

## HISTORIC RESOURCE ASSESSMENT

400 S Alameda Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012



*Prepared for:*  
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP  
333 S Hope Street, 43rd Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071

*Prepared by:*  
Chattel, Inc. | Historic Preservation Consultants  
13417 Ventura Blvd  
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

December 23, 2016

*THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>Introduction and Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II</b>	<b>Methodology and Evaluation.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>Qualifications .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Regulatory Setting .....</b>	<b>5</b>
	National Register of Historic Places .....	5
	California Register of Historical Resources .....	6
	California Environmental Quality Act .....	7
	City of Los Angeles .....	8
<b>V.</b>	<b>Historic Contexts .....</b>	<b>9</b>
	Industrial District.....	9
	Manufacturing for the Masses .....	10
	L.W. Stockwell Company .....	10
	Industrial Design and Engineering.....	12
	R.B. Young & Son .....	12
	Mill Construction and Fire Resistance .....	13
	History of Ownership and Occupants .....	13
	Period of Significance.....	15
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Description .....</b>	<b>16</b>
	Physical Description .....	16
	Setting .....	16
	Exterior.....	16
	Interior .....	18
	Character-Defining Features .....	19
	History of Alterations .....	21
	Integrity .....	23
<b>VII.</b>	<b>Historic Resource Assessment .....</b>	<b>25</b>
	National and California Registers and City of Los Angeles HCM/HPOZ .....	25
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>Impacts Analysis.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>IX.</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>X.</b>	<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>XI.</b>	<b>Attachments</b>	
	Attachment A: Contemporary Maps	
	Attachment B: Contemporary Photographs	
	Attachment C: Historic Maps and Photographs	
	Attachment D: Exterior Alterations	
	Attachment E: Periodicals	
	Attachment F: Proposed Project Plans and Renderings	

## **I. INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This Historic Resource Assessment report (report) has been prepared to determine whether the building located at 400-420 S Alameda Street (400 S Alameda Street or subject property) is a historical resource. This assessment will be used to determine whether a project proposed for the subject property has the potential to impact a historical resource for the purposes of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review. The subject property is located at the southeast corner of S Alameda Street and E 4<sup>th</sup> Street in Los Angeles, California. The subject property occupies lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 in Block A of F. P. Howard and Co.'s Subdivision of the Bliss Tract. The parcel (Assessor Identification Number (APN) 5163-026-001) is trapezoidal in shape, and bound by S Alameda Street to the west, E 4<sup>th</sup> Street to the north, Seaton Street to the east, and an adjacent parcel (422 South Alameda Street, APN 5163-026-002) to the south.

The subject property consists of a single, three-story building originally constructed for mattress manufacturing in 1911 and would be rehabilitated for adaptive reuse as a hotel (proposed project). The proposed project would retain the majority of the brick exterior perimeter walls, create an interior courtyard, and include a partial, single story rooftop addition.

This report will assess potential eligibility of the subject property for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), and for local designation as a City of Los Angeles (City) Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) or as a contributor to a potential Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ), the form of local designation for an historic district. This report evaluates significance by describing the physical characteristics, integrity, and history of the subject property and identifying the appropriate historic contexts within which to evaluate it. Due to the manufacturing/warehouse use of the subject property, it is evaluated under the two themes in the SurveyLA historic context statement, *Industrial Development, 1850-1980*: "Manufacturing for the Masses, 1883-1989" and "Industrial Design and Engineering, 1887-1965." The subject property is also evaluated for association with early twentieth century industrial development in the area south and east of downtown Los Angeles, as described in the historical overview of *Industrial Development, 1850-1980*.<sup>1</sup>

The subject property was constructed for the L.W. Stockwell Company and designed by R.B. Young & Son. Typical of unreinforced masonry industrial and warehouse buildings of the period, its character is utilitarian with brick exterior perimeter walls, and fairly regular fenestration pattern and an interior of "mill construction." The company produced bed springs, mattresses, and furniture hassocks at the subject property, its only manufacturing facility. Distribution was limited to the Los Angeles area. Following the L.W. Stockwell Company's occupancy, the subject property was briefly owned by Eastern Outfitting Company before being purchased in about 1941 by the current owner, Southwestern Bag Company. For the next 75 years, the subject property was leased for manufacturing, warehousing, or both. The period of significance is 1911-1934, which corresponds to occupancy of the L.W. Stockwell Company, ending with the company's dissolution and departure from the subject property.

The building has experienced numerous alterations, including areas of inappropriate brick replacement, infill of several window openings, and removal of the top floor. Originally four stories,

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the general boundaries of downtown Los Angeles are the Hollywood (101) Freeway to the north, the Los Angeles River to the east, the Santa Monica (10) Freeway to the south, and the Harbor (110) Freeway and Lucas Avenue to the west, this report refers to the central business district as downtown Los Angeles to distinguish it from the industrial area to the east and south.

the building sustained significant damage in the 1971 Sylmar Earthquake, which necessitated removal of the top floor.

Based on the following evaluation, the subject property does not appear individually eligible for listing in the National and California Registers or for listing as an HCM. The subject property was identified as a contributor to the potential Los Angeles Industrial Historic District in the Central City North Community Plan Area as part of SurveyLA in 2016.<sup>2</sup> For this reason, the potential historic district is considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA, and the proposed project is analyzed for impact on the potential historic district as a whole. The proposed project is found to not cause material impairment to the potential historic district and thus, would not cause a significant impact under CEQA.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Los Angeles Industrial Historic District has been identified as a potential historic district in SurveyLA during a 2016 survey of the Central City North Community Plan Area. The City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources (OHR) granted Chattel access to a draft map identifying boundaries of the potential historic district, noting contributing and noncontributing resources. This data remains unpublished at this time, and is subject to change.; A portion of this potential historic district was surveyed in 2002 by the City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) during development of the Central Industrial Redevelopment Project. The subject property was not identified in this survey, and remains outside of the boundaries of the Redevelopment Project Area.

## **II. METHODOLOGY & EVALUATION**

The evaluation and determination is the result of site-specific and contextual research in primary and secondary sources, including that obtained from the Los Angeles County Assessor and the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety; application of criteria of significance within the appropriate historic context; direct observations of the subject property made during a site visit conducted on July 18, 2016 by professionals meeting the *Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards* for historic architecture, architecture and architectural history; and comparative analysis.

Evaluation of the subject property is also based on eligibility standards established in *Industrial Development, 1850-1980* written under a Certified Local Government grant for the California Office of Historic Preservation. Evaluation also utilizes SurveyLA's available, currently unpublished data on the potential Los Angeles Industrial Historic District.

A records search from the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton, including the Historic Property Data File (2011),<sup>3</sup> did not return any previous records or evaluations associated with the subject property or any affiliated address.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Historic Property Data File from 2011 is the most recent available data file.

### **III. QUALIFICATIONS**

Chattel is a full service historic preservation consulting firm with practice throughout the western United States. The firm represents governmental agencies and private ventures, successfully balancing project goals with a myriad of historic preservation regulations without sacrificing principles on either side. Comprised of professionals meeting the *Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards* in history, architecture, architectural history, and historic architecture, the firm offers professional services including historical resources evaluation and project impacts analysis, in addition to consultation on federal, state, and local historic preservation statutes and regulations.

Staff engage in a collaborative process and work together as a team on individual projects. This historic resource assessment was prepared by President Robert Chattel, historical architect, and Associate I Brian Matuk, architectural historian. The team visited the subject property on July 18, 2016, when interior and exterior inspection was performed.

#### **IV. REGULATORY SETTING**

##### NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

The National Register is the nation's official list of historic and cultural resources worthy of preservation. Authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the National Register is part of a federal program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect the country's historic and archaeological resources. Properties listed in the National Register include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service (NPS), which is part of the United States Department of the Interior. Resources are eligible for National Register listing if they:

- A) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B) are associated with the lives of significant persons in our past; or
- 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 history or prehistory.<sup>4</sup>

Once a resource has been determined to satisfy one of the above-referenced criteria, then it must be assessed for integrity. Integrity refers to the ability of a property to convey its significance, and the degree to which the property retains the identity, including physical and visual attributes, for which it is significant under the four basic criteria listed above. The National Register recognizes seven aspects or qualities of integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To retain its historic integrity, a property must possess several, and usually most, of these aspects.

The National Register includes only those properties that retain sufficient integrity to accurately convey their physical and visual appearance from their identified period of significance. Period of significance describes the period in time during which a property's importance is established. It can refer simply to the date of construction, or it can span multiple years, depending on the reason the property is important. The period of significance is established based on the property's relevant historic context and as supported by facts contained in the historic context statement.

Evaluation of integrity is founded on "an understanding of a property's physical features and how they relate to its significance."<sup>5</sup> A property significant under criterion A or B may still retain sufficient integrity to convey its significance even if it retains a low degree of integrity of design, materials or workmanship. Conversely, a property that derives its significance exclusively for its architecture under criterion C must retain a high degree of integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. For some properties, comparison with similar properties is considered during the evaluation of integrity, especially when a property type is particularly rare.

While integrity is important in evaluating and determining significance, a property's physical condition, whether it is in a deteriorated or pristine state, has relatively little influence on its

---

<sup>4</sup> National Register Bulletin #15, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (National Park Service, 1990, revised 2002).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

significance. A property that is in good condition may lack the requisite level of integrity to convey its significance due to alterations or other factors. Likewise, a property in extremely poor condition may still retain substantial integrity from its period of significance and clearly convey its significance.

### **Relationship to Project**

The subject property is not listed in, nor has it been officially determined eligible for listing in the National Register, and, for the reasons presented in this report, does not appear eligible for such listing, either separately or as a contributor to any potential National Register-eligible historic district.

### CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The California Register was established to serve as an authoritative guide to the state's significant historical and archaeological resources (Public Resources Code (PCR) §5024.1). State law provides that in order for a property to be considered eligible for listing in the California Register, it must be found by the State Historical Resources Commission to be significant under any of the following four criteria, if the resource:

- 1) Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States; or
- 2) Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history; or
- 3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values; or
- 4) Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

The primary difference between eligibility for listing in the National and California Registers is integrity. Properties eligible for listing in the National Register generally have a higher degree of integrity than those only eligible for listing in the California Register. There is, however, no difference with regard to significance. A property that meets the significance criteria for California Register eligibility would also be eligible for listing in the National Register, unless there are issues of integrity that decrease the ability of the property to convey its significance.

The California Register also includes properties which: have been formally *determined eligible for listing in*, or are *listed in* the National Register; are registered State Historical Landmark Number 770, and all consecutively numbered landmarks above Number 770; points of historical interest, which have been reviewed and recommended to the State Historical Resources Commission for listing; and city and county-designated landmarks or districts (if criteria for designation are determined by State of California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) to be consistent with California Register criteria). PRC §5024.1 also states:

- g) A resource identified as significant in an historical resource survey may be listed in the California Register if the survey meets all of the following criteria:
  - 1) The survey has been or will be included in the State Historical Resources Inventory.
  - 2) The survey and the survey documentation were prepared in accordance with [OHP]... procedures and requirements.
  - 3) The resource is evaluated and determined by the office to have a significance rating of category 1-5 on DPR [Department of Parks and Recreation] form 523.
  - 4) If the survey is five or more years old at the time of its nomination for inclusion in the California Register, the survey is updated to identify historical

resources which have become eligible or ineligible due to changed circumstances or further documentation and those which have been demolished or altered in a manner that substantially diminishes the significance of the resource.

### **Relationship to Project**

The subject property is not listed in, nor has it been officially determined eligible for listing in the California Register, and, for the reasons presented in this report, does not appear eligible for such listing, either separately or as a contributor to any potential California Register-eligible historic district.

### CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

According to CEQA,

an historical resource is a resource listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources. Historical resources included in a local register of historical resources..., or deemed significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (g) of Section 5024.1, are presumed to be historically or culturally significant for purposes of this section, unless the preponderance of the evidence demonstrates that the resource is not historically or culturally significant (PRC §21084.1).

If the proposed Project were expected to cause *substantial adverse change* in an historical resource, environmental clearance for the project would require mitigation measures to reduce impacts. “Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired” (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (b)(1)). California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3 §15064.5 (b)(2) describes *material impairment* taking place when a project:

- A) 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... or
- B) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register... or its identification in an historical resources survey... 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
- C) Demolishes or materially alters 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... as determined by a lead agency for the purposes of CEQA.

### **Relationship to Project**

The subject property is not listed in, nor has it been officially determined eligible for listing in the California Register and, for the reasons presented in this report, does not appear eligible for such listing, either separately or as a contributor to any potential National or California Register-eligible historic district. The building has been identified as a contributor to the potential Los Angeles Industrial Historic District as part of SurveyLA in 2016. As identified, the potential historic district is a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA, and the proposed project is reviewed for impacts on

that historical resource. The proposed project is found to not cause material impairment to the potential historic district and thus, would not cause a significant impact under CEQA.

### CITY OF LOS ANGELES

Sec. 22.171.7 of Los Angeles Administrative Code defines criteria for designation of a Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM). For ease in applying local eligibility, the following numbers are assigned to the criteria, which align to a large degree with National and California Registers. HCMs are defined as:

- 1) Historic structures or sites in which the broad cultural, economic or social history of the nation, state or community is reflected and exemplified; identified with important events in the main currents of national, state, or local history; or
- 2) Historic structures or sites identified with personages in the main currents of national, state or local history; or
- 3) Historic structures or sites which embody the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type specimen, inherently valuable for a study of a period style or method of construction or a notable work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual genius influenced his age.

Listing as an HCM is subject to review by the Cultural Heritage Commission and the Planning and Land Use Management Committee of the City Council, and requires approval by the City Council.

The Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) Ordinance was adopted by the City of Los Angeles in 1979, and revised in 1997. As defined in the Cultural Heritage Masterplan Review Draft (March 7, 2000, Cultural Heritage Masterplan), an HPOZ is, "...a planning tool which recognizes the special qualities of areas of historic, cultural, or architectural significance. An HPOZ does not change the underlying zoning; rather it lays an added level of protection over a zone through local board oversight." There are thirty designated historic preservation overlay zones in Los Angeles, incorporating thousands of properties. The Cultural Heritage Masterplan defines HPOZ criteria for evaluation and states that structures, natural features, or sites within the involved area, or the area as a whole, shall meet one or more of the following:

- A) Adds to the historic architectural qualities or historic associations for which a property is significant because it was present during the period of significance, and possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at that time
- B) Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established feature of the neighborhood, community, or City
- C) Retaining the structure would help preserve and protect an historic place or area of historic interest in the City

### **Relationship to Project**

The subject property is not a designated HCM, nor is it located within an existing HPOZ. The subject property was identified as a contributor to the potential Los Angeles Industrial Historic District, and because an HPOZ is the local designation for an historic district, it is possible that the potential historic district would be treated as an HPOZ in the future. The proposed project is found to not cause material impairment to the potential historic district or HPOZ and thus, would not cause a significant impact under CEQA.

## V. HISTORIC CONTEXTS

The manufacturing history and industrial design of the subject property is relevant to two themes in SurveyLA's historic context statement titled *Industrial Development, 1850-1980: "Manufacturing for the Masses, 1883-1989" and "Industrial Design and Engineering, 1887-1965."*<sup>6</sup> This section discusses industrial development in the area south and east of downtown Los Angeles, a history of consumer goods manufacturing and the primary occupants of the subject property, and background on the building's industrial design and fire resistant construction method.

### **Industrial District**

The area south and east of downtown Los Angeles, between the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks and the Los Angeles River, developed into the City's first industrial district as a result of many pressures, including the availability of land, proximity to the Los Angeles River and existing railroads, specific zoning changes, and a general desire for an independent industrial district. Until the last quarter of the nineteenth century, this area was largely agricultural with the cultivation of citrus groves and vineyards. After the 1886 completion of the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad (Santa Fe Railroad) in Los Angeles, manufacturing began to move to the area to take advantage of the new rail link between the Port of Los Angeles and the rest of the nation.<sup>7</sup>

The first two decades of the twentieth century saw a sharp influx of population into Los Angeles, which necessitated an action to designate specific districts around the increasingly crowded area, segregated by residential, commercial, and industrial uses. In 1906, the City declared the first industrial district in an area east of downtown, bound by the Salt Lake Railroad and Butte Street to the south, the Southern Pacific Railroad to the west, and the Santa Fe Railroad to the east.<sup>8</sup> This area was strengthened as the industrial center in 1922, when the City rezoned downtown to eliminate all residential land use, and only accommodate office and retail facilities.<sup>9</sup> This action effectively pushed all residential development to the outskirts of the City's central core, and encouraged existing manufacturers to relocate to the industrial district.<sup>10</sup>

By the mid-1920s, manufacturers of all types—clothing, publishing materials, automobile parts, furniture—were producing goods in Los Angeles for local sale and interstate export.<sup>11</sup> Furniture manufacturing, in particular, was one of the highest producing sectors of the local economy during the 1920s, and several furniture factories were rooted in the industrial district, with most located within only one and one-half miles of each other.<sup>12</sup> By the end of the 1920s, Los Angeles was the metropolitan area with the largest manufacturing output in the western United States.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> LSA Associates, Inc. (Tanya Sorrell and Jennifer Thornton); Chattel Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, Inc. (Kathryn McGee, Marissa Moshier, Jenna Snow, and Shane Swerdlow); and University of Southern California (Mary Ringhoff and April Sommer Rabnera), *SurveyLA Historic Context Statement, Industrial Development, City of Los Angeles*, draft, 26 Aug. 2011.

<sup>7</sup> LSA Associates, Inc. et al., *SurveyLA Historic Context Statement, Industrial Development, City of Los Angeles*, 26 Aug. 2011, 80.

<sup>8</sup> "New District for Industry," *Los Angeles Times*, 6 Feb. 1906.

<sup>9</sup> While the zoning downtown allowed for office, manufacturing and retail, such manufacturing was generally limited to an accessory use associated with a retail store.

<sup>10</sup> Los Angeles Conservancy, *The Arts District: History and Architecture in Downtown L.A.*, Nov. 2013, 2. The industrial district offered ease of access to rail and highways for distribution.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> Anderson, *Eastside Industrial Area*, Sept. 1992, 1-4.

<sup>13</sup> Robert M. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis – Los Angeles, 1850-1930* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967, republished 1993), 133.

### **Manufacturing for the Masses**

In the 1910s and 1920s, the furniture industry was a major player in the consumer manufacturing segment of the Los Angeles economy. The subject property's role in this sector falls into the theme "Manufacturing for the Masses, 1883-1989" in SurveyLA's *Industrial Development, 1850-1960*. Following is a brief discussion of consumer manufacturing in the early twentieth century, as well as the history of the L.W. Stockwell Company.

In the late nineteenth century, the manufacturing sector accounted for a relatively low percentage of the local economy in comparison with other cities, especially given the City's expanding population. In an effort to grow this part of the economy, the Los Angeles Merchants and Manufacturers Organization made an effort in 1896 to rouse the public to support local businesses by purchasing products made in Los Angeles.<sup>14</sup> In addition to successfully convincing Angelenos to purchase household goods from local manufacturers, the campaign attracted new migrants from industrial hubs in Midwestern and Eastern states to the new industrial employment opportunities in Los Angeles.

Although manufacturing output was rising through the end of the nineteenth century, production of household goods continued to be outweighed by demand through the 1910s. Playing off the earlier movement, similar but more focused "buy local" campaigns were waged through the 1920s. Particular to the furniture industry, the Los Angeles Furniture Manufacturer's Association purchased advertisements in the *Los Angeles Times* aimed at persuading residents to "Help Keep Southern California Prosperous" by purchasing locally made furniture.<sup>15</sup>

The prosperous economy of the 1920s hailed an era of new spending on consumer goods, leading to another dramatic growth in manufacturing facilities in Los Angeles. This occurred once again after World War II, when another wave of demand for consumer goods was met with an increase in local manufacturing. The furniture and mattress industry, in particular, was strongest in the 1910s and 1920s, but thereafter was not a major component in the local manufacturing economy.<sup>16</sup>

### **L.W. Stockwell Company**

Lora Wood Stockwell (1859-1922) was an Ohio native who came to California between 1891 and 1892.<sup>17</sup> Upon his arrival, Stockwell became the Los Angeles branch manager of the Hulse-Bradford Co., a San Francisco-based upholstery firm, before founding the L.W. Stockwell Company to manufacture mattresses in 1905.<sup>18</sup> For the first six years after its founding, the company was located at 945 S. Los Angeles Street in downtown. By 1909, the firm's name had been changed to the Stockwell-Haley Company.

In 1910, the company commissioned W.J. Saunders to design a new factory and warehouse for the mattress maker's operations.<sup>19</sup> However, for unknown reasons, Saunders was replaced by the firm

---

<sup>14</sup> "All of One Mind – Henceforth Merchants and Manufacturers Will Work Together," *Los Angeles Times*, 21 July 1896.

<sup>15</sup> The Furniture Manufacturers' Association, "Help Keep California Prosperous," Advertisement. *Los Angeles Times*, 3 Jan. 1921.

<sup>16</sup> Anderson, *Eastside Industrial Area*, Sept. 1992, 1-5. Ortho Mattress, founded in 1961 by brothers Herman, Jerome and Sherman Mickell, grew from a single retail store to become the "nation's largest chain of mattress specialists" by 1972. This company was unusual in its being both a manufacturer and retailer. (Chuck Zaremba, "Ortho Mattress: Bedding Down to Business," *Home Furnishings Daily*, 31 July 1972.)

<sup>17</sup> "Pacific Coast Notes," *The Upholsterer and Interior Decorator*, Vol. 68, 1922, 110.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> "Other Improvements," *Los Angeles Times*, 3 July 1910.

R.B. Young & Son, which drew up the final plans and initiated construction of the subject property in the latter half of 1910.<sup>20</sup> The building was completed in 1911, and the company moved in that same year.

The Stockwell-Haley Company was one of the first of many furniture and mattress manufacturers to move to the growing industrial district. Despite its early arrival, it was the second furniture manufacturer on the block, behind the factory of Weber Show Case and Fixture Co., which had arrived prior to 1905.<sup>21</sup> However, this was the beginning of a greater movement of manufacturers relocating to the neighborhood, many of whom left their previous locations in downtown for the new industrial district. Mattress and furniture makers that followed this movement included the Simmons Manufacturing Company and Garetson Manufacturing Company, both moving to the industrial district in 1913.

Stockwell-Haley Company's new name did not survive long after the building's opening. In 1912, the firm reverted back to its original name, the L.W. Stockwell Company, and business remained under that name until another name change in 1931.<sup>22</sup> Throughout the 1910s and 1920s, the L.W. Stockwell Company manufactured bed springs, mattresses, and furniture hassocks, but was most known for two key products, the "Never Stretch" mattress, and the "Dixie, No-tuft" mattress. These flagship models were consistently advertised in the *Los Angeles Times* and the *Los Angeles Herald* by furniture retailers and department stores. According to a 1922 newspaper advertisement, a Never Stretch mattress "cannot become lumpy, tufts cannot pull out and it does not spread or flatten at the edges and always retains its original shape;" and the advertisement continued to enthuse that it "costs no more than the ordinary mattress."<sup>23</sup> The names of these products were painted on the south and east elevation of the building, portions of which still exist in ghosting. Although these were the company's key products, the two mattress models were also produced by other mattress manufacturers in the Los Angeles area and across the nation, and were not invented by or unique to the L.W. Stockwell Company.

Stockwell remained president of the company until his death on January 28, 1922, when son Nathaniel Y. Stockwell replaced him as president. His widow, Alice L. Stockwell, continued as Vice President with the company for only a few years after her husband's death.

Through the 1920s, the company was a longstanding member of the Los Angeles Furniture Manufacturer's Association, and Nathaniel Y. Stockwell was serving as President of the association by 1924. During his tenure with the Association, Nathaniel led plans to construct a building for permanent exhibition of the Los Angeles Furniture Association.<sup>24</sup> It was during this time that the forty-seven furniture companies involved in the Association saw a level of "unprecedented prosperity."<sup>25</sup> As a response to this strong decade, the *Los Angeles Times* called Los Angeles "the furniture manufacturing metropolis of the Pacific Coast."<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> "Weber Show Case and Fixture Company," *Los Angeles Herald*, 3 Sept. 1905.

<sup>22</sup> Los Angeles City Directory, 1909.; "San Francisco Notes," *The Upholsterer and Interior Decorator*, 1912, 69.

<sup>23</sup> The Wallace Company, "Wonderful Day Beds, Never-Stretch Mattresses, Paradise Bed Springs Featured in this Demonstration." Advertisement. *Schnectady Gazette*, 21 April 1922.

<sup>24</sup> While this furniture mart was never built, the concept ultimately led to construction of facilities such as the Los Angeles Furniture Mart, California Mart for the garment and fashion industry, and others.

<sup>25</sup> "Predicts Good Business," *Los Angeles Times*, 21 Dec. 1924.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

By 1930, Nathaniel Y. Stockwell had partnered with George S. Kling, of the Los Angeles-based Kling Manufacturing Company, to create the Stockwell-Kling Corporation. Likely a casualty of the Great Depression, not four years passed before the company went into bankruptcy and out of business, a moment proclaimed through mattress sale discounts and asset auctions during the month of February 1934.<sup>27</sup> Photography documenting the company's machinery was ordered in 1934 by James H. Koehl, of a patent law firm in Los Angeles, for the San Francisco-based McRoskey Mattress Company (Attachment C, Fig. 41-44). With information from a related court case filed in 1931, these photographs suggest that the San Francisco company was inspecting mattress-making equipment for evidence in a legal case concerning patent infringement. However, research to date has not confirmed this assumption.

### **Industrial Design and Engineering**

The subject property represents an industrial building design that prevailed between the mid-nineteenth to early twentieth centuries as a fire-resistant method of construction. This building's "mill construction" falls into the theme "Industrial Design and Engineering, 1887-1965" in SurveyLA's historic context *Industrial Development, 1850-1960*. Following is a brief discussion of early twentieth century industrial building design, architect R.B. Young & Son, and details regarding mill construction and other fire resistant elements of the building.

At the time of construction, the subject property was described as "one of the finest factory improvements in the City" in the *Los Angeles Sunday Times*, and was an addition to a burgeoning industrial district to the east of downtown.<sup>28</sup> During construction, it was described in the *Los Angeles Times* as being clad in blue brick and fitted with "Fire Appliances of the Latest Types."<sup>29</sup> The blue brick, however, does not appear to have made it into the building's final design.

Multi-story unreinforced masonry or brick buildings were common for industrial facilities in Los Angeles, and typically exhibited classically derived elements in their design.<sup>30</sup> These early masonry buildings were often described as "industrial lofts" as a building type. These designs were generally prevalent during the late 1900s until the 1930s, and were commonly marked by symmetry, regular or so-called classical rhythm of window openings, and the use of brick patterning and cornices as simple ornament.<sup>31</sup>

### **R.B. Young & Son**

The subject property was designed by R.B. Young & Son as a mattress factory and warehouse. This prominent Los Angeles architecture firm was named for founder and president Robert Brown Young (1854-1914), regarded as one of the most prolific architects in late nineteenth and early twentieth century Los Angeles.<sup>32</sup> Young was a Quebec-born architect who developed a respected reputation with several iconic designs representative of early Los Angeles architecture. In about 1905 Young's son, Frank Wilson Young, joined his father's practice to create R.B. Young & Son.<sup>33</sup> After R.B.

---

<sup>27</sup> J. J. Sugarman Co., Ltd. And Samuel C. Rudolph, "AUCTION, Furniture Factory," Advertisement, *Los Angeles Times*, 4 Feb. 1934.; The May Company, "Mattress Sensation," Advertisement, *Los Angeles Times*, 28 Feb. 1934.

<sup>28</sup> "New Factory Spells Growth," *Los Angeles Times*, 27 Nov. 1910.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Anderson, *Eastside Industrial Area*, Sept. 1992, 2-1.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> "Buildings Are His Monument," *Los Angeles Times*, 30 Jan. 1914.

<sup>33</sup> "With the Architects." *Architect and Engineer*, Vo. LVI, No. 1, Jan 1919, 113.

Young's passing in 1914, Frank took over the business before his own unexpected passing in 1919.<sup>34</sup>

R.B. Young's portfolio includes the San Fernando Building (1907) at 400 S Main Street, Vickrey-Brunswig Building (1888) at 501 N Main Street,<sup>35</sup> Los Angeles City Hall (1888, now demolished) at 226 S Broadway, among many other influential designs. The aforementioned were among R.B. Young's most well-known works, but the architect also designed more restrained industrial and commercial buildings such as the subject property. Several of R.B. Young's designs utilized mill construction, incorporating an unreinforced masonry perimeter wall with heavy timber framing, including the aforementioned Vickrey-Brunswig Building and the Forve-Pettebone Building (1906) at 510 S Broadway.

### **Mill Construction and Fire Resistance**

For factory owners in early twentieth century Los Angeles, electric power posed a great fire risk. To limit the damage in such an event, industrial buildings were designed and constructed with specific measures to minimize structural loss. While fireproofing did not necessarily prevent this type of disaster, it was carried out in hopes of limiting the time it took for a fire to consume a building.

In the early twentieth century, it was common for architects to implement "mill construction"—a type of heavy timber framing—for fire resistance. This construction method is defined by the use of timber columns on one floor connecting to timber columns on an upper floor using a cast iron pintle and separating beam. Although wood was not as fire resistant as reinforced concrete, mill construction was believed to be able to withstand a fire for much longer than other wood-frame construction. Because heavy timbers burn relatively slowly, this design would prevent a fire from quickly compromising the entire building. However, the effectiveness of this design in the event of a fire was highly debated in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.<sup>36</sup>

Attached to the top of each column are heavy timber beams that run across the width of the building. Atop these beams rest the flooring of the story above, which also acts as the ceiling for the story below. Through the use of a connecting cast iron pintle, the column on the lower floor is attached to the column on the upper floor. Mill construction was believed to be a wise choice for fire resistance, as it eliminates space between the floor and ceiling of each story to prevent fires from spreading across the building through compact, combustible channels that would otherwise provide a convenient space for fire to travel.<sup>37</sup>

For added fire resistance, fire walls were constructed between major sections of an industrial building to provide breaks during the event of a fire—hindering its spread. These features were usually constructed of several wythes of brick, with a few large openings that were able to be closed with sliding metal doors on either side to contain the fire to a single section of the factory.

### **History of Ownership and Occupants**

Completed in 1911, the subject property was built to house a warehouse and factory for the L.W.

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> The Vickrey-Brunswig Building is an HCM, and is currently part of La Plaza de Cultura y Artes.

<sup>36</sup> Edward Atkinson, "Mill Construction: What It Is, What It Is Not," *American Architect and Building News*, 1 April 1893, 14.

<sup>37</sup> LSA Associates, Inc. et al., *SurveyLA Historic Context Statement, Industrial Development, City of Los Angeles*, 26 Aug. 2011, 17.

Stockwell Company's mattress manufacturing business. The building remained a mattress factory until the company (under the name Stockwell-Kling Corporation) went out of business in 1934.

By 1936, available building permits show that the building was owned by the Eastern Outfitting Company, a furnishings retailer, that used the property as a warehouse.<sup>38</sup> By 1941, the building was recorded under the ownership of the Southwestern Bag Company, a firm founded in 1924 that specialized in manufacturing paper sacks.<sup>39</sup> During this time, the building's owner was referenced under several names, including Southwestern Bag Co., Max Baran (founder and owner of the company), Ben Baran (Max's son), and later, Baran Co. Inc. Around 1943, the Southwestern Bag Company's main address had moved to 1380 E 6<sup>th</sup> Street, which continues to be their headquarters today. It appears that Southwestern Bag Company owned the subject property, but leased to manufacturing and warehousing space to non-affiliated businesses.

In 1941, the Southwestern Bag Company leased the building to the Los Angeles Period Furniture Company for at least two years. The tenant intended to use the subject property as additional storage space, at a total cost of approximately \$10,000.<sup>40</sup> Founded in 1918, the Los Angeles Furniture Manufacturing Company bought the Period Manufacturing Company of Huntington Park to become the Los Angeles Period Furniture Company.

By 1950, the principal tenant appears to have been the Ero Manufacturing Company.<sup>41</sup> There is additional evidence that this tenant operated in the building between 1950 and 1973; however, the lease was likely for a longer period. During this time, the Ero Manufacturing Company manufactured auto seat covers, leather sporting goods, and hassocks. A 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map of the subject property details three distinct interior spaces and describes the various functions that occupied each space (Attachment C, Fig. 35). For the northern section of the interior, the first and third floors were devoted to storage, the second floor to offices, and the fourth floor to sewing. In the central section, shipping and storage occupied the first story, stock and packing the second story, manufacturing the third story, and cutting and sewing the fourth story. In the southern section, all levels appear to have been used for manufacturing and cutting. These three spaces are divided by original brick fire walls.

The Los Angeles City Directory shows that Atlas Manufacturing Company occupied a section of the subject property, along with Ero Manufacturing Company, between 1963 and 1987, and likely for a longer period. From the 1973 Los Angeles City Directory, other tenants that occupied the subject property include Reimann Ralph Sales, and Washington Quilt of California, a manufacturer of sleeping bags.

Not much is known about the tenants and uses of the building between 1973 and the building's most recent sale in 2014. However, there is evidence of a past sign on the exterior of the building that suggests that the American Shoe Corp., also known as the Zapateria Americana, had occupied at least part of the building at some point between the company's incorporation in 1993 and 2008.

---

<sup>38</sup> The Eastern Outfitting was merged with Columbia Outfitting in 1930 to become Eastern-Columbia, housed in the Eastern-Columbia Building at 849 S Broadway.

<sup>39</sup> Obituary of Milton Baran, *Los Angeles Times*, Aug. 18, 2013.

<sup>40</sup> "Warehouse Lease Deals Negotiated," *Los Angeles Times*, 20 April 1941.

<sup>41</sup> Sanborn Fire Insurance Map Company. Los Angeles, 1906-1950, Volume 2, Sheet 201.

The most recent title change occurred on November 18, 2014, transferring the title from Baran Company, Inc. to BC Real Estate Group, Inc. It appears that the building continues in the same family of ownership, now known as the Baran Spiwak family.

**Period of Significance**

If one were to assign a period of significance to the subject property, it would likely correspond to the building's completion in 1911 and the L.W. Stockwell Company's occupation from that date to 1934. Based on review of limited ownership and tenant information, it appears the L.W. Stockwell Company's ownership and occupation is the only significant period, as it corresponds with the manufacturer's early arrival to the City's first industrial district. The post-1934 occupation of the building does not appear to rise to any level of significance, as none of the following tenants or uses appear to have made a significant contribution on any industry. Therefore, the period of significance for the subject property is 1911-1934.

## **VI. DESCRIPTION**

Following is description of the subject property, including its setting, exterior, and interior. Alterations to the subject property are also summarized.

### PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

#### **Setting**

The subject property is located at 400 S Alameda Street, at the southeast corner of S Alameda and E 4<sup>th</sup> Streets (formerly Vincent Street). Seaton Street borders the property at the east. According to Los Angeles County Assessor Maps, the subject property contains one parcel (AIN 5163-026-001), which includes lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Block A in the F.P. Howard and Co.'s Subdivision of the Bliss Tract (Attachment A, Fig. 1). The building perimeter extends directly to the sidewalk on S Alameda, E 4<sup>th</sup>, and Seaton, and takes the general, irregular shape of the parcel. There is a one-story building immediately adjacent to the subject property on the south elevation (422 S Alameda, AIN 5163-026-002). There are four young trees in sidewalk planters on S Alameda, while the other two sidewalk-adjacent elevations are void of landscaping and street furniture.

At the time of construction, the subject property was located in the burgeoning industrial district, across Alameda from the Southern Pacific rail yards, which serviced the adjacent Arcade Depot (1888, demolished 1914), then Central Station (1914, demolished 1956). In the late 1950s the property west of Alameda and south of E 4<sup>th</sup> Street, was redeveloped as a cold storage facility (Los Angeles Cold Storage, 400 S Central Avenue, 1957-1969). At the date of construction of the subject property, buildings in the vicinity housed manufacturing and warehousing facilities and other industrial operations, while a handful of properties remained residential in use.

Remnants of rails are still visible on the west side of Alameda, however there is no evidence of spurs that lead—or once led—to the subject property. Today, the neighborhood is generally known as the Arts District, and the subject property continues to be surrounded by both operating industrial facilities and former industrial buildings converted to residential and artist live-work uses. Contributors to the potential historic district are typically one to four stories in height, are constructed of brick or reinforced concrete, and fill the entire site. While the area largely retains its industrial character, there are also several non-industrial uses nearby such as multi-family residential buildings, art galleries, restaurants, cafes, parking lots, and various retail spaces in both new and adaptively reused industrial buildings.

#### **Exterior**

The site contains a three-story irregular-shaped building constructed of unreinforced brick masonry atop a reinforced concrete foundation at grade. The building has a flat, built-up roof clad in rolled asphalt and bordered by a low, reinforced concrete parapet. Due to the angled entrance at the subject property's northwest corner, the building has five distinct elevations: west elevation (S Alameda, primary elevation), northwest entry elevation (primary elevation), north elevation (E 4<sup>th</sup>, primary elevation), east elevation (Seaton, secondary elevation), and south elevation (tertiary elevation).

The original fourth story of the subject property was removed in 1971, and a new roof was installed over the existing third story. During this alteration, the 10-inch high concrete parapet was constructed at the perimeter to terminate the masonry wall below and topped by a metal guard rail.

The building does not have a clearly identifiable style, but consists of a utilitarian form and design that is typical of early twentieth century industrial architecture. The building was constructed of brick and heavy timber framing over a 21-inch deep concrete foundation with concrete footings that are 3 feet wide and 12 inches deep.<sup>42</sup> The concrete foundation is visible for 1 foot 9 inches above the sidewalk on the four visible elevations. The exterior brick was laid in American common bond at the time of construction; however, substantial sections of brick on the west, north, east, and south elevations have been replaced with masonry units that are longer and wider than the original brick, and laid in stretcher bond. Much of the brick is overpainted. Several original window openings have been infilled with brick, concrete masonry, or hollow clay tiles. While the east, south, and west elevations have several window openings that have been enclosed, all fenestration on the north elevation has been enclosed.

The northwest entry elevation is recessed one wythe from the north and west elevations, and faces the intersection of S Alameda and E 4<sup>th</sup> at an angle. The first story entry is marked by a central opening that is fitted with a non-original metal frame glazed door with a fixed transom and sidelights. On the exterior of the entry, there are non-original fixed metal grilles and operable metal scissor gates for security. The second story has two wood sash double-hung windows with triple course, header bond, segmental arch lintels and a sill that spans both window openings in a single projecting belt course. The third story has two rectangular wood sash hopper windows that are not original to the building and were likely installed when the fourth story was removed. These hopper windows have trapezoidal concrete lintels that replaced the original segmental arch brick lintels, as well as similar projecting belt course sills that span both window openings. Directly above the main entry is the building's address written with individual projecting characters, spelling "400 South Alameda St." on the top line, "Los Angeles" on the center line, and "TEL:" on the bottom line. Ghosting is apparent from a telephone number that once followed "TEL:", however, the number is not legible. All of the lettering is not original. There are several anchor plates and tie rods—evidence of Division 88 seismic retrofitting—on the exterior of this elevation.

The north elevation faces E 4<sup>th</sup>. This is the only elevation without windows, as thirteen original window openings on the first through third stories have been infilled with brick. Arched header courses and slightly projecting sills indicate the locations of some of the window enclosures; these signs have been obliterated for most of the previous openings. The brickwork exterior of this elevation shows evidence of extensive patchwork and replacement. There is ghosting of a previous painted sign that reads "American Shoe Corp." on the top line, and "Zapateria Americana." on the bottom line. There is a painted sign that reads "ENTRANCE" and "ENTRADA" with an arrow pointing east toward Seaton. This elevation displays several pieces of artwork on the lower third of the brick exterior, many of which have been applied to the building atop a stiff papery film. There is also evidence of overpainting that was carried out to cover graffiti and artwork on this elevation.

The east elevation faces Seaton. The exterior has two metal fire escapes, as well as a broken downspout that ends approximately 12 feet above the sidewalk. The elevator shaft that is visible at the building's southeast corner has had nearly all of the exterior brick replaced with newer brick on this elevation. The first story has three ground-level loading bays—one of which has been enclosed, and another that is fitted with a metal scissor security gate. There is a fourth, smaller loading bay that is located at the elevator shaft on the southern end of the elevation, and begins at the height of a cargo truck loading deck. Also on the first story, there is a bricked-in door with a segmental arch lintel, as well as fourteen window openings that have all been enclosed with either hollow concrete masonry units or wood boards. The second story has twenty-one window openings, one of which

---

<sup>42</sup> Dimensions are quoted from as built drawings, Attachment F.

appears to have been permanently enclosed, while another appears to have been enlarged and converted to a second-story loading door with the installation of a vertical wood batten leaf. Of the other nineteen openings, twelve appear to have had the original wood double-hung windows replaced with either wood sash hopper windows or metal fixed windows with privacy glass and metal spandrels. The three smallest windows appear to be unaltered, with wood sash casement windows with vertical metal bars spanning the reveals. Due to the amount of replaced brick and lack of historic photographs of this elevation, it is unclear at this time how many window openings were originally on the third story. There are several anchor plates and tie rods—evidence of Division 88 seismic retrofitting—on the exterior of this elevation. At the northeast corner, there is ghosting of a painted sign that once read “L•W•STOCKWELL” in vertical script, then on successive lines below, “CO”, “NEVER STRETCH”, then “MATTRESSES”.

The majority of the south elevation is obscured by the attached neighboring building, and not visible from the right-of-way. There is ghosting from signage that existed on the eastern corner of this elevation, on the exterior of the elevator shaft. It reads “NEVER STRETCH AND DIXIE TUFT MATTRESS”, though the word “NEVER” is obscured by the concrete parapet wall, and only shows approximately the bottom 10% of the word (Attachment B, Fig. 12). Historical research found the phrase in a newspaper advertisement from 1921, verifying the words on the signage (Attachment E, Fig. 49). The second story appears to have had six windows originally; however, all have been enclosed with brick or hollow concrete masonry units. Photographic evidence also shows the third story having six windows originally. Of these windows, four have been enclosed in brick, one has been replaced with a wood sash hopper window, and one appears to be a wood sash double-hung window with diagonal metal bracing in the reveal. There is evidence of overpainting that was carried out to cover graffiti and artwork on this elevation.

The west elevation is 194 feet 8 inches in length and faces S Alameda. Of all the elevations, the west elevation has the largest number of unaltered window openings; however, many other openings on this elevation have had windows removed and been enclosed in brick. There is one metal fire escape attached to the exterior brick, as well as one downspout that is broken approximately 7 feet above the sidewalk. The first story has three loading bays that lead to curb cuts onto S Alameda, but only the center bay opening extends to the sidewalk level. The outer two bays are covered by the concrete wraparound foundation. The first story has twelve original window openings; however, all have been enclosed with brick or hollow concrete masonry units. On the second story, there are twenty-one window openings. While several of these openings appear to have original wood sash double-hung and wood sash hopper windows in place, others appear to have been replaced over time or boarded up with plywood. The third story originally had twenty-one window openings, but all of the window openings were altered during the fourth story removal in 1971. Today, most of the openings are enclosed with brick, while five of the openings have wood sash hopper replacement windows. There is evidence of overpainting that was carried out to cover graffiti and artwork on this elevation.

The subject property is capped by a built-up roof that consists of rolled asphalt and gravel. The parapet extends approximately 1 foot above the roofline, and a metal guard rail rises approximately 1.5 feet above the parapet. The roof is accessible from the third story via a stairwell that leads to a doghouse with an exterior metal door.

### **Interior**

The interior appears to largely retain the spatial arrangement of the original design, but no longer contains the machinery of the original mattress factory, which was likely removed in 1934. The building’s heavy timber columns are regularly spaced along parallel girders, secured together by

cast-iron pintles. Because of the open floor plan, the mill construction is visible throughout all stories of the interior.

There are three main sections of the building's interior, each divided by brick interior fire walls that are laid in common bond. For the purposes of this report, the sections are referred to as the northern section, central section, and southern section. The fire walls are 1 foot 10 inches thick and have segmental arch doorways fitted with rail-sliding metal fire doors on both sides.

The 1971 removal of the building's fourth story was a substantial alteration to the internal layout. Previously, the interior had undergone minor changes since its 1911 construction. In 1949, sections of flooring were removed for an additional elevator shaft located at the building's southeast corner. In 1962, interior rooms were added to sections of the building as office space. These rooms were sequestered to the perimeters of the building or its internal fire walls, retaining the general open arrangement.

The majority of the building is open in plan, with only the two brick interior fire walls to separate the spaces. However, on the first story, there are six individual rooms constructed of wood frame and drywall, each with a single opening, and several with fixed wood frame windows. There are two existing freight elevators in the building. One is situated on the northern wall of the central section, while the other is located at the southeast corner of the building. The northern elevator appears to have extended to the serve the roof before 1971.

On the first story, the northwest corner entrance leads into an entry vestibule that has finished interior walls and ceiling. The vestibule provides step-up access to the main first story, and a wood staircase to the second story. This staircase is one of four stairways on the first story, and has large, square, wood banister posts. The other three stairways consist of wood treads and risers hidden between a wood partition wall and either a brick perimeter wall or a brick interior wall. The entire first story has poured concrete flooring, with linoleum laid over the concrete on portions of the northern section. The loading dock on the west wall of the central section is marked by a wood board platform that extends inward approximately 18 feet.

The second and third stories are similar in finishes. Both stories have narrow-cut wood floors throughout, separated only by metal sills in the brick fire wall openings. Several walls are clad in drywall, while others are painted brick, and still others clad in vertical wood beadboard.

### CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

While the subject property does not appear individually eligible at any level, this report applies traditional assessment methods to review potential project impacts, including identification of character-defining features. Character-defining features are the physical features of a building that convey its significance. A three-step approach, as described in *Preservation Brief 17: Architectural Character: Identifying the Visual Aspects of Historic Buildings as an Aid to Preserving Their Character*<sup>43</sup> is utilized to identify materials, features, and spaces that contribute to the visual character of the subject property. The purpose of this approach is to identify features or elements that give a building its visual character and that should be preserved to the maximum extent possible. Character-defining features of the subject property are identified as they convey the building's industrial character as it exists today.

---

<sup>43</sup> National Park Service, Department of the Interior. *Preservation Brief 17: Architectural Character: Identifying the visual Aspects of Historic Buildings as an Aid to Preserving Their Character*. Washington D.C.

**Significant**

- Industrial setting
- Mill construction
- Brick exterior
- Regular fenestration pattern

**Contributing**

- Segmental arch window openings
- Open floor plan
- Interior brick fire walls
- Loading dock doors
- Entry vestibule and wood staircase
- Sign ghosting associated with L.W. Stockwell Company

**HISTORY OF ALTERATIONS**

Building permits and City records document alterations to the subject property. A summary of the available documentation is as follows:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Listed Owner</b>	<b>Architect</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Description</b>
1932	A. W. Stockwell	Contractor: L. A. Aisteier[?]	\$270	"Installing three drop ladders"
1936	Eastern Outfitting	Unknown	\$75	"Drive in [concrete] ramp from Seaton 172 ft from 4 <sup>th</sup> St through existing door 12 x 15 from building line two ft rise"
1941	Pacific Outdoor Advertising Co.	Unknown	\$100	"1- 10x25 sign to be attached to the south wall [illegible] approx. 19" to the bottom Will not cover any windows or extend above fire wall – Sign of metal with wood trim, no hollow spaces"
1943	Ben Baran	Engineer: Chas L. Webber	\$1,000	"Repair damaged roof construction, install new truss members and connections, reinforce present girders and hip rafter, replace arches with lintels of two door openings as per plans herewith."
1945	Southwestern Bag Co.	Unknown	\$560	"Re-roof fwd building area asbestos cap sheet top mopped. 30" asphalt felt[?] & 65" asbestos cap sheet top mopped."
1946	Max Baran	Unknown	\$2,500	"Remove burned floor, columns, girders, joists and replace with new construction. This building partially burned and all new work to be done so as to restore the building to its original condition. Damages by fire was less than 5% of total of building."
1949	Southwestern Bag Company	Engineer: John G. Case	\$4,000	"To gut holes in existing wood floors and roof, support out ends, and frame and plaster for future elevator."
1949	Southwestern Bag Company	Engineer: John G. Case	\$4,500	"Install elevator"
1962	Ero Mfg. Co	Contractor: Sam Chesler	Unknown	"Interior partitions for offices suspended ceiling & A.C."
1971	Ben Baran	Engineer: S.B. Barnes	\$20,000	"Earthquake Repair[:] Remove north wall & part of east and west walls of 4 <sup>th</sup> story & replacing w/ new 10" reinf. brick walls"
1985	Ben Baran	Engineer: S.B. Barnes and Associates	\$125,000	"Full compliance Div. 88 Class II"
1988	Ben Baren [sic]	Engineer: HRC Consultants, Inc.	\$75,000	"Repair of earthquake damage"
1989	Boran Co., Inc. [sic]	Contractor: P.E. Roofing	\$17,200	"Remove old roofing & install new glasc[?] & roof"
2011	Baran Co Inc	Unknown	Unknown	"Replace 520 Fire Sprinkler Heads"

From around the time of construction to at least 1950, the building had large, open-panel roof sign facing west towards downtown, which read: "L.W. STOCKWELL CO." (Attachment C, Fig. 45-46). Other signage was applied with paint onto the exterior brick at three other elevations. A 1934 photograph shows the painted sign reading "L.W. STOCKWELL CO." across the entire north elevation between the third and fourth story windows, along with "NEVER STRETCH MATTRESSES" between the second and third story windows (Attachment C, Fig. 38). The north elevation signage was removed some time before 1951. A 1934 photograph also evidences the painted signage at the northern corner of the east elevation, which reads "L•W•STOCKWELL CO NEVER STRETCH MATTRESSES", with the "L•W•STOCKWELL" shown in vertical text. Part of this signage on the east elevation is visible as ghosting, and still shows "NEVER STRETCH MATTRESSES", with a portion of "MATTRESSES" that has since been painted over (Attachment C, Fig. 38). The most visible ghosting exists on the south elevation, however, due to removal of the fourth story and installation of new brick and the concrete parapet, the original text has been significantly obscured (Attachment B, Fig. 12). Today, it reads "STRETCH AND DIXIE NO TUFT," however, it's clear that the full name of the product "NEVER STRETCH" was once fully visible. Both the Never Stretch and Dixie No-Tuft mattresses were flagship products of the L.W. Stockwell Company.

During ownership under the Barans, the subject property received a new roof and new truss members. A small fire in 1946 necessitated the removal and replacement of portions of burned floor, columns, girders, and joists, however, it is noted that the fire damaged less than 5% of the building's total interior square footage. In 1949, the subject property was altered to accommodate the installation of an additional freight elevator, which is located at the southeastern corner of the building.

In 1962, small areas of the open-plan layout were partitioned into several interior rooms. These spaces appear to be wood framed with drywall exterior and drop ceilings, and as suggested by the building permit, were constructed to accommodate air conditioning through a central HVAC system. Today, the building has thirteen of these rooms, including those built as restrooms.

The subject property was substantially damaged in the 1971 Sylmar Earthquake, and the fourth floor was removed within a few weeks of the seismic event. This work dramatically altered the building's massing and exterior appearance, effectively cutting its height by a quarter and losing the original cornice. A band of exposed reinforced concrete, surmounted by a steel pipe railing, now tops the building. The change also resulted in the modification of the third story window size and shape; the segmental arch heads were removed and replaced by flat heads, lowering the height of the windows. Many of these third story windows have since been enclosed with brick, however, it is not known when these changes occurred (Attachment D, Fig. 47-48).

In 1985, the subject property underwent Division 88 seismic retrofitting—the structural components of which are visible on the building's exterior, and on several brick perimeter walls and partition walls. Division 88 was required earthquake hazard reduction for existing unreinforced masonry buildings and required tying exterior perimeter walls to floor and roof diaphragms, as well as later strengthening. Thus, anchor plates and infilled windows are prevalent.

Chattel, Inc. conducted a site visit at the subject property on July 18, 2016. Although the above history of alterations indicates changes of the subject property through building permits, field inspection confirmed several alterations that were not identified in the permit research. These alterations include removal of original brick in several sections of the exterior, and its replacement with contemporary brick of differing size, color, and bond. Several original windows have been removed and the openings have been enclosed with brick or concrete masonry units. All of the

original window openings on the third story have been reshaped, including the removal of the segmental arch brick lintels, and replacement with flat concrete lintels.

### INTEGRITY

In addition to meeting one of the four criteria, National and California Register-eligible properties must also retain sufficient integrity to convey historic significance. A property either retains its integrity, the physical and visual characteristics necessary to convey its significance, or it does not. Evaluation of integrity is founded on “an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance.” The seven aspects of integrity are Location, Design, Setting, Materials, Workmanship, Feeling, and Association. In *National Register Bulletin 15*, the National Park Service states the following: “To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects.”<sup>44</sup>

The industrial building at 400 S Alameda, has been substantially altered since its construction, with most changes taking place after the 1934 departure of the original owner and occupant L.W. Stockwell Company. The most significant alteration occurred in 1971, when damage from the Sylmar Earthquake necessitated removal of the subject property’s fourth story—an alteration that caused a severe loss of integrity.

### **Location**

The subject property retains integrity of location, as the property has never been moved, and represents the second factory location of the L.W. Stockwell Company.

### **Setting**

The subject property retains integrity of setting, as the setting includes a busy commercial and industrial corridor lined mostly with garages, industrial lofts, and manufacturing spaces. The secondary elevations are located on narrower streets that experience less traffic, or are partially obscured by neighboring buildings. Several neighboring industrial buildings that were constructed before or during the subject property’s period of significance still exist, however, many have experienced substantial integrity loss. Of these, several have taken on new, residential and commercial uses, and have undergone significant design changes. Arcade Station (and later, Central Station) and the accompanying Southern Pacific rail yards that were located on the west side of Alameda Street, were developed in the 1950s for industrial use. Although several new buildings have been constructed since the period of significance, the overall industrial nature of the immediate setting and neighboring blocks continues to prevail in use and architecture. Therefore, the subject property retains integrity of setting.

### **Design**

The subject property does not retain integrity of design. Although the building’s mill construction is still intact and visible on the interior, other aspects of the design have experienced substantial integrity loss over the years.

As described in this report, the original building had four complete stories until 1971, when earthquake damage necessitated the demolition of the fourth story, which had implications to the exterior and interior. Photographs from 1934 show the fourth story with a pitched truss ceiling—the only ceiling of this type in the building. The removal of the fourth story not only affected this structural system, but also had significant impacts on exterior elements at the third story. Segmental brick

---

<sup>44</sup> National Register Bulletin #15, 44.

header lintels—character-defining features—were removed from the windows of the third story, and were all replaced with straight concrete lintels. With the demolition of the fourth story came the removal of the classically-derived dentiled brick cornice that topped the original roofline. Photographic evidence shows the original cornice as having wrapped around the roofline of the north, east, and west elevations.

All 18 windows on the north elevation have been enclosed or removed, however, it is not known at this time when this alteration was carried out. Double-hung wood windows, as well as their brick sills and lintels, are significant to the early twentieth century utilitarian design of the subject property. The enclosure of these windows (and removal as a result of brick replacement) have substantially impacted the integrity of design.

### **Materials**

The subject property does not retain integrity of materials due to changes to the building over its lifespan. Several significant sections of brick exterior have been replaced with contemporary bricks that differ in size, color, and bond from the original masonry units. The building's large concrete parapet and concrete lintels also detract from its integrity of material.

### **Feeling**

The subject property retains integrity of feeling. In this context, feeling is the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the building's original character. The extensive alterations to the subject property's primary and secondary elevations compromise the building's ability to convey its character as a four-story early twentieth century mattress factory with simple classical ornamentation. However, in the industrial context, such compromised feeling does not detract from integrity.

### **Association**

The subject property retains integrity of association. For integrity of association to be retained, the building must be sufficiently intact to convey its earlier relationships to an observer. The association with the L.W. Stockwell Company, while compromised, is still present in the ghosted signage from its period of significance. In the industrial context, such limited evidence of association does not detract from integrity.

### **Workmanship**

The subject property does not retain significance of workmanship. On the primary and secondary elevations, only 74 of the building's original 176 window openings have retained the character-defining segmental arch lintels. An area of workmanship that is no longer extant is the dentiled brick cornice, which was eliminated at the removal of the fourth story. With fewer than half of the lintels remaining, and the absence of the cornice, the building does not retain integrity of workmanship.

Overall, the subject property displays a substantial loss of integrity in design, materials, and workmanship, and compromised feeling and association, as a result of the alterations and modifications made to the building over its lifespan. Therefore, the subject property is no longer able to convey its significance from the 1911-1934 period of significance.

## **VII. HISTORIC RESOURCE ASSESSMENT**

Using the framework established in the historic context, this section evaluates the subject property for listing in the National Register, California Register, and for local designation.

### NATIONAL AND CALIFORNIA REGISTERS AND CITY OF LOS ANGELES HCM/HPOZ

Because eligibility criteria for local HCM designation and the California Register align in large degree with eligibility criteria for the National Register, the following evaluation considers eligibility under each of the criteria at federal, state, and local levels under a single heading.

#### **Criterion A/1/1**

*Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history and cultural heritage.*

Evaluated individually, the subject property has not made a significant contribution to broad patterns of history. In the context of “Manufacturing for the Masses, 1883-1989”, the furniture and mattress industry was not a particularly large or impactful industry for the Los Angeles economy after the 1920s. In particular, the L.W. Stockwell Company is not shown to have had a lasting impact on social history in a local, statewide, or national context. Furthermore, the company’s key products were also produced by other mattress manufacturers in the Los Angeles area and across the nation, and were not invented by or unique to the L.W. Stockwell Company. Therefore, the subject property is not individually eligible for listing under Criterion A/1/1.

SurveyLA identified the subject property as a contributing resource to a potential historic district. Although the SurveyLA data is currently in draft form, it is assumed that the potential historic district is significant under City Criterion 1, for its association with industrial development of Los Angeles. Therefore, as the potential historic district is considered a qualified historical resource for the purposes of CEQA review, and discretionary changes to the subject property have the potential to impact the potential historic district.

#### **Criterion B/2/2**

*Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.*

The research conducted for this report did not identify any persons who made significant contributions to history that were particularly associated with the subject property. Although Lora Wood Stockwell was the founder and namesake for the L.W. Stockwell Company, there is very little evidence to suggest that he made significant contributions to history in a manner what would warrant designation under this criterion. Additionally, a partial list of past owners and tenants did not reveal any historically significant individuals or organizations associated with the building or its uses. Therefore, the subject property is not eligible for listing under Criterion B/2/2.

#### **Criterion C/3/3**

*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.*

Designed by R.B. Young & Son, a prominent architecture firm in late nineteenth and early twentieth century Los Angeles, the subject property is the work of an important creative group of architects. However, the building does not retain sufficient integrity of design, materials and workmanship to convey the original architectural work of R.B. Young & Son. While several industrial buildings in the vicinity share similar design elements, the character-defining features of the subject property are not rare or unique for early twentieth century industrial architecture. However, the subject property is an

example of mill construction—a relatively early type of Los Angeles industrial loft architecture—which is only visible from the interior. The building’s exterior does not exhibit sufficient integrity to convey this architectural significance, and therefore, the subject property is not eligible for listing under Criterion C/3/3.

**Criterion D/4**

*Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.*

The subject property cannot be reasonably expected to yield information important in prehistory or history. Therefore, it does not meet Criterion D/4.

## VIII. IMPACTS ANALYSIS

### APPROACH

*The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* contains four treatments: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, Reconstruction. The appropriate treatment for the proposed project is rehabilitation, which is defined as "The process of returning a property to a state of utility...while preserving those portions and features of the property which are significant to its historic, architectural, and cultural values."<sup>45</sup> Therefore, this impacts analysis will evaluate proposed project conformance with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Secretary's Standards and Guidelines)* as it applies to the subject project (direct impacts) and, separately, the potential historic district (indirect impacts).

Of course, it is important to note that when applying the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines* to the proposed project, greater weight is afforded to those impacts which may impact the potential historic district, not the subject property itself, because the potential historic district is considered to be the historical resource under CEQA.

In addition, this section will also assess whether the proposed project will reach a level of material impairment as defined by CEQA to the subject property (direct impacts) and, separately, the potential historic district (indirect impacts). Similar to the application of the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines* stated above, any level of material impairment to the potential historic district carries greater weight than material impairment to the subject property.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project involves adaptive reuse of the subject property as a hotel with 66 guestroom units, retail and restaurant functions operating on the ground level, and a bar on the rooftop level.<sup>46</sup> Hotel and restaurant pedestrian entrances are provided on Seaton; no parking is provided on site. As described, the subject property does not appear individually eligible for listing at the federal, state or local levels under any criteria, but has been identified in 2016 by SurveyLA as a contributor to a potential historic district, eligible only at the local level. For buildings not considered significant for architecture, a greater degree of flexibility is generally allowed for alterations found to not substantially impact historical resources under CEQA. It is assumed that the potential historic district is significant for its association with industrial development under City Criterion 1, and not for architecture under City Criterion 3.

Review of the proposed project is based on concept layouts consisting of floor plans, elevations, and renderings prepared by Gracia Studio and contained in Attachment F. It should be noted that these drawings are in the early stages of development. Major proposed project components are listed below:

- Conversion of all floors to guestrooms, amenities, and services, with retail and restaurant at the ground level.
- Construction of a partial single-story rooftop addition to consist of guestrooms, restrooms, pool, Jacuzzi, open air gym, and bar.

---

<sup>45</sup> U.S. Department of the Interior, "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings" (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1990), 5.

<sup>46</sup> The proposed project drawings describe the ground floor or level following British tradition: the floor of a building which is level with the ground is called the ground floor, and the floor above it is called the first floor.

- Retention of majority of brick exterior perimeter walls, with alteration of various existing openings including enlarging, infilling or otherwise modifying loading dock bays.
- Installation of new windows to replace infilled original openings.
- Addition of contemporary window frame projections.
- Infill of access at northwest entry elevation, and conversion to a window.
- Removal of all existing interior stairwells, and construction of new locations.
- Creation of an interior courtyard with retention of the brick exterior perimeter wall and reconstructed window fenestration, but without any new windows.
- Retention of interior brick fire walls.

### SECRETARY'S STANDARDS

The *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines* is produced by the National Park Service "to assist the long-term preservation of a property's significance through the preservation of historic materials and features."<sup>47</sup> There are two sections: the *Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards)*, and the *Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Guidelines)*. The *Standards* consist of ten treatment principles that "comprise...overall preservation project standards and [address] the most prevalent treatment." The *Guidelines* are intended to be used to help apply the *Standards*.

Under CEQA, effects on historical resources resulting from a project found in conformance with the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines* are generally considered mitigated to a less than significant level or exempt, as provided in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(b)(3). Therefore, a project that complies with the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines* is a project that does not result in a substantial adverse change to a historical resource.

### **Direct impacts on subject property**

The proposed project is found to not conform with the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines* as described in detail below. Although the subject property is not separately eligible as a historical resource under CEQA, the proposed project should nevertheless strive to conform to the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines*, as it applies to the subject property.

Conformance with the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines* is a high level of review – higher than the threshold for not causing material impairment. The ten *Standards*, and proposed project conformance to each, are described below:

1. *A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial arrangements.*

The proposed project does not conform to Standard 1. The addition of contemporary window frame projections that obscure the segmental arch lintels at extant original window openings and vertically groups several upper level windows together results in a major change to primary (Alameda and E 4<sup>th</sup>) and secondary (Seaton) elevations. The new spatial arrangement on the ground level removes the (northwest corner) entry vestibule, which is a contributing feature of the subject property. The addition of new interior walls would conceal several heavy timber columns that display the building's "mill construction." Together, these changes have a cumulative effect which goes beyond "minimal change," and thus the proposed project does not conform to Standard 1.

---

<sup>47</sup> U.S. Department of the Interior, "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings" (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1990), 5.

2. *The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*

The proposed project does not conform to Standard 2. The distinct, regular fenestration pattern defined by the existing segmental arch window openings will be altered by the addition of contemporary window frame projections. As the concept layouts show, the proposed project would not retain the exterior ghosting of painted signage related to the L.W. Stockwell Company—a contributing feature—which is extant on three of the five elevations. The creation of an interior courtyard necessitates removal of several heavy timber columns that characterize the subject property's "mill construction."

3. *Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.*

The proposed concept layouts do not create a false sense of history, and the proposed project conforms to Standard 3.

4. *Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.*

Standard 4 does not apply, as the alterations over time have not acquired historic significance.

5. *Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*

The proposed project does not conform to Standard 5. The addition of contemporary window frame projections does not preserve the craftsmanship represented by the segmental arch lintels at extant original window openings.

6. *Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*

The proposed project conforms to Standard 6. Infilled window openings are proposed to be reopened and fitted with new windows. The locations of aforementioned windows are substantiated by pictorial evidence.

7. *Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.*

Standard 7 does not apply, as chemical or physical treatments have not been proposed.

8. *Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If*

*such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.*

Standard 8 does not apply as encountering archeological resources is not anticipated.

9. *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. New work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

The proposed project does not conform to Standard 9. The addition of contemporary window frame projections destroys the character-defining segmental arch lintels at extant original window openings. The creation of an interior courtyard necessitates removal of several heavy timber columns that characterize the subject property's "mill construction," and reopens or enlarges original fenestration without windows and doors.

10. *New additions and adjacent related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

The proposed project does not conform to Standard 10. While the partial single-story rooftop addition would not alter the subject property's form, integrity, or environment, the addition of contemporary window frame projections destroys the character-defining segmental arch lintels at extant original window openings.

#### **Indirect impacts on potential historic district**

The National Park Service summarizes the importance of assessing proposed project conformance to the *Guidelines* as it relates to impacts on historic districts:

The relationship between historic buildings, and streetscape and landscape features within a historic district or neighborhood help to define the historic character and therefore should always be a part of the rehabilitation plans.<sup>48</sup>

Indirect impacts on a historic district cannot be evaluated using all ten *Standards* listed previously, as these relate to impacts on an individual resource, and not a historic district. However, Standards 2 and 9 can be used to evaluate the proposed project's impacts on a historic district. These two applicable standards, and proposed project conformance to each, are described below:

2. *The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*

The proposed project conforms to Standard 2, as the proposed changes retain and preserve the historic scale, character and sense of time and place of the potential historic district. Despite the partial single-story rooftop addition, the proposed project retains the general shape and massing of the subject property, as well as the brick exterior perimeter walls.

---

<sup>48</sup> "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings" (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1990), 49.

9. *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. New work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

The proposed project conforms to Standard 9, as the proposed single-story partial rooftop addition does not destroy the historic materials that characterize the potential historic district. The rooftop addition and contemporary window frame projections are both compatible with the scale, character and sense of time and place of the potential historic district.

The *Guidelines* describe applicable principles in the form of specific rehabilitation planning and treatment actions that are recommended and not recommended. The only applicable Guideline for evaluating impacts of the proposed project to the potential historic district is the “Identifying, retaining, and preserving” recommendation under the “District/Neighborhood” section. This Guideline, and proposed project conformance, is described below:

*Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings, and streetscape, and landscape features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the district or neighborhood.*

The proposed project conforms to this Guideline. The proposed project would retain and preserve the industrial character of the building and streetscape, by retaining the brick exterior perimeter walls and original height of the subject property. In addition, the proposed project would remain compatible with the scale, character and sense of time and place of the potential historic district. Landscape features are not described in the current plans of the proposed project, and are not evaluated for alignment with this Guideline.

#### MATERIAL IMPAIRMENT

Per CEQA, a proposed project anticipated to cause substantial adverse change to a historical resource would require mitigation measures to reduce impacts. CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (b)(1) defines substantial adverse change as the following: “Substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource means the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired.” CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (b)(2) describes material impairment taking place when a project:

- (A) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register...; or
- (B) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register... or its identification in a historical resources survey... 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
- (C) Demolishes or materially alters those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register... as determined by a lead agency for the purposes of CEQA.

While general conformance with the *Secretary’s Standards and Guidelines* results in a less than significant impact to historical resources under CEQA, nonconformance does not necessarily equal

material impairment of historical resources under CEQA.<sup>49</sup> Thus, it is possible to make a finding of nonconformance with the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines* while also making a finding that a proposed project does not materially impair the historical resource. A proposed project existing in this "gray area" has a less than significant impact to historical resources under CEQA.

**Material impairment on the subject property**

As previously noted, a project reaches material impairment if it "demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance." Therefore, material impairment is calculated by overall loss of character-defining features. For buildings not considered significant for architecture, a greater degree of flexibility is typically allowed for alterations found to not reach the level of material impairment.

Despite the finding that the proposed project does not conform to the *Secretary's Standards*, as applied to the subject property, the proposed project does not reach the threshold for material impairment under CEQA. The concept layout shows retention of majority of character-defining features of the subject property, which includes maintaining historic scale and massing, retaining the majority of exterior brick perimeter walls, and retaining the majority of interior heavy timber columns and interior brick fire walls. Given the insufficient significance and substantial integrity loss of the subject property, the proposed project would not detract from the character the subject property currently possesses.

**Material impairment on the potential historic district**

As the concept layout shows, the proposed project would not result in material impairment of the potential historic district because it retains the majority of the subject property's character-defining features, and continues to display its industrial character and historic scale.

For the proposed project to not cause material impairment, the potential historic district must retain substantial integrity. It is difficult to determine the threshold that defines the moment a historic district no longer retains enough integrity to convey its significance. To determine the impacts that the proposed project would have on the integrity of the potential historic district, this report utilizes guidelines presented in National Register Bulletin #15 titled *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. The bulletin states the following:

For a district to retain integrity as a whole, the majority of the components that make up the district's historic character must possess integrity even if they are individually undistinguished. In addition, the relationships among the district's components must be substantially unchanged since the period of significance.

When evaluating the impact of intrusions upon the district's integrity, take into consideration the relative number, size, scale, design, and location of the components that do not contribute to the significance. A district is not eligible if it contains so many alterations or new intrusions that it no longer conveys the sense of a historic environment.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Material impairment occurs when a project alters or demolishes in an adverse manner "those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in ... the California Register of Historical Resources" (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(b)(2)(A)).

<sup>50</sup> U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation" (Washington D.C. National Park Service, 2002), 46.

The potential historic district is comprised of 195 buildings (106 of which are contributing) that are representative of early industrial development in Los Angeles. The contributing resources represent a wide variety of styles and construction dates, and original uses that include textile and consumer goods manufacturing, agricultural processing and packing, ice and cold storage, produce and fish markets, and warehousing. This potential historic district is also defined by its character, represented by the presence of a large stock of buildings that reveal the industrial qualities of the City's earliest industrial district, in addition to the railroads and the lack of street curbs, sidewalks, landscaping, and building setbacks. Contributors to the potential historic district are typically one to four stories in height, are constructed of brick or reinforced concrete, and fill the entire site.

The proposed project would have a negligible impact on the integrity of the potential historic district. The retention of the subject property's brick exterior perimeter walls, and general massing of the original design preserve the character of the potential historic district and the subject property would continue to contribute to the significance of the potential historic district. The construction of the partial single story rooftop addition would not cause enough integrity loss to the subject property to render it unable to convey its significance as a contributor to the potential historic district.

Given no material impairment, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change to the potential historic district, as it does not materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility as a potential historic district. As described above, the proposed project does not conform with the *Secretary's Standards*; however, it does not cause material impairment to the subject property or the potential historic district. Therefore, the proposed project does not constitute a substantial adverse change to a historical resource under CEQA.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

As stated above, the proposed project does not conform to the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines* when evaluated for impacts to the subject property. However, there are minor design changes that would improve proposed project conformance with the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines*. Although these recommendations are voluntary, in striving to conform with the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines*, the proposed project should consider the following recommendations and comply to the extent feasible.

### **Recommendation 1**

The addition of contemporary window frame projections obscure the character-defining segmental arch lintels at extant original window openings, which does not conform to Standards 1, 2, 5, and 9. The elimination of these proposed new features could, alone, improve conformance with Standard 5.

### **Recommendation 2**

In conjunction with elimination of the contemporary window frame projections, the proposed project would conform to Standard 1 with retention of as many visible heavy timber columns as possible, to display the building's "mill construction." This could be achieved through reorganization of some new interior walls.

### **Recommendation 3**

In conjunction with elimination of the contemporary window frame projections and retention of heavy timber columns, the proposed project would conform to Standard 2 with preservation of exterior ghosting of painted signage related to the L.W. Stockwell Company.

### **Recommendation 4**

In conjunction with elimination of the contemporary window frame projects, retention of heavy timber columns, preservation of ghosting of painted signage related to L.W. Stockwell Company, the proposed project would conform with Standards 9 and 10 with reconstruction of original window and door fenestration, as evidenced by physical and other documentary evidence.

These four recommendations, taken as a group, would improve proposed project conformance with the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines*, at the level of the subject property. However, the implementation of the recommendations may not be feasible given the existing project design and program objectives. As demonstrated in this analysis, the project as currently proposed would not cause a substantial adverse change to either the subject property individually or to the subject property as a contributor to the potential historic district, or to the potential historic district as a whole.

No mitigation measure for design review is provided because the proposed project does not materially impair the identified historical resource under CEQA, the potential Los Angeles Industrial Historic District. Thus, as the proposed project is found in conformance with the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines*, as it applies to the potential historic district, the identified historical resource under CEQA, no mitigation is required, as there is no adverse impact to the historical resource.

## **IX. CONCLUSION**

This historic resource assessment report does not find any evidence that the subject property at 400 S Alameda is individually eligible for listing in the National and California Registers or for listing as an individual Historic-Cultural Monument. However, the building has been identified as a contributor to the potential Los Angeles Industrial Historic District as part of the SurveyLA survey efforts in 2016, likely for its association with early industrial development in Los Angeles. As identified, the potential historic district is the historical resource for the purposes of CEQA, and the proposed project is reviewed for impacts on that historical resource. The proposed project is found to not cause material impairment to the potential historic district and thus, would not cause a significant impact under CEQA.

No mitigation measure for design review is necessary, as the subject property is not separately eligible as a historical resource under CEQA, and the impacts analysis shows no material impairment to either the subject property or to the potential historic district. Although the concept layout does not show the proposed project causing material impairment to the historical resource, the proposed project does not conform to the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines*, as it applies to the subject property. Four recommendations, taken as a group, would improve proposed project conformance with the *Secretary's Standards and Guidelines* at the level of the subject property. However, due to the individual ineligibility of the subject property, these recommendations are not presented as part of a mitigation measure.

## **X. BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- “All of One Mind – Henceforth Merchants and Manufacturers Will Work Together.” *Los Angeles Times*, 21 July 1896.
- Atkinson, Edward. “Mill Construction: What It Is, What It Is Not.” *American Architect and Building News*, 1 April 1893.
- “Buildings Are His Monument.” *Los Angeles Times*, 30 January 1914.
- “Factories to Build, Where?” *Los Angeles Times*, 3 October 1909.
- Anderson, Carson. *Eastside Industrial Area Architectural and Historical Resources Survey*, September 1992.
- J. J. Sugarman Co., Ltd. And Samuel C. Rudolph. “AUCTION, Furniture Factory.” Advertisement, *Los Angeles Times*, 4 February 1934.
- Los Angeles City Directory, 1909.
- Los Angeles Conservancy. *The Arts District: History and Architecture in Downtown L.A.*, November 2013.
- LSA Associates, Inc. (Tanya Sorrell and Jennifer Thornton); Chattel Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, Inc. (Kathryn McGee, Marissa Moshier, Jenna Snow, and Shane Swerdlow); and University of Southern California (Mary Ringhoff and April Sommer Rabner), *SurveyLA Historic Context Statement, Industrial Development, City of Los Angeles*, draft, 26 Aug. 2011.
- National Register Bulletin #15, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (National Park Service, 1990, revised 2002).
- “New District for Industry.” *Los Angeles Times*, 6 February 1906.
- “New Factory Spells Growth.” *Los Angeles Times*, 27 November 1910.
- “Other Improvements.” *Los Angeles Times*, 3 July 1910.
- “Pacific Coast Notes.” *The Upholsterer and Interior Decorator*, Vol. 68, 1922.
- “Predicts Good Business.” *Los Angeles Times*, 21 December 1924.
- Robert M. Fogelson. *The Fragmented Metropolis – Los Angeles, 1850-1930* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967, republished 1993).
- Sanborn Fire Insurance Map Company. Los Angeles, 1906-1950, Volume 2, Sheet 201.
- “San Francisco Notes.” *The Upholsterer and Interior Decorator*, 1912.
- SurveyLA. Potential Los Angeles Industrial Historic District. Digital map. Currently unpublished. Accessed October 2016.

The Furniture Manufacturers' Association. "Help Keep California Prosperous." Advertisement. *Los Angeles Times*, 3 January 1921.

The May Company. "Mattress Sensation," Advertisement, *Los Angeles Times*, 28 February 1934.

The Wallace Company. "Wonderful Day Beds, Never-Stretch Mattresses, Paradise Bed Springs Featured in this Demonstration." Advertisement, *Schenectady Gazette*, 21 April 1922.

"Warehouse Lease Deals Negotiated." *Los Angeles Times*, 20 April 1941.

"Weber Show Case and Fixture Company." *Los Angeles Herald*, 3 September 1905.

"With the Architect." *Architect and Engineer*, Vol. LVI, No. 1. January 1919.

Zaremba, Chuck. "Ortho Mattress: Bedding Down to Business." *Home Furnishings Daily*. 31 July 1972.

Natural History Museum  
of Los Angeles County  
900 Exposition Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90007

tel 213.763.DINO  
www.nhm.org



Vertebrate Paleontology Section  
Telephone: (213) 763-3325

e-mail: [smcleod@nhm.org](mailto:smcleod@nhm.org)

24 January 2017

EcoTierra Consulting  
29 Orinda Way, # 165  
Orinda, CA 94563

Attn: Katrina Hardt-Holoch, Senior Project Manager / Northern California Regional Manager

re: Vertebrate Paleontology Records Check for paleontological resources for the proposed  
Property Located at 400 South Alameda Street Project, in the City of Los Angeles,  
Los Angeles County, project area

Dear Katrina:

I have conducted a thorough search of our paleontology collection records for the locality and specimen data for the proposed Property Located at 400 South Alameda Street Project, in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, project area as outlined on the portion of the Hollywood USGS topographic quadrangle map that you sent to me via e-mail on 9 January 2017. We do not have any vertebrate fossil localities that lie directly within the proposed project area, but we do have localities nearby from the same sedimentary deposits that occur subsurface in the proposed project area.

The entire proposed project site area has surficial deposits of younger Quaternary Alluvium, derived as fluvial deposits from the flood plain of the Los Angeles River that currently flows in a concrete channel just to the east. These younger Quaternary deposits usually do not contain significant fossil vertebrates, at least in the uppermost layers, but the underlying older Quaternary deposits found at varying depths may well contain significant vertebrate fossils.

Our closest vertebrate fossil locality from the older Quaternary deposits is LACM 1755, west-southwest of the proposed project area near the intersection of Hill Street and 12<sup>th</sup> Street, that produced a fossil specimen of horse, *Equus*, at a depth of 43 feet below the street. Our next

closest vertebrate fossil locality from older Quaternary deposits beneath the younger Quaternary Alluvium is LACM 2032, northeast of the proposed project area near the intersection of Mission Road and Daly Street around the Golden State Freeway (I-5), that produced fossil specimens of pond turtle, *Clemmys mamorata*, ground sloth, *Paramylodon harlani*, mastodon, *Mammut americanum*, mammoth, *Mammuthus imperator*, horse, *Equus*, and camel, *Camelops*, at a depth of 20-35 feet below the surface. The pond turtle specimens from locality LACM 2032 were figured in the scientific literature by B.H. Brattstrom and A. Sturn (1959. A new species of fossil turtle from the Pliocene of Oregon, with notes on other fossil *Clemmys* from western North America. Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Sciences, 58(2):65-71). At our locality LACM 1023, just north of locality LACM 2032 near the intersection of Workman Street and Alhambra Avenue, excavations for a storm drain recovered fossil specimens of turkey, *Meleagris californicus*, sabre-toothed cat, *Smilodon fatalis*, horse, *Equus*, and deer, *Odocoileus*, at unstated depth. A specimen of the turkey, *Meleagris*, from this locality was published in the scientific literatus by D. W. Steadman (1980. A Review of the Osteology and Paleontology of Turkeys (Aves: Meleagridinae). Contributions in Science, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, 330:131-207).

Shallow excavations in the younger Quaternary Alluvium exposed throughout the proposed project area are unlikely to uncover significant fossil vertebrate remains. Deeper excavations in the proposed project area that extend down into the older Quaternary sediments, however, may well encounter significant vertebrate fossils. Any substantial excavations in the proposed project area, therefore, should be closely monitored to quickly and professionally recover any potential vertebrate fossils without impeding development. Also, sediment samples should be collected and processed to determine the small fossil potential in the proposed project area. Any fossils recovered during mitigation should be deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution for the benefit of current and future generations.

This records search covers only the vertebrate paleontology records of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County. It is not intended to be a thorough paleontological survey of the proposed project area covering other institutional records, a literature survey, or any potential on-site survey.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Samuel A. McLeod".

Samuel A. McLeod, Ph.D.  
Vertebrate Paleontology

enclosure: invoice

**South Central Coastal Information Center**

California State University, Fullerton  
Department of Anthropology MH-426  
800 North State College Boulevard  
Fullerton, CA 92834-6846  
657.278.5395 / FAX 657.278.5542

[sccic@fullerton.edu](mailto:sccic@fullerton.edu)

*California Historical Resources Information System*  
*Orange, Los Angeles, and Ventura Counties*

2/15/2017

SCCIC File #: 17282.3308

Katrina Hardt-Holoch  
EcoTierra  
29 Orinda Way, #165  
Orinda, CA 94563

Re: Records Search Results for the 400 S Alameda St Project

The South Central Coastal Information Center received your records search request for the project area referenced above, located on the Los Angeles, CA USGS 7.5' quadrangle. The following summary reflects the results of the records search for the project area and a ½-mile radius. The search includes a review of all recorded archaeological and built-environment resources as well as a review of cultural resource reports on file. In addition, the California Points of Historical Interest (SPHI), the California Historical Landmarks (SHL), the California Register of Historical Resources (CAL REG), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California State Historic Properties Directory (HPD), and the City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments (LAHCM) listings were reviewed for the above referenced project site. Due to the sensitive nature of cultural resources, archaeological site locations are not released.

**RECORDS SEARCH RESULTS SUMMARY**

<b>Archaeological Resources</b>	Within project area: 0 Within project radius: 13
<b>Built-Environment Resources</b>	Within project area: 1 Within project radius: 77
<b>Reports and Studies</b>	Within project area: 3 Within project radius: 77
<b>OHP Historic Properties Directory (HPD)</b>	Within project area: 0 Within ¼-mile radius: 14
<b>California Points of Historical Interest (SPHI)</b>	Within project area: 0 Within ¼-mile radius: 0
<b>California Historical Landmarks (SHL)</b>	Within project area: 0 Within ¼-mile radius: 0
<b>California Register of Historical Resources (CAL REG)</b>	Within project area: 0 Within ¼-mile radius: 1
<b>National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)</b>	Within project area: 0 Within ¼-mile radius: 1

**HISTORIC MAP REVIEW** – The Pasadena, CA (1900) 1:62,500 scale historic map indicated that in 1900 the area was already highly developed with many paved roads and buildings present. The Southern Pacific Railroad and the Los Angeles Terminal Railroad both ran through the search radius. The Los Angeles River also ran through the project radius.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

According to our records, the project site has not been subjected to any previous archaeological studies and the cultural resource sensitivity of the project site is unknown. Although the project site is currently developed, there is the potential for the discovery of prehistoric and historic cultural resources within the project boundaries. Agricultural remains, foundations, trails, hearths, trash dumps, privies, changes in soil colorations, human or animal bone, pottery, chipped or shaped stone, etc. are all potential indications of an archaeological site. Therefore, customary caution and a halt-work condition should be in place for any ground-disturbing activities. In the event that any evidence of cultural resources is discovered, all work within the vicinity of the find should stop until a qualified archaeological consultant can assess the find and make recommendations. Excavation of potential cultural resources should not be attempted by project personnel. It is also recommended that any historic structures (45 years and older) be identified, recorded, and evaluated for local, state, or national significance prior to the approval of project plans. It is also recommended that the Native American Heritage Commission should be consulted to identify if any additional traditional cultural properties or other sacred sites are known to be in the area.

For your convenience, you may find a professional consultant\* at [www.chrisinfo.org](http://www.chrisinfo.org). Any resulting reports by the qualified consultant should be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center as soon as possible.

\*The SCCIC does not endorse any particular consultant and makes no claims about the qualifications of any person listed. Each consultant on this list self-reports that they meet current professional standards.

If you have any questions regarding the results presented herein, please contact the office at 657.278.5395 Monday through Thursday 9:00 am to 3:30 pm.

Should you require any additional information for the above referenced project, reference the SCCIC number listed above when making inquiries. Requests made after initial invoicing will result in the preparation of a separate invoice.

Thank you for using the [California Historical Resources Information System](#),

Michelle Galaz  
Assistant Coordinator

*Due to processing delays and other factors, not all of the historical resource reports and resource records that have been submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation are available via this records search. Additional information may be available through the federal, state, and local agencies that produced or paid for historical resource management work in the search area. Additionally, Native American tribes have historical resource information not in the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Inventory, and you should contact the California Native American Heritage Commission for information on local/regional tribal contacts.*

*The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) contracts with the California Historical Resources Information System's (CHRIS) regional Information Centers (ICs) to maintain information in the CHRIS inventory and make it available to local, state, and federal agencies, cultural resource professionals, Native American tribes, researchers, and the public. Recommendations made by IC coordinators or their staff regarding the interpretation and application of this information are advisory only. Such recommendations do not necessarily represent the evaluation or opinion of the State Historic Preservation Officer in carrying out the OHP's regulatory authority under federal and state law.*