

4.3 CULTURAL and HISTORIC RESOURCES

This section includes a discussion of onsite development's potential impacts to historic and cultural resources. Information has been summarized from a report prepared by Architectural Resources Group, Inc. (October 2009). This report is provided in its entirety in Appendix D.

4.3.1 Setting

a. Historical Setting. The project site is located in the downtown area of the City of Los Angeles, a region that was originally inhabited by the Chumash Indians and later the Tongva Indians. Settling here for some 1,000 years before the arrival of European settlers in the eighteenth century, the Tongva were eventually renamed the Gabrielino Indians for their proximity to the Mission San Gabriel. It is estimated that approximately five thousand Tongva resided in the region when the Spanish began the mass colonization of native peoples under the mission system in the eighteenth century. In 1769, the Spanish explorer Gaspar de Portola led an expedition from Baja California to the northern territories.

In 1781, the Pueblo of Los Angeles was established. It appears that the subject property was within the original pueblo or just south of it. Beginning as a small town, the pueblo would eventually grow to become the City of Los Angeles. Located to the east, the Los Angeles River served as a channel with flowing water until the 1930s when it was paved with concrete to control floods; the river was instrumental in the development of the original pueblo. Cattle ranching was prominent on land adjacent to the river.

Rapid construction in the area occurred during the region's first substantial building boom in the 1880s; single-family housing and industrial buildings characterized the area at that time. The Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway built tracks along the Los Angeles River as they and other railroad companies had done throughout the region to promote development and travel. In the late nineteenth century, businesses in the area included the Schallert-Gannahl Lumber Company, Walter S. Maxwell Coal Yard, the Los Angeles Electric Light Company, the Wells Fargo & Company Express, and the Los Angeles Soap Company. A winery, stable yards, warehouses and additional lumber yards also characterized the area. Modest single-family dwellings were abundant in the area, many likely providing home to those working at nearby industries.

The City of Los Angeles witnessed a second building boom in the 1920s, though by this time the introduction of street cars had allowed people to move farther away from the Central City area. This is evident in the Sanborn Fire Insurance map from 1923, which reveals that the blocks around the subject property were almost exclusively used for industrial purposes. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway ran tracks by this time along Banning Street; several termini were located on the block of the Mangrove Estates site. The construction of municipal buildings such as Los Angeles City Hall (completed 1928) characterized the area to the west of the site.

Beginning in the 1910s, Japanese Americans began to settle in the area, a portion of which would become known as Little Tokyo. The center of the district was 1st and San Pedro Streets, and by 1930 the majority of the 35,000 Japanese Americans in Los Angeles lived and worked

within a three-mile radius of these two streets. After the Japanese military bombed Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the United States government ordered the removal of all Japanese Americans to internment camps. At this point, many African Americans settled in Little Tokyo. When the Japanese American community was released from internment at the end of the war, the boundaries of Little Tokyo had shrunk to 1st Street to the north, Los Angeles Street to the west, Third Street to the south, and Alameda Street to the east. Most Japanese Americans in southern California chose instead to settle in places such as Gardena and Torrance in the post-war years, but Little Tokyo – as one of only three official “Japantowns” in the United States – has continued to serve as an important center for the community to the present day.

b. Regulatory Setting. A property may be designated as historic by National, State, or local authorities. In order for a building to qualify for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or as a locally significant property in the City of Los Angeles, it must meet one or more identified criteria of significance. The property must also retain sufficient integrity to continue to evoke the sense of place and time with which it is historically associated. An explanation of these designations follows.

National Register of Historic Places. The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), which is administered by the National Park Service, is the Nation's official list of cultural resources worthy of preservation. Authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the National Register is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect historic and archeological resources (National Park Service Official Website, 2005). Listing in the National Register assists in preservation of historic properties through the following actions: recognition that a property is of significance to the nation, the state, or the community; consideration in planning for Federal or federally assisted projects; eligibility for Federal tax benefits; consideration in the decision to issue a federal permit; and, qualification for Federal assistance for historic preservation grants, when funds are available.

Properties may qualify for NRHP listing if they:

- 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.*
- (National Park Service, 2002)

According to the 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 to convey its significance.” The seven aspects of integrity are:

1. **Location** *(the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred);*

2. **Design** (the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property);
3. **Setting** (the physical environment of a historic property);
4. **Materials** (the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property);
5. **Workmanship** (the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history or prehistory);
6. **Feeling** (a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time); and,
7. **Association** (the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property). (National Park Service, 2002)

The relevant aspects of integrity depend upon the NRHP criteria applied to the 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 on integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. The California Register procedures include similar language with regard to integrity.

California Register of Historic Resources. CEQA requires evaluation of project impacts on historic resources, including properties “listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historic Resources [or] included in a local register of historical resources” [CEQA *Guidelines*, §15064.5(a)(1)]. The California Register is an authoritative guide in California 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. A resource is eligible for listing on the California Register if it meets any of the following criteria for listing:

1. *Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;*
2. *Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;*
3. *Embodies the distinctive work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or*
4. *Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.* [Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(c) *et seq.*]

The California Register may also include properties listed in “local registers” of historic properties. A “local register of historic resources” is broadly defined in Section 5020.1(k) as “a list of properties officially designated or recognized as historically significant by a local government pursuant to a local ordinance or resolution.” Local registers of historic properties come in two forms: (1) surveys of historic resources conducted by a local agency in accordance with Office of Historic Preservation procedures and standards, adopted by the local agency and maintained as current; and (2) landmarks designated under local ordinances or resolutions (Public Resources Code Sections 5024.1, 21804.1, 15064.5).

By definition, the California Register of Historic Resources also includes all “properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register of Historic Places,” and certain

specified State Historical Landmarks. The majority of formal determinations of NRHP eligibility occur when properties are evaluated by the State Office of Historic Preservation in connection with federal environmental review procedures (Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966). Formal determinations of eligibility also occur when properties are nominated to the NRHP, but are not listed due to owner objection.

The minimum age criterion for the NRHP and the California Register 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 California Register, if “it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance” [Chapter 11, Title 14, §4842(d)(2)].

City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments. The local designation program for the City of Los Angeles is the Historic-Cultural Monument designation. The City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Ordinance (Ordinance Number 175891, found in Section 12.20.2 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code) defines a Historic-Cultural Monument as any site (including significant trees or other plant life located thereon), building, or structure:

1. *In which the broad cultural, economic, or social history of the nation, state or community is reflected or exemplified;*
2. *That is identified with historic personages;*
3. *That is identified with important events in the main currents of national, state or local history;*
4. *That embodies the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type specimen, inherently valuable for a study of a period style or method of construction; or*
5. *That is a notable work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual genius influenced their age.*

Central City North Community Plan. The onsite development is located within the Central City North Plan Area. The City North Community Plan contains the following objectives, policies, and goals for historic and cultural resources within the Plan Area:

- **Goal 17.** *Preservation and restoration of cultural resources, neighborhoods, and landmarks which have historical and/or cultural significance.*
- **Objective 17-1.** *To ensure that the Community's historically significant resources are protected, preserved, and/or enhanced.*
- **Policy 17-1.1.** *Encourage the preservation, maintenance, enhancement, and reuse of existing buildings and the restoration of original facades. Adherence to the City's historic properties preservation ordinances and the City's Cultural Heritage Board requirements for preservation and design; implementation of design standards.*
- **Goal 18.** *A community which promotes cultural amenities and implements the City's Cultural Master Plan.*
- **Objective 18-1.** *To enhance and capitalize on the contribution of existing cultural and historical resources in the community.*
- **Policy 18-1.1.** *Support the existing artists community in Central City North as a cultural resource for the community. The Plan's policies and programs encourage the development of the artists-in residence community in Central City North.*

c. Site-Specific Setting. A 1948 historic aerial shows the neighborhood that existed on the site prior to the construction of 432 East Temple Street (formerly Turner Street). Other than single-family houses that lined the north side of what is now East Temple Street and a portion of the south side where the current building is located, the area appears to have been predominantly industrial by the middle of the twentieth century. Banning Street ran east to west through the block and was used by the Atchison Topeka and Santa Fe Railway; several termini were located on the block.

The existing onsite building located at 432 East Temple Street (Turner Street on the new building application) was constructed in 1952 on three lots that were consolidated at the time of construction. Photos of the existing onsite building are shown on Figure 4.3-1. It was designed by architect E.L. Wilson as a light manufacturing building for the Zinsco Electrical Products Company, who had their main offices at 729 East Turner Street. A mezzanine was added to the interior of the building in 1955. In 1976, the building changed in use from a retail warehouse to packaged food storage and, in 2005, from a warehouse to a medical office building, according to the Certificate of Occupancy forms for those years. Several garage entrances at the north façade of the building were filled in and various window openings were boarded up with plywood.

Architectural Resources Group (ARG) prepared a Historic Resources Report for the project site in October, 2009 (Appendix D). The report concludes that the existing onsite building does not appear to be eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. The property is associated with the historical theme of the development of the heavy industrial character of the block that existed for over half a century, thereby meeting NRHP Criterion A and CRHR Criterion 1 (refer to *Regulatory Setting* above for description of NRHP and CRHR eligibility criteria). However, the building has undergone a number of alterations over its lifetime, and although it can be identified as a reminder of the past heavy industrial character of the block, it is not a strong example of such a building type due to its low integrity. Little is known about Martin Zinsmeyer, Zinsco's founder; therefore, it appears that the building is not significant for its association with an individual important to the nation's or state's past under NRHP Criterion B and CRHR Criterion 2. The building does not embody a particular architectural style and the building's architect, E.L. Wilson, does not appear to have been particularly influential to the architecture of Los Angeles or elsewhere; and therefore, the building is not the work of a master architect. The addition of two garage doors and a standard size pedestrian door on the north façade were covered with concrete block, and windows on the north and east facades were boarded up with plywood. No historic windows remain (or are obscured from view by plywood). Two non-historic roll-up doors were added to the west façade. Therefore, the building does not retain integrity of design and is not a representative example of an architectural style or period or method of construction under NRHP Criterion C and CRHR Criterion 3.

ARG also concludes that the existing onsite building does not appear to meet any of the significance criteria for designation as an individual City Historic-Cultural monument (refer to *Regulatory Setting* above for description of local eligibility criteria). The onsite building does not (1) exemplify elements of the cultural, economic, or social history of the nation, state or community; is not identified with (2) historic personages; has not been identified with (3) important events in the main currents of national, state or local history; does not (4) embody the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type specimen, inherently valuable for a study of a period style or method of construction as the property's design integrity has been



Photo A - View of the east side of the building to be demolished.



Photo B - View of the north side of the building to be demolished.

Existing Building

Figure 4.3-1
City of Los Angeles



diminished; and (5) no notable builders or architects are associated with the construction of this building.

4.3.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds. According to Public Resources Code (PRC) §21084.1, “a project that may cause a substantial change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” The Public Resources Code broadly defines a threshold for determining if the impacts of a project on an historic property will be significant and adverse. By definition, a substantial adverse change means, “demolition, destruction, relocation, or alterations,” such that the significance of an historical resource would be impaired [PRC §5020.1(6)]. For purposes of NRHP eligibility, reductions in a resource’s integrity (the ability of the property to convey its significance) should be regarded as potentially adverse impacts.

Further, according to the *CEQA Guidelines*:

[A]n historical resource is materially impaired when a project...[d]emolishes 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] 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.” [§15064.5(b)(2) et seq.]

The lead agency is responsible for the identification of “potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant adverse changes in the significance of an historical resource.” The specified methodology for determining if impacts are mitigated to less than significant levels are the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* and the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* (1995), publications of the National Park Service [PRC §15064.5(b)(3-4)].

Furthermore, as set forth in the *City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of significance shall be made on a case-by-case basis, considering the following factors:

- CR-1 Demolition of a significant resource;
- CR-2 Relocation that does not maintain the integrity and significance of a significant resource;
- CR-3 Conversion, rehabilitation, or alteration of a significant resource which does not conform to the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*; or
- CR-4 Construction that reduces the integrity or significance of important resources on the site or in the vicinity.



As set forth in the *City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact upon archaeological resources if it could disturb, damage, or degrade an archaeological resource or its setting that is found to be important under the criteria of CEQA because it:

- CR-5 *Is associated with an event or person of recognized importance in California or American prehistory or of recognized scientific importance in prehistory;*
- CR-6 *Can provide information which is both of demonstrable public interest and useful in addressing scientifically consequential and reasonable archaeological research questions;*
- CR-7 *Has a special or particular quality, such as the oldest, best, largest, or last surviving example of its kind;*
- CR-8 *Is at least 100 years old and possesses substantial stratigraphic integrity¹;*
or
- CR-9 *Involves important research questions that historical research has shown can be answered only with archaeological methods.*

As set forth in the *City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of significance for paleontological resources shall be made on a case-by-case basis, considering the following factors:

- CR-10 *Whether, or the degree to which, the project might result in the permanent loss of, or loss of access to, a paleontological resource; and*
- CR-11 *Whether the paleontological resource is of regional or statewide significance.*

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact CR-1 Onsite development would involve the demolition of the existing building at 432 East Temple Street. However, this property does not appear eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR, nor does it meet any of the criteria for designation as an individual City Historic-Cultural monument. Therefore, construction of onsite development would result in *no impact* with respect to historic resources.

Development of the project site would require the demolition of the existing onsite building at 432 East Temple Street (see Figure 4.3-1 for photos of existing onsite building). As stated in the *Site-Specific Setting*, the existing building is not considered a historic resource under the NRHP or CRHR and does not meet any of the criteria for designation as a City Historic-Cultural monument. Although the building is over 50 years old, it has low integrity and does not meet the standards of significance required under any of the above thresholds. The existing building is not a contributor to a historic district. Therefore, demolition of the existing building at 432 East Temple Street would result in no impact to historic resources.

¹ Although the CEQA criteria state that “important archaeological resources” are those that are at least 100-years-old, the California Register provides that any site found eligible for nomination to the National Register will automatically be included within the California Register and subject to all protections thereof. The National Register requires that a site or structure be at least 50-years-old.

Mitigation Measures. No mitigation required as no impact to historic resources has been identified.

Impact CR-2 There is no evidence that archaeological resources are present onsite. Nevertheless, activities associated with construction of onsite development could potentially expose previously unknown, buried archaeological resources and human remains at the project site. This would be a *significant but mitigable* impact.

Previous onsite development included numerous residences and several commercial properties including a blacksmith, Chinese wash house, carpenter shop and LA Electric Light Company. By 1928, the site was developed with commercial and industrial buildings. In 1950, the site included commercial stores, an electrical supply warehouse, a parking lot and LA Soap Company buildings. At present, the project site is entirely paved and is occupied by a surface parking lot. In addition, a vacant office building is located in the northwest corner of the site. Any archeological resources and/or human remains that may have existed on the project site would likely have been removed or damaged during the construction of the existing and previous onsite development. As such, the potential for archaeological resources and/or human remains remaining onsite is minimal. Nonetheless, there exists the possibility that unknown, buried archaeological resources and/or human remains could be uncovered during excavation. Therefore, impacts related to the disturbance of previously unknown, buried archeological resources and/or human remains during onsite construction would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures. The following standard mitigation measures would be required.

CR-2(a) Archaeological Materials. If any archaeological materials are encountered during the course of project development, all further development activity shall halt and the services of an archaeologist shall then be secured by contacting the South Central Coastal Information Center (657-278-5395) located at California State University Fullerton, or a member of the Society of Professional Archaeologist (SOPA) or a SOPA-qualified archaeologist who shall assess the discovered material(s) and prepare a survey, study or report evaluating the impact. The archaeologist's survey, study or report shall contain a recommendation(s), if necessary, for the preservation, conservation, or relocation of the resource. The applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the evaluating archaeologist, as contained in the survey, study or report.

CR-2 (b) Archaeological Report. The archaeological survey, study or report shall be submitted to:

SCCIC Department of Anthropology
McCarthy Hall 477
CSU Fullerton
800 North State College Boulevard



Fullerton, CA 92834

- CR-2(c) Case Letter.** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall submit a letter to the case file indicating what, if any, archaeological reports have been submitted, or a statement indicating that no material was discovered.
- CR-2(d) Human Remains.** 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 identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) of the deceased Native American, who will then help determine what course of action should be taken in dealing with the remains.

Significance After Mitigation. Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce the effects of excavations and ground disturbing activities to human remains and archaeological resources to a less than significant level.

Impact CR-3 Although the potential for onsite paleontological resources is low, activities associated with construction of the onsite development could potentially expose previously unknown, paleontological resources at the project site. This would be a significant but mitigable impact.

Previous onsite development included numerous residences and several commercial properties including a blacksmith, Chinese wash house, carpenter shop and LA Electric Light Company. By 1928, the site was developed with commercial and industrial buildings. In 1950, the site included commercial stores, an electrical supply warehouse, a parking lot and LA Soap Company buildings. At present, the project site is entirely paved and is occupied by a surface parking lot. In addition, a vacant office building is located in the northwest corner of the site. Any paleontological resources that may have existed on the project site would likely have been removed or damaged during the construction of the existing and previous onsite development. As such, the potential for paleontological resources remaining onsite is minimal. Furthermore, because the site is located on Quaternary fill and alluvium, which is recent (Holocene) in age, there is a low chance for paleontological resources to occur (USGS, 2005). Nonetheless, there exists the possibility that unknown, buried paleontological resources could be uncovered during excavation. Therefore, impacts related to the disturbance of previously unknown, buried paleontological resources during onsite construction would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures. The following City of Los Angeles standard mitigation measures would be required to address potential impacts to unknown, buried paleontological resources.

- CR-3(a) Paleontological Materials.** If any paleontological materials are encountered during the course of onsite construction, construction activities shall be halted.
- CR-3(b) Paleontologist Review.** If excavation activities go 20 feet or deeper, or if excavation encounters undisturbed basement sediments or if any paleontological artifacts are discovered, the services of a paleontologist shall be secured by contacting the Center for Public Paleontology - USC, UCLA, Cal State Los Angeles, Cal State Long Beach, or the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum to assess the resources and evaluate the impact.
- CR-3(c) Paleontological Study.** If the services of a paleontologist are required, copies of the paleontological survey, study, or report shall be submitted to the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum.
- CR-3(d) Agreement Prior to Grading Permit.** A covenant and agreement shall be recorded prior to obtaining a grading permit.

Significance After Mitigation. Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts of excavations and ground disturbing activities to unknown paleontological resources to a less than significant level.

c. Cumulative Impacts. The onsite development, in conjunction with other planned and pending development in the City of Los Angeles, would cumulatively increase the potential to alter known and unknown cultural resources. If all of the development indicated in Table 3-2 (Section 3.0, *Environmental Setting*) were to proceed, individual construction projects located throughout the City and the surrounding area would add approximately 2.7 million square feet (sf) of commercial/retail space, 1.8 million sf of office space, 20,000 residential dwelling units, 400,000 sf of restaurant space, 2,000 hotel rooms and 200,000 sf (900 students) of institutional development. Because the potential to create adverse impacts to known and unknown cultural resources depends on the specific site and nature of an individual development, cultural resource issues must be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Compliance with CEQA requirements on all new developments, including any recommendations in site-specific historic resource studies, would reduce cumulative impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level.

This page intentionally left blank.