

INTRODUCTION

*An historic resources evaluation of all the existing structures on the project site was conducted to identify if any of these structures represent historic resources under national, state or local standards. This section addresses the presence of historic resources on the project site that could be affected by implementation of the proposed project and discusses potential impacts and available mitigation. This section incorporates information from a report prepared by San Buenaventura Research Associates titled, Historic Resources Evaluation – Glendale Town Center Project, dated December 2003 contained in **Appendix 4.9**. In addition, this section relied on the a report prepared by Myra L Frank and Associates titled – Glendale: Pacific Park/Edison School Project, Glendale, dated November 19, 1995, and a report prepared by Mellon and Associates – Historic Resources Evaluation for City of Glendale Former Fire Station # 21, 210 S. Orange Street, Glendale, California, dated August 2000.*

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Existing Conditions

Historic Context

The Spanish government employed a three-part colonization system in Alta California, which was composed of missions, presidios and pueblos, representing the clerical, military and civilian elements of colonial rule, respectively. Mission San Gabriel, founded in 1771, was the member of the mission chain located nearest to the present City of Glendale. In 1784 a Spanish soldier, Jose Maria Verdugo, posted at San Gabriel, was granted the 36,000-acre tract of land known as Rancho San Rafael. Verdugo, like most of his contemporaries, utilized the land for low-intensity agriculture, such as cattle ranching and dry farming. The decline of Rancho San Rafael began in 1855, as the Verdugo heirs fell prey to the factors besetting many Californians of the time, which included debt and drought. Official Statehood in 1850 also hastened the end of, what was referred to as, the Californio Era.

A period of intense land speculation in Southern California followed the completion of the first Los Angeles link to the transcontinental railroad in 1876, culminating in the land rush of 1886-1888, commonly known as the “Boom of the ‘80s”. The prodigious development efforts of the Southern Pacific Railroad along their new routes provided much of the impetus for producing the speculative optimistic bubble, which burst in 1889, leaving many of the new town sites virtually unpopulated. The Glendale Tract, recorded in 1887, was typical of the Southern California development schemes implemented

during this period. A joint project of a small number of land speculators, the tract featured a palatial hotel, but boasted only a handful of residences when the boom collapsed. The future of the community of Tropic, also founded in 1887 a few miles to the south of Glendale, appeared somewhat more favorable, having received a Southern Pacific depot. Despite this fortuitous event in its early history, Tropic would eventually be absorbed into its sister city, Glendale, to the north.

The completion of an interurban streetcar connection to Los Angeles in 1904 was to prove critical to the revival of Glendale's promise, and it marked the emergence of Leslie C. Brand as a central figure in the city's development. An aggressive businessman, Brand not only actively pursued the streetcar link, but also secured his personal fortune by obtaining control of land adjacent to the Brand Boulevard route. The location of the new streetcar station at Brand Boulevard and Fourth Street (Broadway) also served to redirect the City's growth towards the Brand Boulevard axis to the west of the existing downtown—a realignment that left much of the earlier commercial district at a decided disadvantage. The arrival of interurban streetcar service, later incorporated into the huge Pacific Electric system, played a vital role in establishing Glendale as a commuter suburb of Los Angeles. Glendale's spectacular residential and commercial growth during the ensuing decade resulted in the City's incorporation in 1906 and a merger with the City of Tropic in 1918; a consolidation that both testified to the boundless ambitions of Glendale's promoters and hastened the demise of Tropic as a recognizably separate settlement.

The sustained, regional economic boom of the 1920s was to be Glendale's coming of age. The center of the City's commercial district, now centered on Brand Boulevard and Broadway, supported a steadily growing number of commercial, civic and social institutions. The prosperity of the 1920s coincided with the introduction of new construction technologies, thus increasing the practicality of constructing "high-rise" buildings of 3 or more stories. Architectural tastes also evolved from the Neoclassical and Italian Renaissance-inspired themes to the more regionally derived Spanish Colonial Revival Styles, and finally to variants of the Moderne Style. By the close of the 1920s, downtown Glendale mirrored Southern California's social, economic and architectural trends as comprehensively as any community in the region.

Research and Field Inventory

The data sources utilized in identifying and assessing historic resources include a review of previous historic resources surveys, as well as the National Register of Historic Places, California Historical Resource Inventory, and City of Glendale Register of Historic Resources. In addition, ordinances, statutes, regulations, bulletins, technical material related to Federal, State, and local historic preservation and design, and assessment procedures were reviewed. Site-specific research on potential historic

resources was also conducted to determine the original date of construction, subsequent alterations, the architect, the builder, and owners. Further data sources utilized were Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, Los Angeles County Assessor Records, and City directories. Additional research conducted included site inspections of the project area and photography of potential historic resources. In analyzing the historic and architectural significance of potential historic resources in the study area, the criteria for eligibility and designation under Federal, State, and local landmark programs were applied.

San Buenaventura Research Associates conducted an historic structures inventory of buildings on the project site. **Table 4.9-1, Properties Evaluated**, presents a list of the properties evaluated and the dates of construction for each. A description of each property follows the table.

**Table 4.9-1
Properties Evaluated**

Property Address	Year(s) Constructed
126 to 130 South Central Avenue	1964/1977/1979
200 South Central Avenue	1967
129 to 131 South Orange Street	1925
133 to 137 South Orange Street	1947
136 South Orange Street	ca. 1934/1948
205 to 207 South Orange Street	1948
210 South Orange Street	1929/1958
213 South Orange Street	1935
217 South Orange Street	1966
224 to 226 South Orange Street	1946
129 to 133 South Brand Boulevard	1921
135 South Brand Boulevard	1921
201 South Brand Boulevard	1919
205 to 207 South Brand Boulevard	1922
217 South Brand Boulevard	1921
219 South Brand Boulevard	1920
221 to 223 South Brand Boulevard	1922
225 South Brand Boulevard	1923
233 South Brand Boulevard	1921
243 to 245 South Brand Boulevard	1967
200 West Harvard Street	1948
201 to 205 West Harvard Street	1946/1948
206 West Harvard Street	1945
208 West Harvard Street	ca. 1948

126 to 130 South Central Avenue. This is a 1-story masonry commercial building with a flat roof set back from the street behind a parking lot. It is rectangular in plan and consists of a continuous storefront on the western elevation covered by a stucco-clad overhang supported by square posts. The other elevations

are essentially featureless. It was constructed in 1964 as a national chain pharmacy and appears to have been substantially altered in 1977 and 1979. No architect is known. (refer to Photo 1 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

200 South Central Avenue. This 1-story automobile service station consists of a single-story building that features a low-pitched gable roof and two detached, gable-roofed, freestanding canopies over the pump islands. It was constructed in 1967 as a Union 76 Station, and it appears to be essentially unaltered. No architect is known. (refer to Photo 2 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

129 to 131 South Orange Street. This small, 1-story, brick building consists of two inset storefronts divided by a brick column. A flat roof is concealed behind a low parapet that features a modestly expressed cornice line. The storefronts are largely covered by plywood panels, but they appear to feature low brick bulkheads and transom windows. This building was constructed in 1925 as a commercial office building. With the exception of the covered storefronts, it appears to be unaltered. No architect is known. (refer to Photo 3 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

133 to 137 South Orange Street. This essentially featureless 1-story brick commercial building consists of five storefronts, each consisting of plate glass windows above plastered bulkheads and wood doors with single glass panels. A metal canopy projects from the upper facade of the building. The building was constructed in 1947 as a commercial office building. Apart from the metal canopy, it appears to be unaltered. No architect is known. (refer to Photo 4 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

136 South Orange Street. This 1-story building features a slightly inset storefront consisting of aluminum windows and a single aluminum door. A low parapet is scored with reveals to form two rows of square panels and the corners of the street elevation are similarly scored, presumably to imitate quoins. The western-most portion of this building appears to have been constructed of plastered masonry in 1948 for a light industrial operation. The rear portion of the building, adjacent to the alley, is constructed of exposed common brick and was probably built around 1934. It housed several automotive-related businesses. The storefront appears to be substantially altered. No architect is known. (refer to Photo 5 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

205 to 207 South Orange Street. This single-story commercial building, constructed of common brick, features two storefronts. The southern storefront consists of four vertical glass plates on a low Roman brick bulkhead and a wooden door with a transom window above. The northern storefront features a somewhat higher bulkhead of Roman brick and glass plates angled out slightly over the sidewalk. Both storefronts are covered by a projecting canopy edged with horizontal reveals. A large pylon sign is

attached to the roof and canopy to the north. Constructed in 1948 as an insurance agent's office, this building is a modest example of the Streamline Moderne Style combined with a vernacular interpretation of the International Style. It appears to be unaltered. No architect is known. (refer to Photo 6 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

210 South Orange Street. This 2- and 3-story, plaster-over-brick fire station building consists of eight bays oriented towards Orange Street. The northernmost bay is the street entrance, consisting of double-aluminum doors with a blind transom above; the southern seven bays feature multi-paned roll up garage doors separated by darkly colored columns. Above the five northernmost bays are deeply inset multi-paned windows, and centered above is a 3rd-story featuring three similar windows. A band of aluminum windows is located on the 2nd-story above the southern three bays. The northern elevation features a ground floor sally port enclosed in chain link fencing materials and a number of small windows on the 2nd-floor level above. On the northern side, located at the northeastern corner of the building is a 5-story practice tower with an exterior fire escape. (refer to Photo 7 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

This building was constructed in 1929 by the City of Glendale as the City's central fire station and department headquarters, and it is known as Fire Station Number 21. As originally built, the building consisted of three, 3-story bays flanked by two, 2-story bays expressed by prominent pilasters that terminate into pointed finial caps. Originally the central bay was somewhat higher with its two flanking bays producing a wedding cake effect. The building also featured wide cornice belts displaying geometrical designs at the 2nd- and 3rd-floor levels. The street level featured four fire engine bays with arched opening. The building surface was plastered. The windows were multi-paned steel casements. The building was designed by George M. Linsey and constructed by C.A. Schweissinger, Jr. As originally constructed, the fire station was a very good representative example of the pre-Modern architectural style known as Zig-Zag Moderne.

The City renovated Fire Station Number 21 in 1958. This renovation resulted in a substantial alteration of the existing building. The building's main elevation was vastly simplified by extending the front of the building outwards, in the direction of the street, by perhaps 1 or 2 feet, covering the decorative facade with plaster and deeply inseting the windows, lowering the central bay to match the height of the two adjacent bays and removing the finials. Additionally, the arched engine bay openings were made rectangular. A 2-story addition was made to the south, creating three new engine bays. The architect for the remodeling was Graham Latta of Glendale, who also designed several other public buildings in Glendale during this time period. Through this alteration, the primary emphasis of the design was

changed from vertical to horizontal, transforming the building into a typical example of the later stages of Modern International Style.

213 South Orange Street. This 1-story, stucco-clad building is rectangular in plan with a medium-pitched hipped roof that is covered with Spanish tile and shallow closed eaves. A belt course under the eaves features relief patterns. The building features four symmetrical arched openings organized on the main eastern elevation, the southern three of which define windows, the remainder of which encloses a street entrance. A wrought-iron fan screen is featured above the door. The window openings, which appear to be covered, are also hidden behind a louvered aluminum screen attached to the facade. This building was constructed in 1935 as an office for the Southern California Telephone Company, and it is a modest example of the Spanish Colonial Revival Style. It is somewhat altered. No architect is known. (refer to Photo 8 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

217 South Orange Street. This flat-roofed, brick and stucco-clad 1-story commercial office building is rectangular in plan and oriented along the northern property line with a parking lot to the south. The building features a prominent arched soffit along the southern elevation and atop the aluminum doors and the windows. This building was constructed in 1966 and appears to be unaltered. No architect is known. (refer to Photo 9 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

224 to 226 South Orange Street. This single-story brick commercial building is essentially featureless except for a deeply inset, full-front entrance that, at the time of the field investigation, was covered entirely with plastic sheeting, thus it could not be more fully described. The main western elevation of the building is plastered. This stylistically indistinct building was constructed in 1946 and utilized by automotive repair businesses. It appears to be unaltered, and no architect is known. (refer to Photo 10 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

129 to 133 South Brand Boulevard. This 1-story masonry commercial building features four storefront bays and was originally constructed in 1921. The building is substantially altered. The mildly Moderne-style parapet dates from a 1938 remodeling, and the bulkheads and transoms have been removed from the storefronts and replaced with modern aluminum materials, probably within the last 20 years. No architect is known. (refer to Photo 11 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

135 South Brand Boulevard. This 1-story masonry commercial building consisting of three storefront bays topped by a very high parapet was constructed in 1921. The building is clad in stucco and framed by two full-height Moderne Style pilasters. The building appears to have been altered significantly by the evidence of the application of stucco to the main eastern elevation and alterations to the storefronts. No architect is known. (refer to Photo 12 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

201 South Brand Boulevard. This 1-story commercial masonry building was constructed in 1919. It retains few original architectural features. The storefronts are recent aluminum units and the upper facade is clad in corrugated metal panels. No architect is known. (refer to Photo 13 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

205 to 207 South Brand Boulevard. This 2-story commercial building consists of three street-level aluminum storefronts divided by fluted pilasters and an entry to the upper floor at the south. The upper facade features fired brick with a cornice detailed in white brick, and four windows. The lower facade, above the storefronts, is faced with plywood paneling. This building was constructed in 1922 and designed by the prolific Glendale architect Alfred Priest. It was originally twinned by a similar building on the adjacent lot to the south, which is no longer existent. This building is moderately altered. (refer to Photo 14 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

217 South Brand Boulevard. This 2-story brick commercial building consists of a single storefront and two pairs of windows above. Detailing on this stylistically indistinct building is limited to three horizontal belt courses, including a thin cornice line. The storefront and windows are contemporary additions. The building was constructed in 1921 and appears to be moderately altered. (refer to Photo 15 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

219 South Brand Boulevard. This 1-story brick vernacular commercial building consists of two inset storefront bays separated by a brick pilaster. The upper facade is undetailed with the exception of a cornice line consisting of a single course of brick. This building was constructed in 1920 and appears to be essentially unaltered. (refer to Photo 16 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

221 to 223 South Brand Boulevard. This 2-story brick commercial building consists of an inset centered double-door entry framed by Roman brick veneer and flanked by stucco panels with fixed transom lights above set-in aluminum frames. The five symmetrically organized windows in the 2nd story consist of an arched central opening flanked by two pairs of double windows. The window units are modern aluminum sashes. The window openings are surrounded by glazed-brick casings, with a string course of glazed brick running horizontally across the entire elevation under the windows. The upper facade is stuccoed, and numerous seismic reinforcement anchors are evident. This building was constructed in 1922 and appears to be substantially altered. (refer to Photo 17 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

225 South Brand Boulevard. This 1-story commercial building consists of five bays composed of anodized aluminum storefronts set on low bulkheads and aluminum doors separated by stuccoed pilasters. The upper facade consists of vertical interlocking aluminum panels, possibly concealing a 2nd

floor. This building was constructed in 1923 and appears to be heavily altered. (refer to Photo 18 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

233 South Brand Boulevard. This 2-story commercial building features a ground floor facade finished in square, white panels with two inset entries. Attached to the facade between the 2nd and 1st floors are three, large black tubes spanning the entirety of the elevation. The upper facade is brick, with two large multi-paned window openings, which are now covered and difficult to distinguish. An original decorative surface treatment on the 2nd floor appears to have been removed, exposing rough brick and mortar. The building was constructed in 1921 and appears to be heavily altered. (refer to Photo 19 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

243 to 245 South Brand Boulevard. This 1-story, freestanding, rectangular plan automotive commercial building consists of an aluminum-framed storefront on the eastern elevation and auto repair bays on the southern elevation. It was constructed in 1967 and appears to be unaltered. (refer to Photo 20 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

200 West Harvard Street. This 1-story brick commercial building, occupying a corner parcel, consists of three bays, separated by brick pilasters, facing both streets. The storefronts consist of brick bulkheads with aluminum-framed display windows above. Entries are inset. The upper facade features an inset panel above each storefront. This building was constructed in 1948 for a real estate agency. It appears to be essentially unaltered. (refer to Photo 21 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

201 to 205 West Harvard Street. This property consists of two, 1-story commercial buildings located on one parcel. The eastern building (201) appears to be stucco over masonry construction and is essentially featureless, except for a slightly inset storefront, which has been blocked in with frame and stucco. It was constructed in 1948 as the Continental Santa Fe Bus Station, and appears to be significantly altered. The larger stucco over masonry building abutting to the west (205) consists of an inset windowless storefront with a faux stone bulkhead and a single aluminum door located at the western end. This building was constructed in 1946 as the U.S. Employment Office and originally featured a bank of windows in the storefront. This building is moderately altered. (refer to Photo 22 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

206 West Harvard Street. This one story, poured-in-place concrete commercial building features a medium hipped roof covered with Spanish tile. The eaves are shallow and boxed. The symmetrical main elevation consists of a centered street entrance inset into a double-arched opening, flanked on each side by two steel casement windows set within arched niches. This building was constructed in 1945 for the Southern California Telephone Company and appears to be unaltered, except for the application of

texture coating to the entire building. It has been speculated that this building is the work of the reputable Los Angeles architecture firm of Parkinson and Parkinson, but this appears to be based entirely on other buildings the firm designed for the Southern California Telephone Company over a number of years. No documentary evidence was found to connect the architects to this building. (refer to Photo 23 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

208 West Harvard Street. This 2-story masonry and stucco building consists of an inset entry occupying the western two-thirds of the street-level facade. A continuous band of steel windows is sited above the entry on the 2nd-story. A similar window detail is found on the western elevation. A definitive date of construction for this building could not be established, but it appears to have been built about 1948 as an office for the Southern California Telephone Company. It appears to be unaltered. No architect is known. (refer to Photo 24 in **Appendix 4.9** of this EIR)

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

National Register of Historic Places

First authorized by the Historic Sites Act of 1935, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) was established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as “an authoritative guide to be used by Federal, State, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation's historic resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment.” The National Register recognizes properties that are significant at the national, state and local levels.

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a resource must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of potential significance must meet one or more of the following four established criteria:

- A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- B. Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

According to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) guidelines, the “essential physical features” of a property must be present for it to convey its significance. Further, in order to qualify for the NRHP, a resource must retain its integrity or “the ability of a property to convey its significance.”

The seven aspects of integrity are: location (the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred); design (the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property); setting (the physical environment of an historic property); materials (the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form an historic property); workmanship (the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history or prehistory); feeling (a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time); and association (the direct link between an important historic event or person and an historic property).

The relevant aspects of integrity depend upon the National Register criteria applied to a property. For example, a property nominated under Criterion A (events), would be likely to convey its significance primarily through integrity of location, setting and association. A property nominated solely under Criterion C (design) would usually rely primarily upon integrity of design, materials and workmanship. The Californian Register of Historic Resources’ procedures include similar language with regard to integrity.

The minimum age criterion for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) is 50 years. Properties less than 50 years old may be eligible for listing on the NRHP if they can be regarded as “exceptional,” as defined by the NRHP procedures, or in terms of the CRHR, “if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance.” (Chapter 11, Title 14, §4842(d)(2))

California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) was established to be a comprehensive listing of California's historic resources, including those of national, state, and local significance. Created by Assembly Bill 2881 which was signed into law on September 27, 1992, the California Register is “...an authoritative listing and guide to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens in identifying the existing historical resources of the state and to indicate which resources deserve to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change.” The criteria for eligibility for the California Register are based upon National Register criteria. A resource must meet one or more of the following criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources:

- A. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- B. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

State Office of Historic Preservation Survey

The State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) utilizes a 3-digit evaluation code consisting of seven categories to specify National Register eligibility. The evaluation instructions and classification system used by OHP are provided in its *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources*. Properties that are studied for historic significance in California are evaluated and classified according to OEM's instructions in order to assign a 3-digit classification code. The 1st digit indicates one of the following general evaluation categories for use in conducting historical resource surveys:

1. Listed on the National Register of Historic Places;
2. Determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places;
3. Appears eligible for the National Register of Historic Places;
4. May become eligible for the National Register of Historic Places;
5. Not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, but of local interest;
6. None of the above; and
7. Undetermined.

The 2nd digit is a letter code indicating whether the resource is separately eligible (S), eligible as part of a district (D), or both (B). The 3rd digit is a number used to further specify significance and redefine the relationship of the property to the National Register. Under this system categories 1 through 4 pertain to various levels of National Register eligibility. The California Register, however, may include surveyed resources through level 5 (e.g., properties ineligible for listing in the National Register, but of local interest). In addition, properties found ineligible for listing in the National Register and of no local interest are given an evaluation rating of 6.

City of Glendale Historic Preservation Ordinance

The City of Glendale, through provisions in the Glendale Municipal Code, has established processes to preserve its designated historic resources. The provisions of the Glendale Municipal Code relative to historic preservation (Sections 15.20.05 through 15.20.120), referred to as the Glendale Historic Preservation Ordinance (Ordinance), provide a planning tool for implementing the Historic Preservation Element of the City of Glendale General Plan. The Ordinance addresses both the obligations of historic property ownership and a broad range of incentives available to owners of historic properties.

Section 15.20.020 of the Ordinance defines an historic resource as any site, building, structure, area or place, man-made or natural, which is historically or archaeologically significant in the cultural, architectural, archaeological, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political or military heritage of the City of Glendale, the State of California, or the United States, and which has been designated as historically significant in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, the Glendale Register of Historic Resources, or the Historic Preservation Element of the City of Glendale General Plan.

Section 15.20.050 of the Ordinance establishes the following “findings for designation of historic resources and historic districts”:

Upon recommendation of the historic preservation commission, the City Council shall consider and make findings for additions to the register of historic resources. The designation of any proposed resource in the City as an historic resource or district shall be granted only if the City Council first finds that the proposed historic resource or district contains one or more of the following elements:

- A. The proposed resource or district identifies interest or value as part of the heritage of the City;
- B. The proposed resource or district is the location of a significant historic event;
- C. The proposed resource or district identifies with a person or persons or groups who significantly contributed to the history and development of the City; or whose work has influenced the heritage of the City, the State or the United States;
- D. The proposed resource or district exemplifies one of the best remaining architectural types in a neighborhood; or contains outstanding or exemplary elements of attention to architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship of a particular historic period;
- E. The proposed resource or district is in a unique location or contains a singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood;
- F. The proposed resource or district is a source, site or repository of archeological interest; and

- G. The proposed resource or district contains a natural setting that strongly contributes to the well being of the people of the City. (Ord. 5110 12, 1996: prior Code 21-02)

Listing on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources neither precludes an historic resource from being removed from the local Register nor does it prohibit an historic resource from being altered or demolished. However, the Glendale Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and its staff review recommendations and permits to delete, alter, relocate or demolish these historic resources. Sections 15.20.055 and 15.20.060 of the Glendale Municipal Code must be implemented if removal of an historic resource/historic district from the Glendale Register of Historic Resources is intended. Section 15.20.080 outlines the permit requirements necessary for the demolition or major alteration of an historic resource/historic district. No building located on the project site are on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources.

California Environmental Quality Act

Under CEQA, a "project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." This statutory standard involves a two-part inquiry. The first involves a determination of whether the project involves an historical resource. If so, then the second part involves determining whether the project may involve a "substantial adverse change in the significance" of the historical resource. To address these issues, guidelines that implement the 1992 statutory amendments relating to historical resources were adopted in final form on October 26, 1998 with the addition of State CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15064.5. The State CEQA *Guidelines* specify that for purposes of CEQA compliance, the term "historical resources" include the following:

- A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.
- A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code, or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources.
- The fact that a resource is not listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section

5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource, as defined in Public Resources Code Sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds for determining the significance of impacts related to cultural resources, including historic resources, are contained in the environmental checklist form contained in Appendix G of the most recent update of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) *Guidelines*. Impacts related to cultural resources are considered significant if the project would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5. Section 15064.5 (b)(1) states that in determining potential impacts a “substantial adverse change” means “demolition, destruction, relocation, or alterations of the resource such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.” The setting of a resource may also contribute to its significance, as impairment of the setting could affect the significance of that resource. Material impairment occurs when a project:
- Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or
- Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
- Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5.
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Impact Analysis

Each applicable threshold of significance is listed below followed by analysis of the significance of any potential impacts, identification and discussion of any design features of the project that would lessen or avoid potential impacts as well as other measures identified which would lessen or avoid potential impacts. Finally, the significance of potential impacts after the implementation of all identified mitigation measures is presented.

Threshold: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

Impact Analysis: None of the buildings within the project area that are at least 50 years of age appear to be eligible for the National (NRHP) or State (CRHR) historic registers under Criterion A (CRHR Criterion 1). Most are generally associated with commercial development in Glendale from the 1920s through the 1940s, but the available evidence does not suggest that they played any notable role in that development. As the main headquarters of the Glendale Fire Department beginning in 1929, Fire Station Number 21 (210 South Orange Street) is closely associated with the growth and development of the City of Glendale, and it is a good example of the public institutions that were created for the purpose of sustaining growth. It also appears to be the oldest extant fire station in the City. None of the properties appear to be associated with historically significant persons; therefore, none appear to potentially eligible under Criterion B (CRHR Criterion 2).

No properties within the project area appear to be potentially eligible under Criterion C (CRHR Criterion 3) as examples of an architectural style. Most of the buildings are stylistically indistinct and/or appear to be substantially altered. In addition, none of the building are potentially eligible under Criterion D (CRHR Criterion) 4, which deals with archaeological issues and is not relevant to the buildings.

Individual properties less than 50 years of age may be eligible if they can be found to be “exceptional”. While no hard and fast definition for “exceptional” is provided in the NRHP literature, the special language developed to support nominating these properties was clearly intended to accommodate properties which demonstrate a level of importance such that their historical significance can be understood without the passage of time. In general, according to NRHP literature, eligible “exceptional” properties may include:

“...resources so fragile that survivors of any age are unusual. [Exceptional] may be a function of the relative age of a community and its perceptions of old and new. It may be represented by a building or structure whose developmental or design value is quickly recognized as historically significant by the architectural or engineering profession [or] it

may be reflected in a range of resources for which the community has an unusually strong associative attachment.”

None of the subject properties in the study area appear to rise to the exceptional level.

No properties appear to have the ability to contribute to the formation of a NRHP or CRHR-eligible historic district, due primarily to the considerably altered state of many of the buildings within the study area and the extensive loss of historical setting and context due to the substantial level of demolition and new construction which has occurred within the study area and downtown Glendale over roughly the past twenty years. A survey of historic resources was prepared in 1983-4 by Heumann, Gleye and Associates under the direction of the Glendale Historical Society and partially funded by the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). This survey inventoried approximately 250 buildings, evaluating their relative significance on a somewhat modified version of the 1 to 7 rating scale developed for this purpose by the OHP. In summary, the rating system for the survey was as follows:

1. Individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).
2. Determined individually eligible for listing on the NRHP.
3. Appears eligible for listing on the NRHP.
4. May become eligible for listing on the NRHP with additional research and/or restoration and/or additional age.
5. Is listed or eligible for listing under a local ordinance.
6. None of the above (not significant).
7. Has not been evaluated.

A suffix “d” added to ratings 1-5 indicates that the property’s significance should be considered in the context of a district, rather than individually. Further, the consultants added a 5* category to note properties which may become eligible for listing in a local ordinance, which at the time of the survey had not been adopted. A 6* category was also created to indicate a building which “may have lost its local interest through alterations or because of eroded context, but which could be reclaimed if restored or moved.”¹ The completed survey was subsequently forwarded to the OHP and recorded in the State Historic Resources Inventory. A number of changes were made administratively by the OHP staff to the survey as submitted, including advancing most or all of the ‘6*’ rated (noncontributing) buildings within the boundaries of districts to ‘5d’ (contributing) status, including the definition of a potential historic district on S. Brand Boulevard.

¹ Huemann, Gleye and Associates, 1984. pg. 18.

The relationship between the 1983-4 survey and CEQA's consideration of a "local register" of historic resources was clarified in 1997, when the Glendale City Council adopted the "Glendale Register of Historic Resources," a list consisting of 37 properties. Of the properties in the project area recorded in 1984, none is presently included in the Glendale Register. The potential S. Brand Boulevard historic district identified in the 1984 survey covered the blocks facing Brand Boulevard from Colorado Street to the south to Wilson Avenue to the north, and also included the properties located on the northeastern and northwestern corners of Wilson Avenue and Brand Boulevard. Extensive redevelopment has occurred in this area since the completion of this 1984 survey, including demolition and new construction. Based on a field survey of this area conducted in November 2003, it was determined that approximately 20 percent of the properties within the potential historic district previously identified currently exhibits the level of design integrity required to contribute to the formation of a NRHP or CRHR historic district. This is significantly lower than the generally accepted minimum threshold for contributing properties to an historic district of 50 percent. Based on this updated survey, the potential S. Brand Boulevard historic district documented in the 1984 survey should no longer be regarded as eligible.

Of the properties within the study area, Fire Station Number 21 (210 South Orange Street) has been determined to be potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR under any criteria. Consequently, this is the only property within the study area that warrants an evaluation of its integrity. The integrity of location for 210 South Orange Street is intact; the building has not been moved. The integrity of design for the property is significantly compromised due to the major expansion and redesign of the building in 1958. The setting for the property is significantly altered due to the extensive redevelopment activity that has taken place in downtown Glendale over the last 20 years. The integrity of the property's materials and workmanship is also not present due to alterations. The integrity of feeling and association are also compromised given that the property is no longer used as a fire station. On a whole, this property lacks the integrity required for it to be eligible for listing on either the NRHP or CRHR.

While not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Resources, Fire Station Number 21 could potentially be considered eligible for designation on the City of Glendale Register of Historic Places designed under Criterion A, for its association with the growth and development of the City during the 1920s through the 1940s, and under Criterion E, for its "singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood," given the building location on a downtown intersection and physical characteristics that denote the building's function as a fire station. The building was substantially remodeled in 1958 and no longer retains the integrity of its original design. Unlike the NRHP and CRHR, however, the Glendale Historic Preservation ordinance does not contain express provisions identifying if a property's integrity or age should be taken into consideration in the evaluation of eligibility for the Glendale Register.

Although age and integrity are not expressly provided for in the Glendale Historic Preservation ordinance, the City's consistent practice since adoption of the Glendale Register in 1997 is to consider age and integrity in evaluating a building's eligibility for the Glendale Register. If design integrity is taken into account, Fire Station No. 21 is not be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, and the Glendale Register because it no longer reflects its 1929 appearance. Furthermore, Fire Station No. 21 is not identified as an historic resource in the Historical Preservation Element of the Glendale General Plan, and is not considered to be an historic resource. This conclusion is consistent with two other historic evaluations that took Fire Station No. 21 into account.^{2,3} Removal of Fire Station No. 21 is not, therefore, considered to be an impact on an historic resource.

Of the properties within the study area, 205-07 S. Brand Boulevard has been determined to be potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR under any criteria. While the building's integrity of location remains intact, its design integrity is significantly compromised due to considerable alterations to its ground floor and upper façade. In addition, over the last twenty years the setting for the property was significantly altered because of extensive redevelopment activity in downtown Glendale. Alterations to the building have compromised the integrity of the building's original materials and workmanship. The integrity of feeling and association are essentially intact given the property remains in use as a commercial building. However, on the whole, the property lacks the integrity required for it to be eligible for listing, and therefore removal of this building is not considered to be an impact on an historic resource.

Some original street lamps from the 1920s featuring double acorn fixtures remain along Central Avenue and Harvard Street within the project site. These street lamps would be removed to accommodate the new project. In 1985 the Glendale Historical Society recommended that the Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan be amended to include an inventory of historic streetscapes and street lighting areas and provide policies for their protection. In 1983/1984, a Glendale architectural and historical survey final report was prepared that included discussion of these street lamps. It was determined that the street lamps were not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. These street lamps are also not identified as historic resources in the historic preservation element of the Glendale General Plan and are not considered to be historic resources.⁴ Removal of these street lamps is not, therefore, considered to be an impact on historic resources.

² Mellon and Associates, *Historic Resource Evaluation for City of Glendale Fire Station N# 21, 210 S. Orange Street, Glendale, California*, August 2000.

³ Myra L Frank Associated, *Glendale Pacific Park/Edison School Project*, Glendale, November 19, 1995.

⁴ City of Glendale Interdepartmental Communication, Report; 1920s Era Lampposts. August 17, 1995.

The proposed project also has the potential to adversely impact an historic resource through means other than by demolishing or altering the resource, but also by introducing elements within the setting of the resource that are visually incompatible with the resource. Two other recognized historic resources are located immediately adjacent to the project site, the Masonic Temple at 234 South Brand Boulevard, which was constructed in 1928 and is listed in the Glendale Register of Historic Resources, and the Huntley-Evans Building at 156 South Brand Boulevard, which was constructed in 1921 and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. However, the setting for these resources has already been diminished to the extent that their setting cannot be seen as significantly contributing to their eligibility. Therefore, the additional alterations to their setting that would result from construction of the proposed project would not result in an adverse impact on these historic resources.

Project Design Features: None are required.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Threshold: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5.

Impact Analysis: Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the local area.⁵ In addition, the project site has already been subject to extensive disruption and contains fill materials. Any archaeological resources, which may have existed at one time, have likely been previously disturbed. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources and result in significant impact. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth disturbing work within a 200-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. Implementation of this standard requirement, which is incorporated as mitigation measure, would reduce potential impacts to a level that is less than significant.

Project Design Features: None are required.

5 City of Glendale, Open Space and Conservation Element, January 1993.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Significant.

Mitigation Measure:

4.9-1(a) In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during Project subsurface activities, all earth disturbing work within a 200-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Threshold: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Impact Analysis: Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock. Portions of the project site are underlain by up to 10 feet of alluvium silty sand and up to 80 feet of denser sand. The local area is not known to contain paleontological resources.⁶ In addition, the project site has already been subject to extensive disruption and is extensively developed. Any superficial paleontological resources, which may have existed at one time, have likely been previously unearthed by past development activities. Nonetheless, there is a possibility that paleontological resources may exist at deep levels and significant impact could occur with the implementation of the project.

Project Design Features: None are required.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Significant.

Mitigation Measure:

4.9-2(a) In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth disturbing work within 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

⁶ Ibid.

Threshold: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Impact Analysis: The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape and include retail-commercial uses. No known traditional sites exist within the project area or surrounding area, nor have any resources been identified. Nonetheless, if encountered during excavation and grading activities, any discovery of such resources would be treated in accordance with State and Federal guidelines for disclosure, recovery and preservation, as appropriate. No impact to human archaeological remains would result, and no mitigation measures are required.

Project Design Features: None are required.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Significant.

Mitigation Measure:

- 4.9-3(a) If human remains are unearthed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid, reburial).

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The following cumulative analysis evaluates the impact of the proposed project and related projects on historic resources in Downtown Glendale. The potential for cumulative impacts to the historic character of Downtown Glendale was assessed based upon consideration of the proposed project and related projects in the vicinity of the proposed project. These Related Projects are identified in **Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**. Each applicable threshold is listed below in bold followed by an analysis of the potential for cumulative impacts.

Threshold: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5

Impact Analysis: One of the related projects, the proposed expansion of the Galleria Mall along its Central Avenue frontage, is located adjacent to the project site. The Galleria expansion would take place on the existing developed Galleria site and would not directly impact any historic resources. None of the other related projects would involve impacts to identified historic resources. No cumulative impacts on historic resources, therefore, will result.

Project Design Features: None are required.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

Thresholds: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5.

Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Impact Analysis: Development of the Citywide Projects would also required grading and excavation that could potentially affect archaeological or paleontological or human remains. The cumulative effect of these projects would contribute to the loss of subsurface cultural resources, if these resources are not protected upon discovery. CEQA requirements for protecting archaeological and paleontological resources or human remains are applicable to development in the City of Glendale, as are local cultural resource protection ordinances. Because subsurface cultural resources are protected upon discovery as required by law, impact to those resources would be less than significant. The project includes several mitigation measures that would reduce the project's impact to cultural resources to less than significant. Consequently, the project contribution to any cumulative impacts associated with would not be cumulatively considerable and are therefore less than significant.

Project Design Features: None are required.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.