

November 27, 2019  
Job Number: 2449-002  
Peer Review for  
961 E. Phillips Boulevard  
Pomona, California 91766

**MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD**

2.6 2449-002.M01

TO: WF Construction, Inc.  
(Mr. Jim Moran)

FROM: Sapphos Environmental, Inc.  
(Ms. Carrie Chasteen)

SUBJECT: Peer Review for request for Major Certificate of  
Appropriate for 961 E. Phillips Boulevard, Pomona,  
California 91766

ATTACHMENTS: A. Resume of Key Personnel

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the request of WF Construction, Inc. (Mr. Jim Moran), Sapphos Environmental, Inc. has completed a peer review for the requested Major Certificate of Appropriateness (MAJCOA) required to support improvements for a property located at 961 E. Phillips Boulevard, Pomona (City), Los Angeles County, California (APN 8333-031-013). WF Construction, Inc. commissioned an independent third-party peer review of the property by a qualified architectural historian. Sapphos Environmental, Inc. architectural historian, Ms. Carrie Chasteen meets and exceeds the Secretary of the Interior's *Professional Qualification Standards* in the fields of History and Architectural History. This Memorandum for the Record documents the results of the peer review undertaken by Ms. Chasteen, which included a site visit conducted on May 2, 2019 to document the current conditions of the buildings located on the site and review of the staff report. Ms. Chasteen possesses a Master of Science in Historic Preservation and more than 17 years of experience in the field of cultural resources management.

At the time of the review undertaken by Sapphos Environmental, Inc. on May 2, 2019, four single-family residences were located on the single parcel. Of those four, two reflect the Craftsman, or California Bungalow, styles of architecture. In a 1993 survey, 949 E. Phillips Boulevard was rated as a "NA" and "R;" meaning the building does not contribute to the historic streetscape due to substantial alterations. 961 E. Phillips Boulevard was rated "N," meaning the building does not possess architectural character.<sup>1</sup> Based upon a review of the Historic Resource Inventory (2012) issued by the California Office of Historic Preservation, none of the properties have been previously evaluated in accordance with the criteria for surveys established in Public Resources Code (PRC) 5020.1.<sup>2</sup> Sapphos Environmental, Inc. reviewed the staff report prepared for the City of Pomona Historic Preservation Commission (HPC; April 3, 2019) for review of the requested MAJCOA. The HPC continued review of the requested MAJCOA with the request to staff to explore questions pertaining to the character-defining features of the residences. The HPC questions were primarily related to interior features of the building. It should be noted that California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not regulate privately-owned interior spaces. Additionally, the City municipal code (Section 5809-13) only regulates the exterior of eligible and designated historic landmarks.

As a result of the site review, records search, and review of the staff report, the property and associated buildings located at 961 E. Phillips Boulevard in the City (APN 8333-031-013) are not historical resources pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. The historic building permits were reviewed at City Hall and ownership records were reviewed at the Los Angeles County Assessor. Research was conducted at the City Public Library and via online resources such as newspapers.com and ancestry.com. Based upon the site visit and research conducted for the peer review, the buildings and property are not associated with significant events, persons, are not known to be the work of a master and have been substantially altered and/or do not possess high artistic value. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial adverse change to a historical resource (Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines). However, as a good faith measure and in an effort to be good neighbors, WF Construction, Inc. will provide the public an opportunity to salvage materials from the buildings located on the subject property.

---

<sup>1</sup> Marsh, D. June 1993. City of Pomona: Historic Resource Inventory.

<sup>2</sup> California Office of Historic Preservation. 5 April 2012. "Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File for Los Angeles County." On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.



## INTRODUCTION

At the request of WF Construction, Inc. (Mr. Jim Moran), a real estate development company, Sapphos Environmental, Inc. has completed a peer review for the requested Major Certificate of Appropriateness (MAJCOA) required to support improvements for a property located at 961 E. Phillips Boulevard, Pomona (City), Los Angeles County, California (APN 8333-031-013). Currently, four single-family residences are located on the single parcel. Of those four, two reflect the Craftsman, or California Bungalow, styles of architecture. In a 1993 survey, 949 E. Phillips Boulevard was rated as a “NA” and “R;” meaning the building does not contribute to the historic streetscape due to substantial alterations. 961 E. Phillips Boulevard was rated “N,” meaning the building does not possess architectural character.<sup>3</sup> Based upon a review of the Historic Resource Inventory (2012) issued by the California Office of Historic Preservation, none of the properties have been previously evaluated in accordance with the criteria for surveys established in Public Resources Code (PRC) 5020.1.<sup>4</sup> Sapphos Environmental, Inc. reviewed the staff report prepared for the City of Pomona Historic Preservation Commission (HPC; April 3, 2019) for review of the requested MAJCOA. The HPC continued review of the requested MAJCOA with the request to staff to explore questions pertaining to the character-defining features of the residences. The HPC questions were primarily related to interior features of the building. It should be noted that California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not regulate privately-owned interior spaces. Additionally, the City municipal code (Section 5809-13) only regulates the exterior of eligible and designated historic landmarks. In response to the continuation, WF Construction, Inc. commissioned an independent third-party peer review of the property by a qualified architectural historian.

## REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

### National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

Enacted in 1966, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) declared a national policy of historic preservation and instituted a multifaceted program, administered by the National Parks Service, to encourage the achievement of preservation goals at the federal, state, and local levels. The NHPA authorized the expansion and maintenance of the NRHP, established the position of State Historic Preservation Officer and provided for the designation of State Review Boards, set up a mechanism to certify local governments to carry out the purposes of the NHPA, assisted Native American tribes to preserve their cultural heritage, and created the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). Section 106 of the NHPA states that federal agencies with direct or indirect jurisdiction over federally funded, assisted, or licensed undertakings must take into account the effect of the undertaking on any historic property that is included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the NRHP, and that the ACHP must be afforded an opportunity to comment, through a process outlined in the ACHP regulations at 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 800, on such undertakings. The NHPA created the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

### *National Register of Historic Places*

The NRHP was established by the NHPA of 1966 as “an authoritative guide to be used by federal, state, and local governments, private groups, and citizens to identify the Nation’s cultural

<sup>3</sup> Marsh, D. June 1993. City of Pomona: Historic Resource Inventory.

<sup>4</sup> California Office of Historic Preservation. 5 April 2012. “Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File for Los Angeles County.” On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment.” The NRHP recognizes properties that are significant at the national, state, and local levels. To be eligible for listing in the NRHP, a resource must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of potential significance must also possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. A property is eligible for the NRHP if it is significant under one or more of the following criteria:

Criterion A: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Criterion B: It is associated with the lives of persons who are significant in our past.

Criterion C: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represents the work of a master; possesses high artistic values; or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

Criterion D: It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historic figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, moved historic buildings, and properties that are primarily commemorative in nature are not considered eligible for the NRHP unless they satisfy certain conditions. In general, a resource must be at least 50 years of age to be considered for the NRHP, unless it satisfies a standard of exceptional importance. Properties listed in the NRHP are automatically listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

According to *National Register Bulletin No. 15*, “to be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must not only be shown to be significant under National Register criteria, but it also must have integrity.” Integrity is defined in *National Register Bulletin No. 15* as “the ability of a property to convey its significance.”<sup>5</sup> Within the concept of integrity, the National Register recognizes the following seven aspects or qualities that in various combinations define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

## California Environmental Quality Act

Pursuant to CEQA, a *historical resource* is a resource listed in, or eligible for listing in, the CRHR. In addition, resources included in a local register of historic resources or identified as significant in a local survey conducted in accordance with state guidelines are also considered historic resources under CEQA, unless a preponderance of the facts demonstrates otherwise. According to CEQA, the fact that a resource is not listed in or determined eligible for listing in the CRHR or is not included in a local register or survey shall not preclude a Lead Agency, as defined by CEQA, from determining that the resource may be a historic resource as defined in California Public Resources Code Section 5024.1.

<sup>5</sup> National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. 2017. “How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.” *National Register Bulletin No. 15*. Available at: <https://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb15/>



## **California Register of Historical Resources**

Created in 1992<sup>6</sup> and implemented in 1998, the CRHR is “an authoritative guide in California to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change.” Certain properties, including those listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and California Historical Landmarks (CHLs) numbered 770 and higher, are automatically included in the CRHR. Other properties recognized under the California Points of Historical Interest program, identified as significant in historic resources surveys, or designated by local landmarks programs may be nominated for inclusion in the CRHR. A resource, either an individual property or a contributor to a historic district, may be listed in the CRHR if the State Historical Resources Commission determines that it meets one or more of the following criteria, which are modeled on NRHP criteria:

- Criterion 1: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.
- Criterion 2: It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
- Criterion 3: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represents the work of an important creative individual; or possesses high artistic values.
- Criterion 4: It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

Resources nominated to the CRHR must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historic resources and to convey the reasons for their significance. It is possible that a resource whose integrity does not satisfy NRHP criteria may still be eligible for listing in the CRHR. A resource that has lost its historic character or appearance may still have sufficient integrity for the CRHR if, under Criterion 4, it maintains the potential to yield significant scientific or historical information or specific data. Resources that have achieved significance within the past 50 years also may be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR, provided that enough time has lapsed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource.<sup>7</sup>

Section 4852(C) of the California Code of Regulations<sup>8</sup> defines integrity as follows:

*Integrity is the authenticity of an historical resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance. Historical resources eligible for listing in the California Register must meet one of the criteria of significance described in section 4852(b) of this chapter and retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to*

<sup>6</sup> Public Resources Code 5024.1

<sup>7</sup> Office of Historic Preservation, California State Parks. n.d. “Technical Assistance Bulletin 6: California Register and National Register, A Comparison (for purposes of determining eligibility for the California Register).” Available at: [www.ohp.parks.ca.gov](http://www.ohp.parks.ca.gov)

<sup>8</sup> Office of Historic Preservation, California State Parks. 1999. *California State Law and Historic Preservation*, 4853(c), p. 66.

convey the reasons for their significance. Historical resources that have been rehabilitated or restored may be evaluated for listing.

Integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It must also be judged with reference to the particular criteria under which a resource is proposed for eligibility. Alterations over time to a resource or historic changes in its use may themselves have historical, cultural, or architectural significance.

## **POMONA MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 5809-13.D**

Historic Landmark Designation Criteria. For the purposes of this section, an improvement, natural feature, or site may be designated an historic landmark by the historic preservation commission and city council and any area within the city of Pomona may be designated an historic district pursuant to subsection E of this section, if the building or majority of buildings (in a district) are 50 or more years old or of exceptional quality if less than 50 years old, and it meets one or more of the following criteria:

1. It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the city of Pomona's cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, architectural, or natural history;
2. It is identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history;
3. It embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;
4. It contributes to the significance of an historic area, being a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic or scenic properties or thematically related grouping of properties which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan or physical development;
5. It is the work of a notable builder, designer, landscape designer or architect;
6. It has a unique location or singular physical characteristics or is a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the city of Pomona;
7. It embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation;
8. It is similar to other distinctive properties, sites, areas, or objects based on an historic, cultural, or architectural motif;
9. It reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth, particular transportation modes, or distinctive examples of park or community planning;
10. It is one of the few remaining examples in the city of Pomona, region, state, or nation possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural or historical type or specimen.

## **METHODS**

WF Construction, Inc. commissioned an independent third-party peer review of the property by a qualified architectural historian. Sapphos Environmental, Inc. architectural historian, Ms. Carrie Chasteen meets and exceeds the Secretary of the Interior's *Professional Qualification Standards* in the fields of History and Architectural History. This Memorandum for the Record documents the results of the peer review undertaken by Ms. Chasteen, which included a site visit conducted on May 2, 2019 to document the current conditions of the buildings located on the site and review of the staff report. Ms. Chasteen possesses a Master of Science in Historic Preservation and more



than 17 years of experience in the field of cultural resources management (Attachment A, *Resume of Key Personnel*).

The peer review consisted of a review of historic records and publicly available archival material, review of the staff report, and a site visit to assess the history and character of the property in relation to criteria for listing in the NRHP, the CRHR, and the protection pursuant to the City Municipal Code: relation to significant events, persons, work of a master, possess high artistic value, and possess integrity of design, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, location, and setting. The historic building permits were reviewed at City Hall and ownership records were reviewed at the Los Angeles County Assessor. Research was conducted at the City Public Library and via online resources such as newspapers.com and ancestry.com. The staff report presented the current conditions of the buildings on the subject property, provided a summary of the information available for the subject property, and recommended the subject property is ineligible for listing in federal, state, or local historical registers. Sapphos Environmental, Inc. conducted a site visit on May 2, 2019 to document the current condition of the buildings located on the subject property and conducted research to verify the staff report recommendations.

## PROPERTY HISTORY

Based on a review on previous occupants and owners of this property as recorded by the Los Angeles County Assessor, the property has had multiple owners and occupants between 1921 and 2018. (Table 1, *Summary of Ownership History, 961 E. Phillips Boulevard*). None of the persons associated with this property are noted as having made demonstrably significant contributions to the history of the nation, state, or region.

**TABLE 1  
SUMMARY OF OWNERSHIP HISTORY  
961 E. PHILLIPS BOULEVARD**

Book	Page	Year Range	Owner Name
341	26	1919–1926	Francis M. Diehl
341	27	1926–1932	Francis M. Diehl
341	35	1932–1939	Francis M. Diehl Roger H. Diehl Arthur Sharpe
341	55	1939–1950	Arthur J. Shape Fred Krumpeck John H. Fyock John and Bess Fyock Luther M. and Cecil W. Angel
341	35	1951–1955	Luther and Cecil Angel Lucy Schmaelzle
341	35	1956–1960	Luch Schmaelzle Roscoe M. and Nettie Hoover
		1996*	Alan and Jean Oleson
		1997*	Kircher Family Partners
		2004*	Marco and Sandra Solis
		2007*	Yu Lin Ching
		2012*	Ching Yu Lin
		2018*	Qiuying Liu

\*Denotes information available at the Los Angeles County Assessor public counter.

Francis Diehl was a farmer and poultry breeder who was born in Ohio circa 1852.<sup>9,10</sup> Roger Diehl was a mechanic who was born in Iowa circa 1887.<sup>11</sup> Arthur Sharpe was a salesman.<sup>12</sup> John Fyock was a tile worker.<sup>13</sup> Bessie Fyock was born in Nebraska circa 1890 and was a homemaker.<sup>14</sup> Luther Angel was a guard.<sup>15</sup> Lucy Schmaelzle was born in Tennessee circa 1900 and worked a cook.<sup>16</sup> Roscoe Hoover was a salesman.<sup>17</sup> Nettie Hoover was born in Missouri circa 1908 and did not work outside the home.<sup>18</sup> No information was available pertaining to Fred Krumpeck, Cecil Angel, Alan and Jean Oleson, Marco and Sandra Solis, Yu Lin Ching, and Ching Yu Lin. Quiying Liu is the current owner of the property.

Additional information on previous occupants as identified in City directories was summarized in the staff report.

A review of the historic building permits on file with the City demonstrates that there have been 12 building permits issued, including at least 5 that have affected the exteriors of the buildings (Table 2, *Summary of Building Permits, 961 E. Phillips Boulevard*).

---

<sup>9</sup> Ancestry.com. Year: 1930; Census Place: *Pomona, Los Angeles, California*; Page: 3A; Enumeration District: 1460; FHL microfilm: 2339909.

<sup>10</sup> Pomona City Directory, 1926.

<sup>11</sup> Ancestry.com. Year: 1920; Census Place: *Los Angeles Assembly District 75, Los Angeles, California*; Roll: T625\_115; Page: 13A; Enumeration District: 452.

<sup>12</sup> Ancestry.com. 2011. *U.S. City Directories, 1822–1995* [database on-line]. Provo, UT: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc.

<sup>13</sup> Ancestry.com. 2011. *U.S. City Directories, 1822–1995* [database on-line]. Provo, UT: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc.

<sup>14</sup> Ancestry.com. Year: 1930; Census Place: *North Campbell, Greene, Missouri*; Page: 12B; Enumeration District: 0053; FHL microfilm: 2340924.

<sup>15</sup> Ancestry.com. 2011. *U.S. City Directories, 1822–1995* [database on-line]. Provo, UT: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc.

<sup>16</sup> Ancestry.com. Year: 1930; Census Place: *Belleville, San Bernardino, California*; Page: 5B; Enumeration District: 0006; FHL microfilm: 2339922.

<sup>17</sup> Ancestry.com. Year: 1940; Census Place: *San Jose, Los Angeles, California*; Roll: m-t0627-00255; Page: 62B; Enumeration District: 19-730.

<sup>18</sup> Ancestry.com. Year: 1940; Census Place: *San Jose, Los Angeles, California*; Roll: m-t0627-00255; Page: 62B; Enumeration District: 19-730.

**TABLE 2  
SUMMARY OF BUILDING PERMITS  
961 E. PHILLIPS BOULEVARD**

<b>E. Phillips Property Address</b>	<b>Permit No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Scope of Work</b>
961	1584	1/18/1927	Construct cesspool
961	6392	8/24/1936	Add to rooms to frame building
961	9461	4/22/1940	Add storeroom
961	26917	3/25/1954	Install three windows in frame dwelling
961	61443	12/17/1986	Demolish existing garage and porch on existing house and shed.
961	P96-0117	3/20/1996	Bathroom remodel
961	B96-0336	7/14/1996	Window replacement
961	B13-0161	3/7/2013	Construct patio cover
955	31238	12/14/1956	Move frame dwelling <u>from 803 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street</u> . Install on foundation.
953	30754	8/20/1956	Move 1-story stucco house from Monte Vista.* Install foundation and minor repairs.
953	P96-0122	3/25/1996	Install shower
949	30280	5/8/1956	Move frame dwelling <u>from 2965 S. East End Avenue</u> . Install foundation and porch slab

\* Based upon a review of the Sanborn fire insurance maps (June 1928–September 1950),<sup>19</sup> there was not a street named “Monte Vista” in Pomona as late as 1950. However, S. Mountain View Avenue is located between Grand Avenue and Phillips Boulevard, and it is assumed the residence was moved from the only block of this street located in eastern Pomona and south of Interstate 10 (I-10).

The original building permits were not available. It is unknown if the buildings were designed by architects or constructed by significant builders. The residence located at 961 E. Phillips Boulevard is the original residence on the subject property; 955, 953, and 949 E. Phillips Boulevard were moved to the subject property in 1956. The original setting of the moved buildings is largely residential based upon a review of current aerial photographs. The buildings were not located within the path of Interstate 10 (I-10), which opened on November 16, 1954, in Pomona.<sup>20</sup> Based upon a review of available literature, there is no apparent reason why the buildings were relocated; however, it is assumed they were moved to maximize density on a large parcel.

<sup>19</sup> [Sanborn Map Company. June 1928 – September 1950, Pomona, Index Map.](#)

<sup>20</sup> [Cahighways.org. 2020. “Pre 1964 Signage History.” Available at: https://www.cahighways.org/009-016.html#010](https://www.cahighways.org/009-016.html#010)

## DESCRIPTION

### ***961 E. Phillips Boulevard***

The 1-story Craftsman, or California Bungalow, is 'L'-shaped in plan. The cross-gabled roof is clad in composition shingles. The exterior walls are clad in horizontal wood clapboard siding. The windows have been replaced with vinyl and aluminum sliding units. The building is in poor condition due to deferred maintenance (Figure 1, *View of Primary Façade*).



**Figure 1. View of Primary Façade**  
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

A rear covered patio addition was constructed in 2013 (Figure 2, *View of Rear Façade*).



**Figure 2. View of Rear Façade**  
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

The interior of the building has been substantially altered and no historic fabric is extant (Figure 3, *Interior View*).



**Figure 3. Interior View**  
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

### **955 E. Phillips Boulevard**

The 1-story building has been substantially altered and no longer reflects a style of architecture. The building is rectangular in plan. The exterior walls are clad in rough textured stucco, which is an alteration. The windows were replaced with vinyl sliding units. The building is in poor condition due to deferred maintenance (Figure 4, *View of Primary and Secondary Façades*).





**Figure 4. View of Primary and Secondary Façades**  
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

The porch on the northern façade is an alteration and spans the entire façade (Figure 5, *Detail of Porch Alterations*).



**Figure 5. Detail of Porch Alterations**  
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

The historic fabric of the interior of the building is generally extant. Historic fabric includes built-in cabinets, battered wood columns, and a tiled fireplace mantel and hearth. The wood features are common to the Craftsman style of architecture; however, they have been painted destroying the wood grain and are ubiquitous. The tile appears to date to the 1920s; however, it does not appear to be Batchelder or similar tile due to lack of ornamental detail and variation of color (Figure 6, *Interior View*).



**Figure 6. Interior View**  
SOURCE: *Sapphos Environmental, Inc.*, 2019

### ***953 E. Phillips Boulevard***

The 1-story Tudor cottage is generally rectangular in plan. The cross-gabled roof with partial boxed eaves is clad in composition shingles. The exterior walls are clad in stucco. False timbering, although painted to match, accents the gables. The one-over-one wood sash windows appear to be original. The building is in poor condition due to deferred maintenance (Figure 7, *View of Primary Façade*).



**Figure 7. View of Primary Façade**  
SOURCE: *Sapphos Environmental, Inc.*, 2019



The secondary façades generally match the primary façade in terms of design and materials. However, evidence of window removal and change of window openings is present (Figure 8, *View of Secondary Façades*).



**Figure 8. View of Secondary Façades**  
SOURCE: *Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019*

Access to the interior of the building was not granted at the time of the site visit. However, the historic tile fireplace mantel and hearth are known to exist and appear to be Batchelder tile. Ernest Batchelder produced tile in Pasadena from 1910 through the 1930s.<sup>21</sup> Although Batchelder tile is generally considered to be a significant feature, privately-owned interior spaces and features are not regulated by CEQA or the City Municipal Code (Figure 9, *Interior View of Fireplace*).



**Figure 9. Interior View of Fireplace**  
SOURCE: *Great Wall Reality, 2019*

<sup>21</sup> Pasadena History Museum. "Batchelder Tile Registry." Available at: <https://pasadenahistory.org/research-and-collections/batchelder-registry/>



### **949 E. Phillips Boulevard**

The 1-story Craftsman, or California Bungalow, residence is rectangular in plan. The front-gabled roof, accented with barge board and brackets, is clad in composition shingles. The exterior walls are clad in horizontal wood clapboard siding. The one-over-one, fixed-pane with diamond-pane transom, and casement with diamond-panes wood windows appear to be original. However, these window types are common to Craftsman and are ubiquitous. The concrete block foundation that was constructed when the building was moved to this site is visible (Figure 10, *Primary Façade*).



**Figure 10. Primary Façade**  
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

A rear addition was constructed at an unknown date (Figure 11, *Rear Façade*).



**Figure 11. Rear Façade**  
SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

The historic fabric of the interior of the building is generally extant; however, rooms have been reconfigured and added. Historic fabric includes built-in cabinets and wall paneling. The wood features are common to the Craftsman style of architecture; however, they have been painted destroying the wood grain and are ubiquitous (Figure 12, *Interior View*).



**Figure 12. Interior View**

SOURCE: Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2019

## EVALUATION

The following table summarizes the buildings' ability to convey significance and integrity (Table 3, *Eligibility Criteria*).

**TABLE 3**  
**ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA**

	<u>949 Phillips Blvd.</u>	<u>953 Phillips Blvd.</u>	<u>955 Phillips Blvd.</u>	<u>961 Phillips Blvd.</u>
<b><u>NRHP</u></b>				
<u>Criterion A</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion B</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion C</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion D</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<b><u>CRHR</u></b>				
<u>Criterion 1</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion 2</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion 3</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion 4</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<b><u>POMONA MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 5809-13.D</u></b>				
<u>Criterion 1</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion 2</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion 3</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion 4</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion 5</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion 6</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion 7</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion 8</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion 9</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Criterion 10</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<b><u>INTEGRITY</u></b>				
<u>Location</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>Design</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Setting</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Materials</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Workmanship</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Feeling</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Association</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No</u>

The original residence (961 E. Phillips Boulevard) was constructed prior to 1927, when the first extant building permit was issued. The Craftsman style of architecture was popular from approximately 1900 to 1930 and the construction of the building likely dates to 1910 as noted in the Los Angeles County Assessor records. This is the period when the California citrus industry flourished, which gave Pomona an economic lead in the area. Many residences were constructed during this period of economic boom. However, the subject property does not have a specific association in the residential development of Pomona in the early 1900s. Therefore, the subject property is ineligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and City historic landmark designation pursuant to Criterion A/1/1. Additionally, the subject property is ineligible for City historic landmark pursuant to Criteria 4, 7, and 9.

Persons who made demonstrably significant contributions to the history of the nation, state, or region are not known to be associated with the subject properties. Therefore, the subject property is ineligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and City historic landmark designation pursuant to Criterion B/2/2.

The Craftsman and Tudor Cottage are not known to be the work of a master. Additionally, they are common and low-style examples of those styles of architecture found throughout the City and Los Angeles County, and do not possess high artistic value and do not embody the distinctive characteristics of these types, periods, or methods of construction. Because the buildings on the subject property do not convey architectural values and do not retain integrity, they are not eligible for consideration in the NRHP Criteria Consideration B for moved properties (~~955, 953, and 949~~ 949, 953, and 955 E. Phillips Boulevard). Therefore, the subject property is ineligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR pursuant to Criterion C/3/3. Additionally, the subject property is ineligible for City historic landmark designation pursuant to Criteria ~~3~~, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10.

The buildings were constructed using common materials and techniques and are not expected to yield important information to history. Therefore, the subject property is ineligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR pursuant to Criterion D/4.

949, 953, and 955 E. Phillips Boulevard were moved to the current site in 1956 and do not retain integrity of location. Additionally, these buildings do not retain integrity in setting as a result of the relocation. 961 E. Phillips Boulevard has not been moved and does retain integrity of location. However, 961 E. Phillips Boulevard does not retain integrity of setting because it was originally a single building located at the southeast corner of a large vacant parcel that has been infilled with three additional residential buildings. All four buildings have been substantially altered and do not retain integrity of design, materials, and workmanship as a result of alteration of materials, additions, and changes in footprint. Lastly, the relocation of three residences and substantial alterations dramatically and negatively impact the property's integrity of feeling and association.

Therefore, the buildings and property are not historical resources pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial adverse change to a historical resource (Section 15046.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines).

## MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the buildings located on the subject property do not qualify for consideration as historical resources pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, as a good faith measure and to be good neighbors, WF Construction, Inc. will provide the public an opportunity to salvage materials from the buildings located on the subject property.

## CONCLUSION

Sapphos Environmental Inc. has determined that the buildings located on the subject property are ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP, CRHR, and for City historic landmark designation, and are therefore not historical resources pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Demolition of the buildings would not result in a substantial adverse change to historical resources pursuant to Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines. However, as a good faith measure and to be good neighbors, WF Construction, Inc. will provide the public an opportunity to salvage materials from the buildings located on the subject property.

Should there be any questions regarding the information contained in this MFR, please contact Ms. Carrie Chasteen at (626) 683-3547, extension 102.

***ATTACHMENT A***  
***RESUME OF KEY PERSONNEL***

---