA ideas, but Radburn in particular established a precedent for comprehensive community design. Limited by the rectilinear grid and zoning requirements at Sunnyside, the designers explored the grouping of row houses around the periphery of each block while keeping the center of each block open for gardens and community recreation. What eventually became known as the "Radburn Idea" encompassed a number of design elements introduced at Sunnyside; at Radburn, however, these were synthesized into a unified town plan that offered a variety of housing types and community facilities. Of particular importance were the superblocks with cul-de-sacs and

²⁷ The Regional Planning Association of America, Preamble, June 8, 1923, box 10, file 12, The Clarence Stein Collection, Rare Book and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

²⁸ For a complete understanding of the RPAA vision see Roy Lubove, *Community Planning in the 1920s: The Contribution of the Regional Planning Association of America* (Pittsburgh, PA: The University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963).

²⁹ Wright, *Rehousing Urban America*, 12.

³⁰ Lubove, *Community Planning in the 1920s*, 73.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 27

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

interior landscaped parks, a hierarchy of roads, the neighborhood unit based on the number of children required to support an elementary school,³¹ and a hierarchy of road uses. New concepts included the reverse-front house with integrated garage, and pedestrian pathways. The “Town for the Motor Age” was sited 12 miles from New York City, near a planned highway and rail line providing easy access to the mid-level employment of most of the residents. Although the designers intended Radburn to be a fully self-sufficient commercial and industrial town of 25,000 in the vein of a true Garden City, that dream was never realized. With the 1934 bankruptcy of the City Housing Corporation, a consequence of the Great Depression, Radburn and Sunnyside effectively highlighted the RPAA suggestion that the housing industry would only remain stable through a government or foundation backed source of funds or mortgage credit.

Although sharing a common vision for community development and social reform, Clarence S. Stein (1882-1975) and Henry Wright (1878-1936) came from very different professional backgrounds and training. Stein, a graduate of Cornell’s architecture program, had European training in Beaux-Arts principles of design and had worked for Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue early in his career and helped design the formal City Beautiful plan for Tyrone, New Mexico and the fair grounds for the 1912 San Diego exposition. Wright, on the other hand, a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, worked initially for landscape architect and planner George E. Kessler in Kansas City and St. Louis. Wright’s early experience was influenced by the naturalistic traditions of American landscape architecture and dominated by a search for innovative solutions for suburban housing. During World War I, he worked on government-sponsored defense housing for the Emergency Fleet Corporation of the U.S. Shipping Board, and in the 1920s developed several attractive and innovative apartment houses in St. Louis.

Although Stein and Wright remained friends, their professional paths diverged in 1934, when Wright formed the Housing Guild with housing reformer Catherine Bauer and others, and devoted his energies to teaching at Columbia. During the last years of his life, Wright advanced his theories of large-scale, low-income housing based on his RPAA experience and the new European precedents, publishing them in *Rehousing Urban America* (1935). Stein continued to promote garden-city planning and during the 1930s provided technical assistance in the creation of Greenbelt (NHL) and the other greenbelt communities built by Rex Tugwell’s Resettlement Administration. Stein was instrumental in the creation of Hillside Homes, a massive multi-story housing community in New York City, one of the first housing communities supported by the Public Works Administration (PWA) and Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC), and later Baldwin Hills Village (NHL), Los Angeles, a large-scale community of apartments and homes having a highly artistic garden city plan, which was privately financed through FHA-approved and insured loans. Stein remained an advocate for garden-city planning and the Radburn Plan, publishing *Toward New Towns for America* (1951) first in England and several years later America (1957).

Radburn was the fullest expression of Stein and Wright’s “extraordinary ten-year collaboration” and the result of the “collaborative genius” that characterized the membership within the RPAA membership, according to Cornell University professor K. Carlyle Parsons, an RPAA-scholar and the late editor of the Clarence Stein Papers. RPAA’s “inner-core” included Stein, “the organizer and manager;” Benton MacKaye, “the conservationist;” Alexander Bing, “the developer-builder;” Lewis Mumford, “the writer;” and Henry Wright, “the analyst” and a “powerful stimulus to clear thinking by RPAA members.

³¹ Stein, *Toward New Towns for America*, 50-51; as suggested by Clarence Perry, *Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs*, Vol. 7, 1929.

Other members included Robert Kohn, Stuart Chase, Charles Whitaker, Robert Bruere, Frederick Ackerman, Catherine Bauer, Henry Churchill, and Albert Mayer.³²

According to Parsons, Radburn's genius stemmed from the interaction of various subgroups within RPAA, each of which Stein was a member:

MacKaye, Mumford, Stein, and Wright advocated building new communities in urban regions as part of a strategy of urban dispersion, expansion, and rebuilding; Stein and Wright invented new forms of large-scale community layout and design; Ackerman, Stein, Wright and Bing developed many economies in affordable housing and financing systems, to make housing sales to families of moderate means easier; MacKaye Mumford, Wright, and Stein formulated new concepts for the structure of large urban regions in which open space preservation would guide urban growth; Ackerman, Bing, Stein, and, later, Catherine Bauer, advocated greater equity in housing production, location, and design; and several RPAA members, Stein, Kohn, Whitaker, and, later, Mumford and Bauer, recommended specific new state and national planning and housing policies and the laws to implement them.³³

The Depression served as a catalyst for significant additional experimentation with the Radburn Idea and the neighborhood planning concept. In 1932, under contract with the privately funded Buhl Foundation, Stein and Wright began construction of their final private collaboration, a planned community called Chatham Village at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Combining their exhaustive construction cost analysis with the Radburn principles of central open space, reverse-front housing, pedestrian safety, and automobile accommodation, the design successfully demonstrated the economic feasibility and livability of high-density attached housing. Chatham Village also represented the first use in the United States of a protective greenbelt around much of the developed property.³⁴

Perhaps the most significant influence of the Radburn Idea came with President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal response to the growing numbers of displaced families during the Depression. The Resettlement Administration undertook the design and construction of a series of 'greenbelt' towns beginning in 1935, a first in government-funded housing for low-income families. Probably the most comprehensive use of the regional and community planning theory of the RPAA and the technical achievements of the Radburn Idea, only three greenbelt towns were actually completed, Greenbelt, Maryland (NHL); Greenhills, Ohio; and Greendale, Wisconsin. Stein and Wright served on the planning staff for two of the projects. Their Garden City approach to community planning as well as their solutions to health and safety were particularly apparent in the design of Greenbelt, Maryland, the largest and most complete of the three towns.³⁵ The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), another federal New Deal response operating on a regional scale, was also impacted by the Radburn experiment.³⁶

³² Parsons, "Collaborative Genius," 463, 472.

³³ Parsons, "Collaborative Genius," 463.

³⁴ David Vater, "Chatham Village Historic District," National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1996). Chatham Village is also a National Historic Landmark.

³⁵ Elizabeth Jo Lampl, "Greenbelt, Maryland Historic District," National Historic Landmark Nomination Form (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1996) 23.

³⁶ Eugenie Ladner Birch, "Radburn and the American Planning Movement: The Persistence of an Idea," in *Introduction to Planning History in the United States*, ed. Donald A. Krueckeberg (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University

Of more far reaching importance was Radburn's contribution to the design of American suburbs through its demonstration of the Neighborhood Unit formula and methods of large-scale residential development. The broader housing and financial reforms brought about by the National Housing Act of 1934 and the creation of the Federal Housing Administration were influenced more by Radburn's innovative demonstration of large-scale residential planning for moderate and lower income Americans than by the Radburn Idea as a planning model to imitate with its organization into superblocks and its innovative reverse-front homes. Two events – the development of the New York Regional Plan and the 1931 President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership—would draw national attention to Radburn and provide the channels through which Radburn would exert its influence on the mainstream of American community planning and suburbanization.

The New York Regional Plan

The development of Radburn was coordinated with the New York Regional Plan, independently being prepared by the Russell Sage Foundation through the leadership of Frederic Delano and Thomas Adams, and others. Adams, who directed the extensive study and edited the multi-volume survey and plan, searched for models for suburban development in the growing metropolitan region as well as nationwide; he was particularly interested in promoting the Neighborhood Unit concept Clarence Perry had developed for the Russell Sage Foundation. His own study on "The Problems of Planning Unbuilt Areas," appeared in the seventh volume of the Regional Survey, *Neighborhood and Community Planning* (1929) and recognized Radburn's outstanding qualities. Through his many influential writings and his participation in the 1931 President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, Adams provided analyses of the merits of Radburn, establishing it as a model for American neighborhood planning and praising its innovative accommodation of the automobile. Although Adams, an internationally recognized planner, was successful in gaining support for Neighborhood Unit planning, he failed to attract national support for the Radburn Idea as a basis for future subdivision design in the United States.³⁷

Stein and Wright gave physical form to Perry's theoretical concept of the neighborhood unit and advanced it by responding to growing concern over the impact of the automobile on neighborhood safety. Although not a member of the RPAA, Clarence Perry worked for the Russell Sage Foundation and was a resident of Forest Hills Gardens on which he based his original concept. He was present at the RPAA meeting where the preliminary planning for Radburn took place, and he freely drew upon its example as a model of his Neighborhood Unit concept in his 1929 monograph, "The Neighborhood Unit," which was published in the seventh volume of the *Regional Survey*. Perry's formula called for communities large enough to support an elementary school, preferably about 160 acres with 10 percent reserved for recreation and park space. Interior streets were to be no wider than required for their use with cul-de-sacs and side streets being relatively narrow. Community facilities were to be centrally located, and a shopping district was to be located on the edge of the community where neighborhood streets joined the main arterials.³⁸

Center for Urban Policy Research, 1983), 129. See also K. C. Parsons, "Clarence Stein and the Greenbelt Towns: Settling for Less," *APA Journal* 56, no. 2 (Spring 1990): 161-83.

³⁷ Thomas Adams, *The Building of the City*, The Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs, vol. 2. (New York: Committee on the Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs, 1931); "Problems of Planning Unbuilt Areas," Monograph Three, *Neighborhood and Community Planning*, vol. 7, *The Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs* (New York: Regional Plan Association, 1929); *The Design of Residential Areas*, Harvard Planning Series (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934).

³⁸ Clarence A. Perry, "The Neighborhood Unit," Monograph One, *Neighborhood and Community Planning*, vol. 7,

In *The Building of the City* (1931), the concluding volume of the Regional Plan, Thomas Adams acknowledged the plan of Radburn as an “independent, but none the less significant, contribution” to the regional plan, and indicated that Stein and Wright had prepared the plan (which was published figure 15, page 134) in consultation with himself (Adams) “as representing the Regional Plan.” Radburn was depicted as a community “where art and nature combine to make good living conditions.” Like many reformers of his time, Adams believed that building sites should be large enough to permit adequate air and light; surroundings should be agreeable in character and free of harmful or dangerous influences; housing should be attractive, well-designed, and unified in character; transportation should be available nearby; and there should be space for healthy recreation. Among the communities the Regional Survey recognized as models of suburban planning were Radburn, New Jersey, Kohler in Wisconsin, Roland Park in Baltimore, Forest Hills Gardens on Long Island, Mariemont near Cincinnati, the Country Club District of Kansas City, and Lawrence Farms outside New York City.³⁹

Adams envisioned the New York City region as offering many opportunities for the creation of new towns where “large open tracts of land” were combined with good transportation facilities. Radburn represented such a new town developed outside the periphery of the existing center of population. Adams summarized the principles that should be followed in planning new towns: adjustment of plan to the natural features; the arrangement of highway and street system that provided for “speed of through movement, the utmost degree of accessibility for local movement and the safety of pedestrians;” the design of streets to obtain “the proper orientation of buildings, ... to suit different needs and obtain economy of development;” the organization of space into areas serving different functions; the selection and planning of open spaces for parks, playgrounds, parkways, and athletic fields; control over the heights and densities of buildings; and developing the town as a unit “with its distinctive parts harmonized in a consistent and well-balanced whole.”⁴⁰

Praising Radburn’s innovative plan, Adams wrote:

The Radburn plan is exceptional as an illustration of original treatment of a system of streets, pedestrian walks and parks. This special treatment has been introduced for the major purposes of separating pedestrian from vehicular traffic and combining the pedestrian ways with the park system. It proves the need of new forms of design to fit in with the needs of motor vehicles and to obtain safety for pedestrians. It shows the defect of the rectangular street plan, in which all streets are used for through traffic, under modern conditions.⁴¹

President’s Conference on Home Buildings and Home Ownership

When the President’s Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership convened in December of 1931, the first of the three “neighborhoods” planned for Radburn was near completion and construction

Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs (New York: New York Regional Plan, 1929), 88-89. Several sources acknowledge the RPAA’s interaction with Perry during the planning of Radburn: Howard Gillette, Jr., “The Evolution of Neighborhood Planning from the Progressive Era to the 1949 Housing Act.” *Journal of Urban History* 9, no. 4 (August 1983): 426; Mumford, “Introduction,” in *Toward New Towns for America* by Clarence Stein, 15; Parsons, “Collaborative Genius,” 475.

³⁹ Adams, *The Building of the City*, 5, 78.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 568, 570-71.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* 571. Adams report carried a full-page copy of the Radburn Plan in color, figure 15, p. 134.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 31

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

was continuing despite the worsening economic conditions brought about by the Great Depression. A strong ally of private industry, President Herbert Hoover had long promoted better housing in America and, while serving as the U.S. Secretary of Commerce in the 1920s, served as the national president of the Better Homes for America, Inc. With the deepening recession, the faltering condition of the nation's home building industry raised increasing concern. The purpose of the 1931 conference was to consider ways of improving housing for a broad spectrum of Americans, developing a sound and lasting system of home financing, and bringing stability to real estate values. Private industry, public agencies, and professional organizations were all well represented. The conference brought together several thousand participants including the nation's leading experts in home financing, neighborhood planning, zoning, home design and construction, domestic science, and methods of prefabrication, including a number of those who, including Thomas Adams, Henry Wright, and Frederick Ackerman, had been involved in the development of Radburn.

Radburn figured prominently in the committee discussions and final recommendations. Radburn's example particularly interested the committees on city planning and zoning, subdivision design, large-scale operations, house design, and landscape planning and planting, whose reports and recommendations were published in various volumes of the proceedings published in 1932. Photographs of Radburn's parks, gardens, and recently completed housing clusters and apartment buildings appeared throughout the published conference reports, with captions such as "recent developments in subdivision practices are producing desirable homes with ample open spaces at reasonable low cost."⁴²

Foremost was the conference's overwhelming endorsement of Clarence Perry's Neighborhood Unit Formula and the recommendations for broad-sweeping implementation of zoning or private deed restrictions to ensure that neighborhoods maintained their value and domestic land use. Of great interest was the economics of planning housing in groups and the large-scale operations. The *Architectural Record* reported that the conference housing committees all concluded "that planned neighborhoods are essential to good housing -- planned neighborhoods within the framework of the city plan and the regional plan.... The very idea of home ownership means permanence, stability, security. The best security for home ownership is a high standard dwelling located in a desirable neighborhood, protected against deteriorating influences."⁴³

Much of what was discussed and concluded at the President's Conference found its way into the institutional guidelines governing subdivision development and large-scale operations compiled by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). The FHA, created by the 1934 National Housing Act, established a framework for federal government-insured mortgage loans, providing the investment security sought by private banks and investors. Mortgage security, an important component in the community building vision of the RPAA, actually served to jump-start the commercial, profit-driven building industry.

⁴² John M. Gries and James Ford, ed., *President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership*, vols. 1-7 (Washington, DC: National Capital Press, 1932). The quoted caption appeared with the photograph used as the frontispiece of volume 1, *Planning for Residential Districts*.

⁴³ *Architectural Record* 71 (January 1932): 41, as quoted in Howard Gillette, Jr., "The Evolution of Neighborhood Planning from the Progressive Era to the 1949 Housing Act." *Journal of Urban History* 9, no. 4 (August 1983), 427 and 441, en. 24.

By the 1940s Perry's concept found widespread acceptance in the planning profession, and Radburn was fixed in the minds of American designers as an ideal model community – one worthy of emulation but one that remained out of reach given the prevailing economic conditions, land use policies, and financial structure of the home mortgage system. Nevertheless Stein and Wright's innovations and Perry's theory had influenced American housing policy spurring in the following decade the creation of privately financed subdivisions and large-scale rental communities through FHA-insured mortgages and fueling the ongoing debate over public housing for low-income Americans and the redevelopment of blighted areas in the nation's cities. The superblock as a unit of neighborhood planning and the necessary requirements for sunlight, fresh air, open space, comfortable and convenient housing, and recreation, so tangible in the Radburn example, would figure importantly in design solutions and become intermingled with the influences of European examples of large-scale residential development.

Highly instrumental in incorporating the concept of neighborhood planning into American urban design was Harland Bartholomew, who chaired the Committee on Subdivision Layout at the 1931 housing conference. According to historian Howard Gillette Jr., Bartholomew "linked neighborhood planning to slum clearance at the 1933 National Conference on City Planning and incorporated the concept in a number of the comprehensive plans he prepared for cities across the United States in the 1930s."⁴⁴

The 1931 President's Conference encouraged the construction of housing on a large scale for both rental housing in single and multiple family dwellings, and owner-occupied dwellings. The Committee on Large-Scale Operations, chaired by Alfred K. Stern, Director of the Julius Rosenwald Fund, examined the design and economics of multi-story apartment houses such as Michigan Boulevard Garden Apartments in Chicago which Stern's foundation had designed to provide moderate priced housing for African American families; the grouped row houses of several World War I-era defense housing communities, Sunnyside Gardens, and Chatham Village; as well as the efficiently arranged small houses designed by Stein, Wright and Ackerman at Radburn. Large-scale operations, with their inherent economy, were recommended for the construction of neighborhoods of single-family homes as well as communities of rental housing.⁴⁵ An appendix to the Report of the Committee on Business and Housing entitled "Economic Factors Underlying Housing" indicated that the economic savings of the Radburn approach lay in the organization of a community where only 21 per cent of the land was covered by streets and lanes, a 10 percent reduction over normal practices of subdivision design. Additional savings stemmed from the completion of building up one part of the community before building up another.⁴⁶

The FHA encouraged large-scale operations, where development was financed and carried out under the direction of an "operative builder" who arranged for the purchase of land, the design of the subdivision plat, and the design and construction of the houses, hiring architects as well as masons, carpenters, and other artisans to carry out the work. Such large-scale operations offered a "broader and more profitable use of capital" and permitted the introduction of industrial methods that resulted in savings in overhead,

⁴⁴ Gillette, "The Evolution of Neighborhood Planning," 429, 433. Gillette also states that Perry applied his theory in 1933 to slum removal in *The Rebuilding of Blighted Areas—A Study of the Neighborhood Unit in Replanning and Plot Assemblage* (New York, 1933) and that James Dahir assessed the impact of neighborhood planning for the Russell Sage Foundation, publishing his findings in *The Neighborhood Unit Plan: Its Spread and Acceptance* (New York, 1947).

⁴⁵ For the Report of the Committee on Large-Scale Operations and Appendix I, "Experience with Large-Scale Operations, see John M. Gries and James Ford, ed., *Slums, Large-scale Operations, and Decentralization*, vol. 3, President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership (Washington, DC: National Capital Press, 1932), 66-95 and 96-105.

⁴⁶ Richard T. Ely, "Economic Factors Underlying Housing, and Experience of Limited Dividend Companies," Appendix 1, in *Slums, Large-scale Operations, and Decentralization*, ed. Gries and Ford, 161. The Report of the Committee on Business and Housing and Appendix I can be found on pp. 143-49 and 150-69.

construction, and merchandising costs.” Developers were able to achieve the plan in a consistent and harmonious manner, and in addition develop “commercial services such as retail stores and gasoline stations necessary to the life of the new community.”⁴⁷

Although the example of Chatham Village most directly influenced the FHA’s program of large-scale rental housing in the mid-1930s, the seminal influence of Radburn was seen in the widespread adoption of large-scale planning, the use of superblock planning, the grouped rows of attached dwellings interspersed with garden courts, and landscape improvements that became the basis for mortgage insurance and loan approval for garden apartment communities such as Colonial Village and the Buckingham Community, in Arlington, Virginia, and later Baldwin Hills Village in Los Angeles. Further evidence of the FHA program as a direct outgrowth of the garden-city principles as promoted by the RPAA and expressed at Radburn and Chatham, lies in the leading role of FHA architect Henry Klaber in formulating the architectural standards for the program and working closely with developers such as Gustave Ring and Allie Freed. Stein’s close friend and former classmate, Klaber was one of the founding members of the RPAA. As the architect of Michigan Avenue Garden Apartments in Chicago, a philanthropic project of the Rosenwald Foundation, and one of the leading architects working for the PWA under Robert D. Kohn from 1933 to 1934, Klaber had considerable knowledge and experience in utilizing economies of scale and lowering the costs of large-scale housing while maintaining the qualities associated with garden-city planning.⁴⁸

The Committee on City Planning and Zoning, chaired by Frederic A. Delano, the former chairman of the Regional Plan of New York and a former president of the American Civic Association, endorsed Perry’s neighborhood unit as self-contained community within boundaries formed by major streets to maintain desirable housing standards and real estate values. In keeping with Perry’s concept and the Radburn example, the committee recommended that a community have as its focal point a group of community facilities centering about the elementary school and that multiple-family dwellings, shopping centers, and commercial establishments be located on or immediately adjacent to boundary thoroughfares. The committee endorsed the use of deed restrictions as the primary means for controlling the physical character of a neighborhood, excluding nonresidential activities, and maintaining real estate values.⁴⁹

The influence of Radburn, and other notable suburbs such as Mariemont, Ohio, on subdivision design and neighborhood planning in the United States lay in a myriad of design practices that became embedded in the committee recommendations and were later adopted for the FHA standards. The Committee on Subdivision Layout, chaired by Harland Bartholomew, defined the ideal neighborhood as one protected by proper zoning regulations, where trees and the natural beauty of the landscape were preserved, and where streets were gently curving and adjusted to the contour of the ground. Spaciousness and the provision of open space were important aspects of design that could be achieved by subdivision into large lots, dedicating large open areas in the interior of blocks, or creating parks and playgrounds.”⁵⁰ Among the conclusions laid out in the report of the Committee on Subdivision Layout,

⁴⁷ FHA, *Planning Neighborhoods for Small Houses*, Technical Bulletin No. 5 (Washington, DC, July 1, 1936), 8-9.

⁴⁸ McClelland, Linda Flint, “Gardens for Suburbia – The Colonial Revival, Community Planning, and the National Housing Act of 1934,” unpublished paper, presented at the Colonial Revival in America Conference, Charlottesville, Virginia, 17 November 2000.

⁴⁹ John M. Gries and James Ford, eds., *Planning for Residential Districts*, vol. 1, President’s Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership (Washington, DC: National Capital Press, 1932), 42-44; Report of 1931 conference, “Federal Housing Construction,” *Architectural Record* 77, no. 3 (March 1935): 191.

⁵⁰ Gries and Ford, ed., *Planning for Residential Districts*, 52-54, 59, 76. The report of the Committee on Subdivision Layout can be found on pp. 47-124. H. Hubbard and H. Wright, John Nolen, and Robert Whitten were members

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 34

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

the influence of the Radburn experiment could be found, particularly the emphasis on developing subdivisions based on the Neighborhood Unit principle.⁵¹ Henry Wright, who served on the committees for subdivision layout and large-scale housing, provided technical information concerning design of the Neighborhood Unit as well as his economic analysis for Radburn.⁵²

The Committee on House Design, chaired by William Stanley Parker, President of the Architects' Small House Bureau in Boston, called for improvements in small house design, the arrangement of houses in well-planned groups that benefited from fresh air, sunlight, and outdoor space and avoided the monotonous repetition of houses placed uniformly on crowded narrow lots. Ackerman was a member of the committee, and Henry Wright served as its research secretary. The Committee on Landscape Planning and Planting, chaired by Josephine Morgan, included illustrious members of the landscape architecture profession and representatives of the American Civic Association, Garden Club of America, Woman's National Farm and Garden Association, National Council of State Garden Club Federations, and government horticulturalists and extension agents. The committee acknowledged the value of open space and parks in the design of neighborhoods of both detached homes and apartment buildings, noting the trend where interior blocks were reserved for parks and gardens. The committee also recommended that the grounds of small homes be developed with three separate areas, "the approach, the service area, and the part of the grounds reserved for pleasure," and advised that the best planting effects were "attained by confining the planting to the shade trees which are native in that part of the county."⁵³

FHA design standards intended to ensure stable property values for subdivisions of low-cost homes were published in a series of bulletins, including *Planning Neighborhoods for Small Houses* (1936), *Planning Profitable Neighborhoods* (1938), and *Principles of Planning Small Houses* (1936 and 1940). Elements from the Radburn Plan were specifically cited as desirable, in particular the designation of open-space for use by residents.⁵⁴ Although more affluent suburbs had relied upon deed restrictions to control land use since the late nineteenth century, Radburn was one of the first residential developments of mixed housing to make use of such restrictions. The idea so emphatically demonstrated at Radburn that neighborhoods be laid out with a hierarchy of roads, from wide feeder roads to narrow cul-de-sacs, was adopted and applied to more traditionally designed subdivisions where houses fronted on streets. Intended to improve traffic safety, eliminate through traffic, and reduce construction costs, such roads became the hallmark of American suburbs beginning in the 1930s. However, the "new town" vision of the Radburn designers, calling for integrated land-uses and self-sufficiency, was lost to the over-riding emphasis on stable property values.

Much subdivision development in the United States in the mid-twentieth century was directly influenced by the FHA guidelines established in the 1930s. Although the plans were clearly improved by Radburn elements, the focus of real estate development continued to be profit-driven, exclusive of the lower classes, and devoid of regional vision. A few later experiments with planned communities, including Baldwin Hills Village (NHL), Los Angeles, California (1941) where Clarence Stein served as a technical consultant, Reston, Virginia (1961), and Columbia, Maryland (1963), continue to confirm the economic and community theories developed by the RPAA and demonstrated by the still-thriving

of this committee.

⁵¹ "The President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership. Tentative Report of the Committee on Subdivision Layout," December 3, 1931, The Henry Wright Papers, box 3, file Dec. 3, 1931, Rare Books and Manuscripts Collections, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, p. 17.

⁵² Ibid, List of References.

⁵³ Gries and Ford, eds., *Planning for Residential Districts*, 167-68, 176-77.

⁵⁴ FHA, *Planning Neighborhoods*, 24.

community of Radburn.

Peopling Places

Post-industrial revolution urban overcrowding and decay initiated the first migration of upper class families to commuter suburbs on the rural edges of the city. These early experiments with suburban design were influenced by the romantic, naturalistic ideals of landscape designers such as Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr., Calvert Vaux, and Andrew Jackson Downing. The curving streets following natural topography and large building lots with landscaping were designed to improve the physical and mental health of the occupants. Such developments were also designed to be exclusive of the lower classes. Working class families could not afford the large lots and houses; nor were they able to afford the transportation costs from such suburbs to their industrial employment located in the urban centers.

Beginning around 1890, the streetcar provided the cheap transportation necessary for the working and middle class movement to the city's edge. Speculative builders quickly subdivided the land along the established 'gridiron' street plan into endless rows of narrow lots, known as 'streetcar suburbs.' But costs were only kept within the moderate range by reducing lot widths, allowing more and more houses to be squeezed into increasingly undesirable neighborhoods lacking light, air and open space. This plan served equally well for the speculative development fueled by the increased availability of the automobile following WWI, which spurred renewed subdivision on the ever-expanding edges of the city.⁵⁵

Members of the Regional Planning Association of America (RPAA), established in 1923, were appalled by the unplanned and unhealthy growth of the American city. Their position was articulated by Henry Wright, one of the core members of the RPAA, stated under the heading "Where Shall We House?"

Behind the speculative activities of the post-War [WWI] land subdivision there lies a very real urge to get to the open country so as to get away from the drabness and sameness of the old parts of the city. Unfortunately, home seekers have not sufficiently reasoned out their desires, to appreciate the fact that the open country which they have been buying in parcels 35 or 50 feet wide has all the seeds of the old monotonous regions that they hoped to escape. The new districts, if and when built up, merely repeat the old conditions and cause a new abandonment for newer, unspoiled fields beyond.⁵⁶

The RPAA proposed dramatic reorganization of urban growth through a planned regional approach, in which planned 'new towns' would house low and middle class workers, complete with de-centralized regional industries, commercial centers, educational and recreational facilities.

Drawing upon the community-building theory of Ebenezer Howard's Garden City concept, Raymond Unwin and Barry Parker's physical Garden City experiments in England, Henry Wright's suburban development plans in Missouri (1910s), and the successes of the U.S. government's defense housing communities constructed during WWI, (Forest Hills and Nolen's Mariemont, the RPAA sought to develop its own demonstration Garden Cities. To that end the City Housing Corporation was created, officially described as, "A Limited Dividend Company Organized to Build Better Homes and

⁵⁵ Peter G. Rowe, *Making a Middle Landscape* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1991), 3-4.

⁵⁶ Henry Wright, *Rehousing Urban America* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1935), 11.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 36

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Communities.”⁵⁷ Financed by private investment funds and under the direction of Alexander M. Bing, the corporation undertook the construction of Sunnyside Gardens in New York City (1924) and Radburn, New Jersey (1928). Sunnyside Gardens was located within the city and limited to the gridiron plan already laid out by city planners. Its designers Clarence Stein and Henry Wright considered Sunnyside Gardens to be technical practice for the later development of a more complete Garden City; the development of Radburn as a satellite town in the outwardly expanding metropolitan region surrounding New York City, provided this opportunity. The outlying greenbelt – integral to Howard’s diagram – was moved to the interior of the community and the superblocks, first introduced by Parker and Unwin at Letchworth and Hampstead Gardens, and the concept of reverse-front housing, built-in garages, and service courts on short cul-de-sacs employed to accommodate the family automobile.

Visions of the American Garden City were altered by the realities of American life. Various elements of the Radburn town plan strayed from Howard’s concept including the lack of a greenbelt surrounding the town, described as “an economic impossibility in the United States where land is taxed directly upon its capital site value without respect to its present use or revenue . . .”⁵⁸ Although the protective greenbelt was originally planned, according to Charles S. Asher then legal counsel to the City Housing Corporation, “As soon as the acquisition [of the Radburn acreage] was announced, the assessor of the Borough of Fair Lawn assessed every square foot as a potential suburban building site.”⁵⁹

Howard’s Garden City vision of a diverse low and middle class population evolved at Radburn into a homogenous middle class community.⁶⁰ The lack of diversity was due in part to the high cost of the land at the chosen site, which in turn raised the cost of the houses. Also, planned industrial development at Radburn did not materialize, a significant departure from the Garden City concept, “and Radburn had to accept the role of a suburb.”⁶¹ Rather than maintain the whole town under single or cooperative ownership, as suggested by Howard, the decision to sell individual house lots (except the interior parks) was thought to be necessary due to American middle class attitudes toward property ownership. Clearly a number of factors contributed to the Radburn’s departure from the Garden City ideal, consequently the community plan focused on the integration of the automobile into community life in a way that would be safe for residents, convenient, and still provide a pleasant, healthy atmosphere. Henry Wright wrote in 1930:

The Garden City Plan (1898) fitted into the old condition of its day, but Radburn (1928) had to meet an entirely new set of conditions. City Planning had been engrossed in the solution of traffic movement, adjusting old time street systems to new demands of the motor car, but no completely new town had recognized the necessity of meeting the human problems of danger, noise, and nuisance accompanying the convenience of the new vehicle. The ‘Radburn Idea’ attacked

⁵⁷ Letterhead description on an article by Tracy Augur, published by the City Housing Corp., “Radburn – The Challenge of a New Town,” March 1931, The Clarence Stein Collection, Rare Books and Manuscripts Collection, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.

⁵⁸ Louis Brownlow, Municipal Consultant, City Housing Corporation, “Radburn: A New Town Planned for the Motor Age,” in *International Housing and Town Planning Bulletin* (February 1930): 4; box 1, file 21, The Clarence Stein Collection, Rare Books and Manuscripts Collection, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

⁵⁹ Charles S. Asher, “Remarks on the Designation of Radburn as an Historic Landmark, 4 October 1975,” The Radburn Association, Radburn, N.J.

⁶⁰ Clarence S. Stein, *Toward New Towns for America* (New York, NY: Reinhold Publishing Corp., 1957), 67-68.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 41.

the problem as a related whole.⁶²

The Radburn town plan reflected a conscious adherence to Clarence Perry's Neighborhood Unit concept (*Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs*, 1929), dividing the town into three units of approximately 10,000 people (see attached plan), based on the number of children served by a neighborhood elementary school. Centrally convenient to the three neighborhoods would be a high school, community center, and commercial area. Actual construction according to the plan, which ended after 1934 with the bankruptcy of the City Housing Corporation, resulted in only 1/3 of one neighborhood and a small section of a second. Although much smaller than originally planned, the Radburn community was able to operate as a neighborhood unit; served by the Radburn elementary school, a community center (the Grange Hall), and the Plaza Building commercial area.

Within the neighborhood unit, the Radburn Idea centered on the superblock and the road network. To accommodate both the automobile and the safety of residents, and to achieve development cost savings, roads at Radburn were designed with a hierarchy of uses resulting in its unique plan. The main through-road (Fair Lawn Avenue) was intersected by boulevards (Plaza Road and Radburn Road), which provided access to the narrower, curving access roads bordering the superblocks (High, Howard, and Owen; Warren, and Sanford). These in turn provided access to the cul-de-sacs on which the houses were located, and the pedestrian paths leading through the interior parks. The closely spaced houses were turned facing inward on the parks to turn the focus of the living space on the open green, to keep children away from the streets, and to encourage neighborly interaction. All of these features achieved a safe and healthy environment at a cost affordable to the working middle class.

Perhaps the most radical community feature, although modified in the Radburn Plan, was the Garden City concept of common ownership of land. Howard suggested that the Garden City should be held under single or associative (community) ownership to remove the speculative nature of development and reduce the cost of greater amenities for all class levels. While the RPAA supported this ideal, Alexander Bing and the Directors of the City Housing Corporation felt that single or community ownership was "impractical" and would cause difficulty in securing mortgages by purchasers.⁶³ However, community ownership of the large tracts of interior green space would keep the purchase price of individual lots within the range of the middle class home owners. The 1929 creation of the Radburn Association, with an elected Board of Directors, provided the mechanism through which the community could take ownership of the common property and maintain and control the use of commonly used parks, pathways, and recreational facilities.⁶⁴ The Association was additionally responsible for administering and enforcing the architectural and lot restrictions conveyed with each property deed and were intended to maintain Radburn's design in perpetuity.

The Radburn Idea, and the planning elements successfully demonstrated at Radburn, had an immediate and lasting impact on community planning in the United States. Tracy Augur, a city planner and landscape architect from Michigan, was clearly aware of the impact Radburn would have on future planning, writing in a 1931 article prior to his employment as a federal planner with the Tennessee

⁶² From Henry Wright, "The Autobiography of Another Idea," *The Western Architect* (September 1930), reproduced in the obituary of Henry Wright written by Clarence Stein in *American Architect and Architecture*, August 1936, box 16, file 52, The Clarence Stein Collection, Rare Books and Manuscripts Collection, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

⁶³ Stein, *Toward New Towns for America*, 68.

⁶⁴ "Declaration of Restrictions No. 1 Affecting Radburn, Property of City Housing Corporation," March 15, 1929, Radburn Association, Radburn, NJ.

Valley Authority:

Radburn stands out singly not because it is the biggest or most beautiful of cities but because it is the first tangible product of a new urban science...that seeks to make the places of man's habitation and industry fit the health requirements of his daily life...Radburn is not a theory, it is a demonstration...Radburn cannot be a model for all types of city, nor for all cities of the residential type; it stands in recognition of the varying functions cities serve, and in planning to serve one of the more common of them, it points the way to the service of others.⁶⁵

Through the continued work of Stein and Wright, funded both privately and through the federal government, elements of the Radburn Plan were refined and improved at Chatham Village, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (1932-36), Greenbelt, Maryland (1935), and at Baldwin Hills Village, Los Angeles, California (planning began 1935, construction began 1941). All employed the hierarchy of road-use, the superblock with interior green and residences turned inward. Greenbelt included the use of pedestrian underpasses and the neighborhood unit with elementary school, community center, and commercial center. Use of the Garden City-influenced single ownership concept was fully implemented at Chatham Village, owned and maintained by the Buhl Foundation until 1960 when it was sold to Chatham Village Homes, Inc., a resident's cooperative that continues today. The federal government initially owned Greenbelt; in 1952 ownership was transferred to the Greenbelt Veterans Housing Corporation, a non-profit organization of resident members.⁶⁶

The cost-savings and increased safety of the design demonstrated at Radburn were important influences on the 1936 FHA guidelines for developing neighborhoods at lower cost.⁶⁷ Henry Churchill, who had worked with Wright on the greenbelt towns, noted:

The heat for guaranteed, effortless profits was not yet on, and the analytical theories of Henry Wright, and their resultant application to good subdivision design, were built into the manuals of FHA in its early days by such men as Miles Colean and E. Henry Klaber. No matter how low FHA has sunk since then, those basic principles left ineradicable traces.⁶⁸

Specifically, the plan of a Radburn superblock was used to illustrate the safety of cul-de-sacs and the desirability of dedicating open space in a development for common use.⁶⁹ Although FHA standards were geared toward the financial stability of low and middle income neighborhoods rather than toward the higher social purpose of quality community living envisioned by the RPAA at Radburn, the success of the Radburn Plan had direct influence on particular aspects of what would become the overriding guide to future suburban development.

The capability of the superblock for high-density, large-scale development was taken a step further by government housing authorities in the creation of public housing. In the name of Urban Renewal these

⁶⁵ Tracy Augur, "Radburn – The Challenge of a New Town," *Michigan Municipal Review*, February 1931, p. 40, as cited in Birch, in Krueckeberg, *Introduction to Planning History*, 129.

⁶⁶ Elizabeth Jo Lampl, "Greenbelt, Maryland Historic District," 45.

⁶⁷ Birch, "Radburn and the American Planning Movement," in *Introduction to Planning History*, ed. Krueckeberg, 133.

⁶⁸ Henry Churchill, "Henry Wright 1878-1936," in *The American Planner, Biographies and Recollections*, ed. Krueckeberg, 2d. ed. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research, 1994), 252.

⁶⁹ FHA, *Planning Neighborhoods for Small Houses*, Technical Bulletin No. 5, July 1, 1936, p. 12-15, 25.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 39

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

planned “neighborhoods” degenerated into warehouses for the poor, cited by critics as “badges of social identification and affliction...and the lives of the residents seem to have neither dimension nor meaning.”⁷⁰ The near-complete failure of the public housing experiments of the 1960s, held against the continued success of the Radburn community, highlights the need for attention to comprehensive planning which the Radburn designers had demonstrated.

Radburn immediately gained international attention. In 1934, the International Congress on Housing met in the United States and visited Radburn. English town planners Parker and Unwin, with whom Stein and Wright consulted in the early stages of planning, became interested in Radburn’s innovations for controlling traffic, and, according to Walter Creese, incorporated references to Radburn in their proposal for Wythenshawe, near Manchester. The Radburn Idea was adopted for the creation of new towns throughout the world, including Kitimat in British Columbia, Vallingby and other satellite cities in Sweden, and Chandigarh in India.⁷¹

Clarence Stein described Radburn later as, “A Most Successful Failure.” Despite the financial collapse of the City Housing Corporation and its failure to complete the whole town plan, Stein concluded,

There can be no question of Radburn’s success as a really good modern place to live well at moderate cost. Its inhabitants present and past answer for that. The extent to which the Radburn Plan has inspired and affected town planners throughout the world tells what others think of it.⁷²

Expressing Cultural Values

The emerging American middle class of the 1920s found improvements to their lifestyle, with manufactured goods, particularly the automobile, becoming more available and affordable to them. The freedom to move away from the crowded city provided by the automobile was stifled however, by the profit-driven nature of subdivision development after WWI. With rising housing costs came diminishing quality of construction, design and setting. The Radburn town plan was designed to demonstrate that a community dedicated to safety and attractive, healthful surroundings for middle class families could be achieved through the economic savings of large-scale construction and comprehensive planning.

Originally conceived of as a “new town” demonstration for the regional planning theories of the RPAA, the town of Radburn was to be fully self-sufficient with government, industry, housing, recreational and educational facilities, and a commercial center. Planners quickly found that industry was not interested in relocating to the relatively remote Radburn site. Lack of industrial employment and the unexpected high cost of land changed the focus of the development from Garden City experiment to demonstration of a new vision of middle class suburban development.⁷³ Within five years of beginning construction, the Depression forced the sale of much of the undeveloped land and the full Radburn town plan was never completed. However, the Radburn Idea, described by Stein as “a radical revision of relation of

⁷⁰ William Moore, Jr., *The Vertical Ghetto*, as cited in Birch, in Krueckeberg, *Introduction to Planning History*, 142.

⁷¹ See Creese, *The Search for Environment*, 266; Parsons, “Collaborative Genius,” 463; and Stein, *Toward New Towns for America*, 9.

⁷² Clarence S. Stein, “Radburn – A Most Successful Failure,” Handwritten article, n.d. (probably 1948), box 1, file 24, The Clarence Stein Collection, Rare Books and Manuscripts Collection, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

⁷³ Stein, *Toward New Towns for America*, 40-41.

houses, roads, paths, gardens, parks, blocks, and local neighborhoods,”⁷⁴ successfully addressed the perceived requirements for acceptable middle class housing. It was a well-defined alternative to the monotonous subdivisions on dangerous grid pattern streets that were being marketed by speculative builders to families desperate to escape the inner city. To modern day planners, the Radburn Plan is viewed as the “ancestor of cluster zoning, planned unit development, and large-scale community building” and such “modern transformations are [seen as] descendents, sometimes blurred shadows, of RPAA concepts.”⁷⁵

Radburn was planned with four primary middle class values in mind, affordability, safety, health, and modernity. The “Town for the Motor Age” was designed specifically to address the presence of the automobile, the key to middle class mobility. Each element of the town plan was considered in the context of construction cost-savings and the creation of a relaxing, healthful atmosphere. The members of the RPAA, and particularly Henry Wright, had already recognized the middle class desire to escape the city and purchase homes in the “open country.” Wright believed that the open country would eventually become the same monotonous grids from which the middle class was trying to escape.⁷⁶ By building their town from former farmland 12 miles from the city’s edge, the Radburn planners anticipated savings in land and subdivision costs that would make their town affordable to the moderate-income families they hoped to attract. Although they found land prices higher than expected, the land required little grading and was free from zoning restrictions that would have limited the cost savings created by their unique town plan.⁷⁷

Central to the plan was the hierarchy of road uses. Stein described the purpose of the “Specialized Roads Planned and Built for One Use Instead of for All Uses:”

...service lanes for direct access to buildings [cul-de-sacs]; secondary collector roads around superblocs; main through roads, linking the traffic of various sections, neighborhoods and districts; express highways or parkways, for connection with outside communities (Thus differentiating between movement, collection, service, parking, and visiting).⁷⁸

The roads of Radburn were a defining feature of the planners’ attempt to integrate safely the automobile with residential design. Like the early upper class subdivisions of Olmsted and Vaux, curving streets not only slowed traffic, they provided pleasant visual effects. Integral also to the hierarchy of road uses and safety was the inclusion of pedestrian pathways providing safe pedestrian access to all community services through interior parks and away from the roads used by automobiles. Again drawing on Olmsted and Vaux in their classic design of the roads and paths of Central Park, the paths of Radburn maintained separation from the roads even at crossings through creative use of the underpass and overpass (see photos).⁷⁹

While the specialized roads achieved a new level of safety and attractive surroundings, they also provided profound cost savings. Radburn’s secondary roads defined the primary subdivision unit, the superblock with houses grouped around cul-de-sacs. Although not radically new, having been used to a small degree in the English Garden Cities and in several earlier American communities, Radburn

⁷⁴ Ibid., 41.

⁷⁵ Parsons, “Collaborative Genius,” 463.

⁷⁶ Wright, *Rehousing Urban America*, 11.

⁷⁷ Stein, *Toward New Towns for America*, 39.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 41.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 44.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 41

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

introduced the first large-scale use of this design concept. Large blocks and cul-de-sac placement of houses dramatically reduced the cost of road and utility improvements. Stein notes, “[t]he saving in cost of these not only paid for the 12 to 14 per cent of the total area that went into internal parks, but also covered the cost of grading and landscaping the play spaces and green links connecting the central block commons.”⁸⁰ By leaving the center of the block as open space, Radburn designers saved additional cost by not having to construct roads around them, and at the same time provided safe play areas for children.

Radburn’s location along the Erie Railroad offered the advantages of transportation by rail to Hoboken, Newark and downtown Manhattan. Early in their planning, Radburn’s designers saw the need for a suburban train station that would be not only an amenity for Radburn commuters, but also a model facility that would be integral to transportation planning throughout the New York metropolitan area. Built on the site of the former rural station that had served local farmers since the late nineteenth century, the new Radburn -Fair Lawn Passenger Station (1930) was to serve as the western anchor of the community’s civic center that was bounded on the east by the prominent Radburn Plaza Building with its striking clock tower. In June 1928 the proposal for the “Fairlawn Station Square” called for a modern structure costing \$60,000 and improved service for the commuters who would be moving into Radburn upon completion of the first 200 homes. Clarence Stein, town planner and architect of Radburn, designed the station to harmonize with the surroundings of the greater Radburn community and to follow the “old Dutch Colonial architecture for which northern New Jersey was known.” The station’s sloping and overhanging gambrel roof, sprawling horizontal massing, and combination of stone walls and moulded woodwork continue today to echo the architecture of the region’s colonial farmhouses. The station served passengers between Suffern (outbound) and Hoboken (inbound), where connections could be made to downtown Manhattan and other points in the metropolitan region. As the suburbanization of Bergen County increased in the twentieth century, the number of daily trains stopping at Radburn increased from 5 in 1899, to 13 in 1938, and to 26 in 1980.⁸¹

The new Radburn station was illustrated in *The Building of the City* (1931), the second volume of the New York Regional Plan, in the chapter calling for the broad scale planning and unified development of transit facilities. Planner Thomas Adams wrote: “There is no part of the problem of communication which suffers so much from lack of broad scale planning and unified development as that which [is] related to suburban transit. That there should be easier access provided between Long Island and New Jersey, Long Island and Westchester, and between Westchester and New Jersey, or in other words around the centers of New York, has been urged by the most competent authorities and is part of the Regional Plan. The solution must be found, if intolerable future congestion of Manhattan is to be prevented.” To Stein, Adams, and the RPAA members, the new Radburn station not only represented a harmonious solution for merging country and suburb, but it also demonstrated that coordination between transportation carriers and suburban land developers was both possible and desirable.⁸²

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 48.

⁸¹ “New Fair Lawn Railway Station – Modern Structure to Cost \$60,000—Built to Harmonize with Radburn,” *Fair Lawn and Paramus Clarion*, 29 March 1929, p. 1; “Public Shows Marked Interest in Radburn Development—Convenient Means of Travel to New York to be Greatly Improved,” *Fair Lawn and Paramus Clarion*, 19 April 1929, p. 1 and 8, in *Radburn: A Photo History, 1929-2004*, a compact disk produced by residents of Radburn to commemorate the community’s 75th Anniversary, 2004. The station first appeared on the November 1929 plan, “Northwest and Southwest Residential Districts;” a year later the station building and grounds (having an automobile entrance off Fair Lawn Avenue, which was lined by trees on the south, and a parking lot to the west) appeared on the “Plan of the development completed by 1930” (reproduced in Stein fig. 26, p. 49). Richard Meyer, Radburn-Fair Lawn Station, National Register of Historic Places Inventory Form, 22 June 1984, in “Operating Passenger Railroad Stations in New Jersey TR.”

⁸² Quotation and photograph appeared in Adams, *The Building of the City*, 257.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 42

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Recreational opportunities and open space were important aspects of the Radburn Plan. Free time for recreation was a new concept enjoyed by middle class workers. Seen as an important component of healthy living, recreational space was designed to be an integral part of the interior parks at Radburn. Facilities including tennis courts, swimming pools, playgrounds, and a gymnasium at “The Grange” were provided to meet the recreational needs of residents. The Radburn Association, financed by an annual fee charged to property owners, maintained the facilities.

The interior parks central to each superbloc served the Radburn town planners in four ways: cost savings on improvements and safety, as already described, as a source of recreation and, most importantly, they provided a healthy, community-enhancing environment. Located along the center of each superbloc, the parkland was accessible to all of the houses on the surrounding cul-de-sacs. The City Housing Corporation set up the Radburn Association as a community-based governing group to facilitate deed restrictions, provide community services, and maintain community property. The Association also retained ownership of the community parkland. Thus, through the purchase of a small lot at an affordable price, residents had convenient, affordable access to the open space considered necessary for a healthy residence. Access to the qualities of fresh air and open space had been considered available only to wealthy families capable of purchasing the large lots associated with earlier suburban communities. At the same time, the parks and the community association were designed to encourage “neighborly interaction,” an important component of a healthy neighborhood.⁸³

Cost-savings, safety and quality of life were also addressed through the buildings of Radburn. Henry Wright had analyzed and confirmed the cost-savings of group housing at Sunnyside Gardens, specifically attached “group dwellings” and “garden apartments.”⁸⁴ However, housing at Radburn was primarily in the form of single-family houses that were either completely detached or connected to an adjoining house by a common garage wall. Lower-cost housing was provided by attached group dwellings that formed rows of four or more units and three-story apartment buildings. The decision to construct mostly single-family houses was based on the perceived preference of middle class families for the single-family dwelling, as well as a better chance at securing mortgage credit.⁸⁵ Savings were realized, however, through the large-scale construction of houses and utilities over a short period of time at Radburn.

The most unique aspect of the dwellings at Radburn was what has been called the “reverse-front” house (see attached plan showing cul-de-sac, reverse-front design, and attached and detached houses). The concept was to focus the living areas (living room, dining room, and bedrooms) of the house on the reposeful garden side, and the service areas (kitchen, laundry, and garage) on the street side. Wright described the function of his design, “the house with two fronts, one for convenient service, the other for peaceful living . . .”⁸⁶ The focus on the interior green enhanced the residents’ sense of having achieved genteel country living. This sense was further increased by architect Frederick Ackerman’s use of the Colonial Revival and Tudor Revival styles of architecture; with their fronts turned toward the central green, the image of a New England colonial town was unmistakable. Peter Rowe, in analyzing modern housing, described this image creation in architecture as “spatiotemporal masks,”

Allusions to other times and other eras, amid contemporary circumstances,

⁸³ Stein, *Toward New Towns for America*, 61.

⁸⁴ Wright, *Rehousing Urban America*, 31.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 42.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 54.

certainly blur the impact of the present, allowing notions of continuity to be reestablished and even traditional values to be reawakened.⁸⁷

In the rapidly changing world of the early twentieth century, the allusion to pre-industrial values was a real source of comfort. Despite increased middle class reliance and demand for technological improvements, yearning for a “simpler time” influenced the value placed on open-air, healthy environments and the return to living in “the country.” Yet the traditional charm of the colonial style houses and their unusual orientation did not come at the expense of the modern amenities the middle class had come to expect. Radburn houses were equipped with modern kitchens, laundry facilities, and integrated garages for convenience. The combination of atmosphere and amenities had long been available to the wealthy through their ability to pay the higher cost; Radburn was among the first developments to provide both quality setting and modern convenience so completely at a cost affordable to middle class working families.

The suggestion of genteel country living at Radburn was again made through the detailed landscape design of Marjorie Sewell Cautley. In her words, “it was the desire of the landscape designer to preserve for Radburn a part of the beautiful natural growth that is being destroyed so rapidly throughout northern New Jersey.”⁸⁸ Emphasis was on native plants and trees including azalea, viburnum, highbush blueberry, hawthorn, wild roses and asters, and dogwood, cedar, hemlock, oak and maple, many transplanted from the woods nearby, “so that when Radburn is a city of twenty-five thousand souls there will still be an echo of the woods and meadows upon which it was built.”⁸⁹ Plantings around the closely spaced houses were designed to increase privacy with tall shrubs and property-line hedges. Cautley hoped to provide through her house plantings an opportunity for additional variety:

...a different foliage scheme was planned for each garden group and for each motor street. Not only may a householder choose between brick and clapboard, six rooms or eight, but he may also select an orchard garden such as Arlington with round-leaved snowberry hedges, and round-leaved honeysuckle vines and bushes, or he may prefer to live in Bancroft in the shade of honeylocusts, mountain-ash, rose vines, and hedges of Vanhoutte spirea. The Ashburn walk will be arched overhead by sweet mockorange and flowering dogwood. Berkeley Place will bloom early with hawthorn and late with shrub-althea, while Audubon remains stiff and prim in a hedge of clipped privet.⁹⁰

The overall cost-savings achieved by the Radburn designers and emphasis on open space allowed for the inclusion of the kind of landscaping associated primarily with the homes of the wealthy upper class. The Radburn planners sought to ensure the continued maintenance of the carefully created atmosphere of the community. Rather than burden the community government with zoning restrictions, which they felt were expensive and ineffective, architectural, property line, open space, and landscaping controls were instead conveyed as part of the property deeds for Radburn. The “Declaration of Restrictions” was established in 1929 along with the creation of the Radburn Association, which administered the restrictions. Designed to protect atmosphere and appearance, this tool had been used previously by wealthy suburban communities.⁹¹ Having attracted considerable interest at the 1931 President’s

⁸⁷ Peter G. Rowe, *Modernity and Housing* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1993), 33.

⁸⁸ Marjorie Sewell Cautley, “Planting at Radburn,” *Landscape Architecture* 21, no. 1 (October 1930): 24.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 26-29.

⁹¹ Eugenie Ladner Birch, “Radburn and the American Planning Movement,” in *Introduction to Planning History*, ed. Krueckeberg, 133.

Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, deed restrictions (later called “restrictive covenants”) figured importantly in the FHA’s loan approval process, providing a mechanism that would ensure neighborhood stability in the absence of local subdivision regulations or comprehensive planning.⁹²

In 1935, Henry Wright wrote of the success of Radburn in attracting and holding the middle class families whose values the town plan had addressed through affordability; the safe integration of the automobile; the healthy, attractive open spaces; and modern houses with traditional charm.

So satisfied were they [Radburn residents] with their bargain that, when costs of new dwellings during the early part of the depression had fallen to a point where the residents might have sacrificed their purchase contract and moved elsewhere at an actual cost advantage, they remained for the simple reason that nowhere else could they have both a house and the community surroundings and advantages represented by the complete ‘Radburn Plan.’⁹³

The impact of the Radburn experiment spread throughout the United States almost immediately, reaching the average middle class American through the print media. *The Saginaw Daily News* ran an editorial on January 27, 1928 (two days after the Radburn town plan was announced) under the heading “Making Life Worth While,” which read,

It is a most interesting project and indicates just what modern traffic conditions are moving towards. Now it probably will be undertaken as a problem to be solved by automobilists how to break into Radburn; and there also is the possibility that the promoters of this most ingenious of schemes will have to build a mighty high and substantial fence to keep the millions from taking possession of the paradise intended for 25,000.⁹⁴

The New York Times noted on August 4, 1928:

This development is bound to be watched with interest by city planners the country over because it holds out so many hopes of a genuine advance in dealing with housing and other modern community problems. Schools, parks, playgrounds and safety are to come first, not last. The 1,200-acre tract is laid out in such a way as to give those who take up their residence there room to breathe and to enjoy life.⁹⁵

The cultural values of the American middle class, or what “made life worthwhile,” were implicit in the Radburn Idea. The excitement expressed in the newspapers about the possibilities for future, Radburn-like developments undoubtedly influenced subsequent planning. However, few later planned communities followed the Radburn Idea completely rather, they selectively drew from its key components.

Two planned communities that follow the Radburn Idea and achieved notable acclaim for their livability and their outstanding artistic design were Chatham Village in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (1932-1936), and Baldwin Hills Village (NHL) in Los Angeles, California (1941, with planning beginning in 1935). Not

⁹² FHA, *Planning Neighborhoods* (1940), 31-33.

⁹³ Wright, *Rehousing Urban America*, 46.

⁹⁴ From pamphlet “Regarding Radburn,” containing excerpts from newspaper editorials, produced by the City Housing Corporation, n.d., The Clarence Stein Collection, Rare Books and Manuscripts Collection, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 45

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

surprisingly, Stein and Wright were technical advisers at Chatham Village supervising local architects Ingham and Boyd, and landscape architects, Griswold and Kohankie as well as involving Allan Kamstra, Albert Lueders, and Frederick Ackerman of the RPAA; Stein similarly acted as consulting architect for Baldwin Hills Village, which was designed by local architects, Reginald D. Johnson and Wilson, Merrill and Alexander, and landscape architect Fred Barlow. Both communities utilized the superblock with a hierarchy of roads, interior parks with pedestrian paths, and houses turned inward on the parks and the service side toward the street. Attached group housing was used at great cost-savings at Chatham Village and Baldwin Hills, with the advantage of attracting lower-income residents. Although both communities were substantially smaller than Radburn, they both included spacious areas for parks and gardens and facilities for community activities, commerce, and recreation.

The first indication of national government interest in the ideals demonstrated at Radburn came at the President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, held in 1931. Henry Wright served on the Committee on Subdivision Layout. Among the committee's conclusions were a number of principles for future design:

- Select the site to meet specific needs, and to insure good access, good setting, public services, schools, parks, and neighborhood unity.
- Spaciousness is a primary principle in good subdivision layout.
- Design the subdivision to adjust all elements into a balanced plan, and to take advantage of topography, sunlight, natural features, and all sensible engineering and landscape development.
- New principles of design are working for economy, for much greater satisfaction and for the solution of many vexing problems.
- Protective covenants in the deeds are valuable for most subdivisions.⁹⁶

Clearly, the successful demonstration of these provisions at Radburn influenced a number of the committee's conclusions. More importantly, much of what was discussed at the 1931 President's Conference found its way into the development of the Federal Housing Administration guidelines and standards by the mid-1930s.

The Depression of the 1930s, so destructive to the City Housing Corporation and the cause of Radburn's incomplete plan, offered a unique opportunity to put many of the Radburn principles into use for lower income families. President Roosevelt's Resettlement Administration charged with the rehousing and occupation of displaced workers during the Depression, undertook the design and construction of the 'greenbelt' towns. Planned to number in the thousands, only three were actually completed due to local fears of government involvement in housing.⁹⁷ Again, Henry Wright and Clarence Stein were deeply involved in the planning of these American "new towns." Designed to approach the Garden City plan with a true 'belt' of green agricultural land which would be supported by the townspeople, Greenbelt, Maryland, the first and reportedly most complete of the greenbelt towns, closely followed the Radburn

⁹⁶ "The President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership. Tentative Report of the Committee on Subdivision Layout." December 3, 1931, box 3, file Dec. 3, 1931, The Henry Wright Papers (#2736), Rare Books and Manuscript Collection, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. The report specifically notes Radburn's protective restrictions and community administration.

⁹⁷ Lampl, "Greenbelt, Maryland Historic District," 26 and 30.

town plan.⁹⁸ According to Stein,

Greenbelt, for various reasons, carried out and developed the Radburn Idea more fully and completely than either of the other towns. It applied all the elements full-heartedly and with fresh approach rather than partially as at the other towns. It revealed its possibilities in some ways more clearly than Radburn.⁹⁹

Communities planned and constructed by the federal government sponsored Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) also drew upon elements of the Radburn Idea. The town of Norris, Tennessee, planned by Earle S. Draper, was particularly noted for its adaptation of interior parks, pedestrian walkways, and the underpass.¹⁰⁰

Changing middle class values as the United States emerged from the Depression and more dramatically following WWII, were reflected in the guidelines and standards for low and moderate income housing produced by the Federal Housing Administration in the late 1930s and into the 1940s. Influenced by some of the economic and health principles adopted at Radburn, FHA guidelines for *Planning Neighborhoods for Small Houses* (1936) adjusted those principles to the overriding need for financial stability (and profit potential) and the value placed on individual property ownership. Anti-communist sentiment in 1950s America contributed to rejection of anything that could be labeled “Communist,” “Socialist” or “Un-American.” Community ownership concepts, particularly the cooperative housing (communal ownership) and consumer cooperatives of Greenbelt, promoted fear of Communist influence and put an additional damper on that important community principle and cost-saving element of the Radburn Plan.¹⁰¹

Clarence Stein wrote in a 1955 article entitled “Cities to Come,”

The soundness of the principles of modern urban planning has been demonstrated in varied ways at Radburn, N.J.; Chatham Village, Pittsburgh; Greenbelt, Md.; Greendale, Wis.; Greenhills, Ohio; and Baldwin Hills Village, California. The RADBURN IDEA is also the basis of large-scale communities being built at Vallingby in Sweden, for 60,000; at Kitimat, British Columbia, for 50,000; and at the capital city of East Punjab, India – Chandigarh, and elsewhere... Each of these communities has a different form and character resulting from the purpose, place and people for which they were built, and the economic, social and political conditions under which they were created. But they are all united in carrying out the Radburn Idea.¹⁰²

Although Radburn’s designers focused on the role of the automobile in American society, they were certainly unaware of the eventual impact the auto would have on regional development. Unable to achieve self-sufficiency in employment, Radburn residents traveled by train and auto to New York City

⁹⁸ Ibid., 23 and 39.

⁹⁹ Stein, *Toward New Towns for America*, 127.

¹⁰⁰ Birch, “Radburn and the American Planning Movement,” in *Introduction to Planning History*, ed. Krueckeberg 132. First published in 1980 (*APA Journal* 46, no. 4), this article provides the most comprehensive discussion of the impact of the Radburn Idea on urban and suburban planning in the United States.

¹⁰¹ Lampl, “Greenbelt, Maryland Historic District,” 43.

¹⁰² Clarence S. Stein, “Cities to Come,” November 1, 1955, box 10, file 7, The Clarence Stein Collection, Rare Books and Manuscripts Collection, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 47

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

to work, foreshadowing the suburban bedroom community of today. Still, evidence of the continued Radburn influence on American community planning can be seen in the ‘new towns’ of Reston, Virginia; Columbia, Maryland; Jonathon, Minnesota; and Irvine, California,¹⁰³ and the growing interest in Planned Unit Developments and Master Planned Communities, reflecting a return of American cultural values to embracing the more “complete” planned community.

¹⁰³ Birch, “Radburn and the American Planning Movement,” in *Introduction to Planning History*, ed. Kruekeberg, 132.

9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Adams, Thomas. *The Design of Residential Areas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934.

_____. *The Building of the City*. Vol. 2, The Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs. New York Committee on the Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs, 1931.

_____. Part One: The Planning and Subdivision of Land, in "Problems of Planning Unbuilt Areas," Monograph Three, Vol. 7, *The Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs*, Neighborhood and Community Planning. New York Regional Plan Association, 1929.

Ames, David, and Linda Flint McClelland. *Historic Residential Suburbs: Guidelines for Evaluation and Documentation for the National Register of Historic Places*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2003.

_____. Historic Residential Suburbs in the United States, 1830 to 1960, MPS. Washington, DC: National Register of Historic Places, May 2004.

Birch, Eugenie Ladner. "Radburn and the American Planning Movement: The Persistence of an Idea." In *Introduction to Planning History in the United States*, ed. Donald A. Krueckeberg. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy, 1983. Also, in *APA Journal* 46, no. 4, (1980).

Birnbaum, Charles A., FASLA, and Robin Karson, eds. *Pioneers of American Landscape Design*. Washington, DC: McGraw-Hill, 2000.

Cautley, Marjorie Sewell, "Planting at Radburn," *Landscape Architecture* 21, no. 1 (October 1930): 23-29.

_____. *Garden Design: The Principles of Abstract Design as Applied to Landscape Composition*. New York, NY: Dodd Mead, 1935.

Churchill, Henry. "Henry Wright: 1878-1936." In *The American Planner: Biographies and Recollections*, ed. Donald A. Krueckeberg. 2d ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1994.

Creese, Walter L. *The Search for Environment – The Garden City Before and After*. Revised ed., Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Dahir, James. *The Neighborhood Unit Plan: Its Spread and Acceptance: A Selected Bibliography*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 1947.

Federal Housing Administration. *Planning Neighborhoods for Small Houses*. Technical Bulletin No. 5. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1936.

Garvin, Alexander. *The American City: What Works, What Doesn't*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1996.

Gillette, Howard, Jr. "The Evolution of Neighborhood Planning from the Progressive Era to the 1949 Housing Act." *Journal of Urban History* 9, no. 4 (August 1983): 421-44.

Girling, Cynthia L., and Kenneth I. Helphand. *Yard – Street – Park: The Design of Suburban Open Space*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, 1994.

- Gries, John M. and James Ford, eds. *Planning for Residential Districts*. Vol. 1, *President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership*. Washington, DC: National Capital Press, 1932.
- _____. eds. *House Design, Construction and Equipment*. Vol. 5, *President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership*. Washington, DC: National Capital Press, 1932.
- _____. eds. *Slums, Large-scale Operations, and Decentralization*. Vol. 3, *President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership*. Washington, DC: National Capital Press, 1932.
- Krueckeberg, Donald A., ed. *Introduction to Planning History in the United States*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy, 1983.
- _____. *The American Planner: Biographies and Recollections*. 2d ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research, 1994.
- Knepper, Cathy. *Greenbelt, Maryland: A Living Legacy of the New Deal*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, n.d.
- Longstreth, Richard W. *Drive-ins, Supermarkets, and the Transformation of Commercial Space in Los Angeles, 1914-41*. Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1999.
- Lubove, Roy. *Community Planning in the 1920s: The Contribution of the Regional Planning Association of America*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963.
- _____. "The Roots of American Planning," *The Urban Community: Housing and Planning in the Progressive Era*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- MacKaye, Benton. *The New Exploration: A Philosophy of Regional Planning*. 1928. Reprint, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1962.
- McClelland, Linda Flint. "Gardens for Suburbia – The Colonial Revival, Community Planning, and the National Housing Act of 1934," unpublished paper, presented at the Colonial Revival in America Conference, Charlottesville, Virginia, 17 November 2000.
- Mather, Alan. "Henry Wright." *Pencil Points*, no. 21 (January 1940).
- Parsons, Kermit Carlyle, ed. *The Writings of Clarence S. Stein, Architect of the Planned Community*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- _____. "The Collaborative Genius: The Regional Planning Association of America," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 60, no. 4 (Autumn 1994): 462-82.
- _____. "Clarence Stein and the Greenbelt Towns: Settling for Less," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 56, no. 2 (Spring 1990): 161-183.
- Perry, Clarence A. *Housing for the Machine Age*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 1939.
- _____. "The Neighborhood Unit," Monograph One. Vol. 7, *Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs*, Neighborhood and Community Planning. New York: New York Regional Plan, 1929.
- Rowe, Peter G. *Making a Middle Landscape*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1991.
- _____. *Modernity and Housing*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1993.
- Schaffer, Daniel. *Garden Cities for America: The Radburn Experience*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1982.
- Scott, Mel. *American City Planning Since 1890*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press,

1971.

Stein, Clarence S. *Toward New Towns for America*. New York, NY: Reinhold Publishing Corporation, 1957.

Sussman, Carl. *Planning the Fourth Migration: The Neglected Vision of the Regional Planning Association of America*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1976.

The Clarence Stein Collection. Division of Rare Books and Manuscripts Collections. Kroch Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

The Henry Wright Papers. Division of Rare Books and Manuscripts Collections. Kroch Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

The Radburn Association. "Declaration of Restrictions No. 1 Affecting Radburn, Property of City Housing Corporation"(1929), "Guidelines of Architectural Control"(1997), historic photographs, and other miscellaneous information, Louise Orlando, Manager, 2000.

Thomas, John L. "Lewis Mumford, Benton MacKaye, and the Regional Vision." In *The American Planner: Biographies and Recollections*, ed. Donald A. Krueckeberg, 2d ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1994.

Unwin, Raymond. *Town-Planning in Practice: An Introduction to the Art of Designing Cities and Suburbs*. 1919. Reprint, New York, NY: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999.

Wheeler, Dan H. *General Index to the Final Reports of the President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership*. Washington, DC: The President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, 1933.

Whitten, Robert, and Thomas Adams. *Neighborhoods of Small Houses*. Harvard City Planning Studies, III, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.

Withey, Henry F., and Elsie Rathburn Withey. *Biographical Dictionary of American Architects*. Detroit: Omnigraphics, 1996.

Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the Dream – A Social History of Housing in America*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1981.

Wright, Henry. *Rehousing Urban America*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1935.

National Register and National Historic Landmark Documents

Author unknown. "Greenbelt Historic District," National Register of Historic Places Nomination. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1980.

Baker, Gail H. "Fairlington Historic District," National Register of Historic Places Nomination. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1998.

Di Geronimo, Louis A. "Radburn" National Register of Historic Places Nomination. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1974.

Lampl, Elizabeth Jo. "Greenbelt, Maryland Historic District," National Historic Landmark Nomination. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1996.

Vater, David. "Chatham Village Historic District," National Register of Historic Places Nomination. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1998.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 51

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

Wong, Dorothy Fue. "Baldwin Hills Village," National Historic Landmark Nomination.
Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service 2000.

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

- Preliminary Determination of Individual Listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.
 Previously Listed in the National Register.
 Previously Determined Eligible by the National Register.
 Designated a National Historic Landmark.
 Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey: #
 Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record: #

Primary Location of Additional Data:

- State Historic Preservation Office
 Other State Agency
 Federal Agency
 Local Government
 University
 Other (Specify Repository):

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Acreage of Property: Approximately 153 acres

UTM References: **Zone Easting Northing**

A	18	574320	4533140
B	18	575140	4531840
C	18	574080	4532920
D	18	575140	4531840

Verbal Boundary Description:

The Radburn district boundary begins at the NE corner of the intersection of Radburn Ave. and Owen Ave., running west along the north side of Owen Ave. to Plaza Rd., North, crossing to the west side of said road running west along the northern boundary of 352 Plaza Rd. North to the west side of Plaza Lane, turning south along the railroad right-of-way to the SW corner of the Radburn tennis courts, then turning east to the west side of Plaza Rd., North, then turning south following said road to the NW corner of the intersection with Fair Lawn Ave., then running west along the north side of Fair Lawn Ave. to the SE corner of the outbound platform of the New Jersey Transit's Radburn-Fair Lawn Passenger Station, then proceeding north along the east side of

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 52

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

the outbound platform, to the NE corner of the said platform, then running west and crossing the railroad tracks to the east side of the inbound platform, then running north to the NE corner of the inbound platform, then turning west and south following the perimeter of the inbound platform until it reaches a point 10 feet from the NE corner of the station building, then running west to intersect with the parking curb near the NW corner of said building, then following the curb south along the west elevation of said building to the boundary between the New Jersey Transit property and the adjoining office building, then following the New Jersey Transit property line east and south along the western edge of the landscaped area, then crossing Fair Lawn Ave. to a point opposite the SW corner of said property, then running east along the south side of Fair Lawn Ave. to the SW intersection with Plaza Rd., then turning south along the west side of Plaza Rd., South, and continuing to the NE corner of 13-26 Plaza Rd. South, then turning west along the northern boundary of said lot to the NW corner, then turning south along the western boundary lines of 13-26 through 13-16 Plaza Rd., South, to the NE corner of the vacant industrial site (formerly Radburn Brick Supply and Hayward Industries), then turning west and running to the railroad right-of-way, then turning south along said right-of-way to the SW corner of Radburn's Daly Field, then turning east along the southern boundary of said field to the west side of Plaza Rd., South, then turning north along said road to a point opposite the south side of Ramsey Terrace, then turning east crossing Plaza Rd., South, following the south side of Ramsey Terrace to the east side of the intersection with Ryder Rd., then turning south following the east side of said road to the north side of the intersection with Rutgers Terrace, then turning east following the north side of Rutgers Terrace to the intersection with Sandford Rd., then turning north following the west side of said road to the intersection with Warren Rd., then turning east following the south side of Warren Rd., then turning north to the east side of Sandford Rd. (north extension) and following said road to the SW corner of the telephone company lot (27-02 Fair Lawn Ave.), then following the southern and eastern boundaries to the NE corner of said lot on the south side of Fair Lawn Ave., then turning east along said avenue to the NW corner of the Radburn Grange Hall lot (29-20 Fair Lawn Ave.) and following the west, south, and eastern boundaries to the NE corner of said lot on the south side of Fair Lawn Ave., then crossing said avenue to the NE corner of the intersection with Radburn Rd. and continuing north along the east side of Radburn Rd. to the place of beginning.

Boundary Justification:

The Radburn NHL District boundary is defined by the roads designed and laid out by the City Housing Corporation, prior to its bankruptcy in 1934. Although the boundary includes a large number of noncontributing resources constructed after 1934, the roads designed for specific traffic uses and the blocks defined by those roads, are character-defining features of the Radburn Plan and are therefore included in the boundaries. Aerial photographs and plans (ca. 1930) have been consulted to determine the extent of the planned roads that were actually constructed and thereby define the district boundary. The boundary extends west of the district to encompass the Radburn-Fair Lawn Passenger Railroad Station, which was part of the 1930 plan for Radburn and built by the Erie Railroad in 1929-1930 to provide commuter service for Radburn residents. The station is integral to the RPAA's vision for Radburn as a satellite garden community. It also signifies the advent of commuter service in suburban New Jersey in conjunction with regional planning efforts for the greater New York metropolitan area. The boundary around the station has been drawn to include the two train platforms, intervening tracks, station building, and a landscaped area to the south of the station which has historically connected the station to Fair Lawn Avenue and provided access to the Radburn community. Although parking was integral to the station's design and purpose, the parking lot is excluded from the boundary because reconfigured and expanded since the period of significance, it no longer possesses historic integrity.

RADBURN

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Page 53

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

11. FORM PREPARED BY

Name/Title: Edith B. Wallace, Research Associate, and Paula S. Reed, PhD, Architectural Historian
Paula S. Reed and Associates, Inc., with Linda Flint McClelland, National Register, History and
Education

Address: One West Franklin Street, Suite 300
Hagerstown, MD 21740

Telephone: 301-739-2070

Date: 25 June 2001, Revised July, 2001, Revised June 2004

Edited by: Linda F. McClelland, Historian, National Register of Historic Places
National Park Service
National Historic Landmarks Program
1849 C Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20240

Telephone: (202) 354-2258

DESIGNATED A NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK
April 5, 2005

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
Park B, along Howard Ave.	swimming pool	concrete	c. 1930	1	-
Park B, along Howard Ave.	pool house	brick	c. 1930	1	-
18-00 Radburn Rd.	school	Institutional Classical Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
19-08 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
19-12 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
19-20 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
20-02 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
20-06 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
20-08 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
20-14 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
3-85 Owen Ave.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
2 Barry Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
6 Barry Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
8 Barry Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
10 Barry Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
12 Barry Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
14 Barry Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
17 Barry Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
15 Barry Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
11 Barry Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
9 Barry Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
7 Barry Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
5 Barry Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
1 Barry Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
2 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
4 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
6 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
8 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
10 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
12 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
14 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-

Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
16 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c.1930	1	-
17 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
15 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
11 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
9 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
7 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
5 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
3 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
1 Ballard Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
2 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
4 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
6 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
8 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
10 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
12 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
14 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
15 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
11 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
9 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
7 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
5 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
3 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
1 Bristol Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
2 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
4 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
6 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
8 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
10 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
12 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
14 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
16 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
15 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
11 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
9 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
7 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
5 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
3 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
1 Bedford Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
2 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
4 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
6 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
8 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
10 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
12 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
14 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
16 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
18 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
17 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
15 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
11 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
9 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
7 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
5 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
3 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
1 Beekman Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
347 Owen Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
3-45 Owen Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
343 Owen Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
341 Owen Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
2 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
4 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
6 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
8 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
10 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
12 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
14 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
16 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
11A Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
11 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
9 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
7 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
5 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
3 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
1 Bolton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
3-35 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1930	1	-
352 A-B through 346 A-B Plaza Rd. North	Multiple-family group dwelling	Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
344 A-B through 338 A-B Plaza Rd. North	Multiple-family group dwelling	Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
336 A-B/334 A-B Plaza Rd. North	Multiple-family duplex	Revival, brick	c. 1929	1	-
332 A-B/330 A-B Plaza Rd. North	Multiple-family duplex	Revival, brick	c. 1929	1	-
328 A-B/326 A-B Plaza Rd. North	Multiple-family duplex	Revival, brick	c. 1929	1	-
324 A-B/322 A-B Plaza Rd. North	Multiple-family duplex	Revival, brick	c. 1929	1	-
318 A-B/320 A-B Plaza Rd. North	Multiple-family duplex	Revival, brick	c. 1929	1	-
Foster Garage/Condominium Complex	apartments	Modern Colonial Revival, brick	2000	-	1
Radburn Tennis Courts	recreational facility	-	c. 1929	1	-
3-33 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
331 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
2 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
4 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
6 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
8 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
10 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
12 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
14 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
13 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
11 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
9 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
7 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
5 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
3 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
1 Burnham Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
325 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
323 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
321 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
319 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
4 Brighton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
6 Brighton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
8 Brighton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
10 Brighton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
12 Brighton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
14 Brighton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
13 Brighton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
11 Brighton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
9 Brighton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
7 Brighton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
5 Brighton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
3 Brighton Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
317 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
315 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
313 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
311 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
309 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
307 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
305 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
303 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
300 Plaza Rd. North	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
302 Howard Ave. (Brearly Crescent)	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
4 Brearly Crescent	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
6 Brearly Crescent	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
8 Brearly Crescent	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
10 Brearly Crescent	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
12 Brearly Crescent	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
14 Brearly Crescent	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
16 Brearly Crescent	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
18 Brearly Crescent	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
316 Howard Ave. (Brearly Crescent)	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
11 Brearly Crescent	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
308 Howard Ave.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
312 Howard Ave.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
318 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
2 Burlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
4 Burlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
6 Burlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
8 Burlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
10 Burlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
12 Burlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
13 Burlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
11 Burlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
9 Burlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
7 Burlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
5 Burlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
3 Burlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
1 Burlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
324 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
326 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
328 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
4 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
6 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
8 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
10 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
12 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
14 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
16 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
18 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
17 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
15 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
13 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
11 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
9 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
7 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
5 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
3 Bancroft Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
330 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
332 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
334 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
2 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
4 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
6 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
8 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
10 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
12 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
14 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
16 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
15 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
13 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
11 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
9 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
7 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
3 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
1 Berkeley Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
340 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
351 Howard Ave.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
343 Howard Ave.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
Howard Ave.	pedestrian underpass	concrete with stone inlay	c. 1929	1	-
341 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
2 Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
4 Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
6 Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
8 Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
10 Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
12 Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
14 Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
11A Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
11 Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
9 Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
7 Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
5 Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
3 Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
1 Allen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
335 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
333 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
2 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
4 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
6 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
8 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
10 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
12 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
14 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
16 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
18 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
17 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
15 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
11A Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
11 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
9 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
7 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
5 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
3 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
1 Aberdeen Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
327 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
325 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
2 Arlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
4 Arlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
6 Arlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
8 Arlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
10 Arlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
12 Arlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
14 Arlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
11 Arlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
9 Arlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
7 Arlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
5 Arlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
3 Arlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
1 Arlington Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
319 Howard Ave.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
2 Ashburn Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
4 Ashburn Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
6 Ashburn Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
8 Ashburn Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
10 Ashburn Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
9 Ashburn Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
7 Ashburn Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
5 Ashburn Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
3 Ashburn Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
1 Ashburn Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
Eldorado Village Apts, Abbott Rd. North (formerly Abbott Court Apts), North Bldg A,B,C,D	apartments	Tudor/Gothic Revival,brick	c. 1929	1	-
Eldorado Village Apts, Abbott Rd. North (formerly Abbott Court Apts), South Bldg E,F,G,H	apartments	Tudor/Gothic Revival,brick	c. 1929	1	-
2316-2304 Howard Ave./1525-1503 Plaza Rd./2305 High St.	multiple-family dwelling	garden apartments, brick	c.1955	-	1
2311-2415 High St.	multiple-family dwelling	garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1
1506/1510 Abbott Rd. North	duplex	brick	c. 1955	-	1
1514/1518 Abbott Rd. North	duplex	brick	c. 1955	-	1
1522/1526 Abbott Rd. North	duplex	brick	c. 1955	-	1
2 Audubon Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
4 Audubon Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
6 Audubon Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
8 Audubon Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
10 Audubon Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
9 Audubon Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
7 Audubon Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
5 Audubon Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
3 Audubon Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
1 Audubon Place	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1929	1	-
2701 High St.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
2 Addison Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
4 Addison Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
6 Addison Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
8 Addison Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
10 Addison Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
11 Addison Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
9 Addison Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
7 Addison Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
5 Addison Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
3 Addison Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
1 Addison Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
2 Andover Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
4 Andover Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
6 Andover Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
8 Andover Place	dwelling	Bungalow	c. 1940	-	1
10 Andover Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
12 Andover Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
14 Andover Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
11 Andover Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
9 Andover Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
7 Andover Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
5 Andover Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
3 Andover Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
1 Andover Place	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1940	-	1
2825 High St.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1510 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1514 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1518 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1522 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1606 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1610 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1614 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1618 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1622 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1626 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1702 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1706 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
1710 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1714 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1715 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1711 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1707 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1703 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1627 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1623 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1619 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1615 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1611 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1607 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1523 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1519 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1515 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1511 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1507 Alden Terrace	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
2911 High St.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1506 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1510 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1514 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1518 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1522 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1604 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1608 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1612 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1616 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1620 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1624 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1628 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1702 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1706 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1710 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
1714 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
2910 Howard Ave.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
2914 High St.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
2910 High St.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
2906 High St.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
2902 High St.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
2816 High St.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1419 Craig Rd.	dwelling	rancher	c. 1955	-	1
1411 Craig Rd.	dwelling	rancher	c. 1955	-	1
1407 Craig Rd.	dwelling	rancher	c. 1955	-	1
2805 Fair Lawn Ave.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
2809 Fair Lawn Ave.	dwelling	Late Colonial Revival	c. 1955	-	1
2815 Fair Lawn Ave.	dwelling	Moderne	c. 1960	-	1
2903 Fair Lawn Ave.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
2907 Fair Lawn Ave.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
2911 Fair Lawn Ave.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
2915 Fair Lawn Ave.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1406 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
1410 Radburn Rd.	dwelling	split-level, frame	c. 1955	-	1
United Methodist Church	church	Gothicized, brick	1948	-	1
2702 High St.	parish hall	institutional, brick	c. 1960	-	1
2701 Fair Lawn Ave.	parsonage	Late Victorian, frame	c. 1900	-	1
2610-2605 Fair Lawn Ave.	multiple-family dwelling	garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1
2531 Fair Lawn Ave.	multiple-family dwelling	garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1
2515 Fair Lawn Ave.	office building	beige brick	c. 1980	-	1
2503 Fair Lawn Ave./1410-1414 Abbott Rd. North/2502 High St.	multiple-family dwelling	garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1
2512-2604 High St.	multiple-family dwelling	garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
2602 High St.	multiple-family dwelling	garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1
2608-2612 High St.	multiple-family dwelling	garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1
1424 Abbott Rd. North	Post Office	institutional, brick	c. 1955	-	1
2421-2411 Fair Lawn Ave.	commercial, retail	shopping strip, brick	c. 1955	-	1
2407 Fair Lawn Ave.	restaurant	Dutch vernacular farmhouse, stone and frame	c. 1790	-	1
2359-2351 Fair Lawn Ave.	commercial, retail	shopping strip, brick	c. 1955	-	1
Plaza Building, 1401 Plaza Rd. North	commercial, retail	Colonial Revival, brick and cast stone	c. 1929	1	-
2302-2412/2420-2428 Fair Lawn Ave.	commercial, retail	shopping strip, brick	c. 1960	-	1
1363-1367 Abbott Rd. South/2502-2506 Fair Lawn Ave.	multiple-family dwelling	Georgian Revival, garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1
2510-2520 Fair Lawn Ave.	multiple-family dwelling	Georgian Revival, garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1
2522-2620 Fair Lawn Ave./1366 Sandford Rd.	multiple-family dwelling	Georgian Revival, garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1
1360-1356 Sandford Rd./2631-2627 Warren Rd.	multiple-family dwelling	Georgian Revival, garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1
2623-2615 Warren Rd.	multiple-family dwelling	Georgian Revival, garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
2609-2601 Warren Rd.	multiple-family dwelling	Georgian Revival, garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1
2519-2501 Warren Rd./1359 Abbott Rd. South	multiple-family dwelling	Georgian Revival, garden apartments, brick	c. 1955	-	1
2702 Fair Lawn Ave.	commercial, office	Art Deco, brick	c. 1920	1	-
Radburn Association, 2920 Fair Lawn Ave.	office/recreational	?, frame	?	1	-
21 Sandford Rd.	dwelling	two-story frame	c. 1955	-	1
23 Sandford Rd.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	-
25 Sandford Rd.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	
27 Sandford Rd.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	
29 Sandford Rd.	dwelling	Col. Revival	c. 1933	1	
31 Sandford Rd.	dwelling	Cape Cod, frame	c. 1940	-	1
33 Sandford Rd.	dwelling	Cape Cod, frame	c. 1940	-	1
35 Sandford Rd.	dwelling	Cape Cod, frame	c. 1940	-	1
37 Sandford Rd.	dwelling	Cape Cod, frame	c. 1940	-	1
39 Sandford Rd.	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
16 Rutgers Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
14 Rutgers Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
12 Rutgers Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
10 Rutgers Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
8 Rutgers Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
6 Rutgers Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
4 Rutgers Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
8 Ryder Rd.	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
17 Ramsey Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
19 Ramsey Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
Park R	swimming pool	concrete	c. 1933	1	-
Park R	pool house	brick	c. 1933	1	-
20 Ramsey Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
18 Ramsey Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
16 Ramsey Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
14 Ramsey Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
12 Ramsey Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
10 Ramsey Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
8 Ramsey Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
6 Ramsey Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
4 Ramsey Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
2 Ramsey Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
1 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
3 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
5 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
7 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
9 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
11 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
13 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
15 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
17 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
19 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
21 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
10 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1933	1	-
12 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1933	1	-
14 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1933	1	-
16 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1933	1	-
18 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1933	1	-
20 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1933	1	-

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
2-4 Randolph Terrace	multiple-family duplex	Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
6-12 Randolph Terrace	Multiple-family group dwelling	Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
14-20 Randolph Terrace	Multiple-family group dwelling	Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
22-24 Randolph Terrace	multiple-family duplex	Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
23-21 Randolph Terrace	multiple-family duplex	Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
19-11A Randolph Terrace	Multiple-family group dwelling	Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
11-5 Randolph Terrace	Multiple-family group dwelling	Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
3-1 Randolph Terrace	multiple-family duplex	Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
2-4 Reading Terrace	multiple-family duplex	Revival, frame	c. 1930	1	-
6-12 Reading Terrace	Multiple-family group dwelling	Revival, frame	c. 1930	1	-
14-20 Reading Terrace	Multiple-family group dwelling	Revival, frame	c. 1930	1	-
22-24 Reading Terrace	multiple-family duplex	Revival, frame	c. 1930	1	-
23-21 Reading Terrace	multiple-family duplex	Revival, frame	c. 1930	1	-
19-13 Reading Terrace	Multiple-family group dwelling	Revival, frame	c. 1930	1	-
11-5 Reading Terrace	Multiple-family group dwelling	Revival, frame	c. 1930	1	-
3-1 Reading Terrace	multiple-family duplex	Revival, frame	c. 1930	1	-

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
2-8 Townley Rd.	Multiple-family group dwelling	Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
10-16 Townley Rd.	Multiple-family group dwelling	Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
18-24 Townley Rd.	Multiple-family group dwelling	Revival, brick	c. 1930	1	-
4 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
2 Ramapo Terrace	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
1301 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
1305 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
1309 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
1315 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
1317 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
1319 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
1321 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Colonial Revival, frame	c. 1940	-	1
1306 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Cape Cod, brick	c. 1950	-	1
1308 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Cape Cod, brick	c. 1950	-	1
1310 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Cape Cod, brick	c. 1950	-	1
1312 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Cape Cod, brick	c. 1950	-	1
1314 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Cape Cod, brick	c. 1950	-	1
1316 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Bungalow	c. 1940	-	1
1318 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Bungalow	c. 1940	-	1
1320 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Bungalow	c. 1940	-	1
1322 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Bungalow	c. 1940	-	1

**Radburn NHL District
Borough of Fair Lawn
Bergen Co., NJ**

Resource Count

<u>Address</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Style & Description</u>	<u>Construction Date</u>	<u># Contributing Resources</u>	<u># Non-contributing Resources</u>
1324 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Bungalow	c. 1940	-	1
1326 Plaza Rd. South	dwelling	Bungalow	c. 1940	-	1
Radburn-Fair Lawn Passenger Station	train station	Colonial Revival, frame and stone	1930	1	
Plaza Rd. South	industrial site	-	c. 1928	1	-
Radburn	site plan	-	c. 1928	1	-
TOTALS=	-	-	-	320	188