NOTICE OF MEETING
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
3:00 p.m., Wednesday, April 24, 2019

Council Chambers – City Hall – 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA
Copies of the agenda packet are available for review at the Pacific Grove Library located at 550 Central Avenue; the CDD counter in City Hall at 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove from 8 a.m. – 12 p.m. and 1 p.m. – 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday; and on the internet at www.cityofpacificgrove.org/hrc. Recordings of the meetings are available upon request.

1. Call to Order - 3:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call
   HRC Members: Claudia Sawyer (Chair), Mark Travaille, Joseph Rock, Jill Kleiss (Secretary), Mimi Sheridan (Vice-Chair), Rick Steres, Geoff Welch

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Public Comments
   a. Written Correspondence
      Communications relevant to HRC jurisdiction, but not related to a matter on this agenda, are attached under this agenda item.
   b. Oral Communications
      Comments from the audience will not receive HRC action. Comments must deal with matters subject to the jurisdiction of the HRC and will be limited to three (3) minutes. Comments regarding agenda items shall be heard prior to the consideration of such items at the time such items are called. Whenever possible, letters should be submitted to the HRC in advance of the meeting.

5. Reports of Council Liaison

6. Items to be Continued or Withdrawn
   None

7. Consent Agenda
   a. Approval of March 27, 2019, HRC Minutes
      Recommended Action: Approve minutes
      CEQA Status: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

8. Regular Agenda
   a. Address: 218 Park Street, Pacific Grove, CA 93950 (APN 006-204-002)
      Application #: Architectural Permit (AP) 18-0970
      Description: An Architectural Permit for a 1,123 sq. ft. two-story residential addition to an existing single-story 676 sq. ft. house listed on the Historic Resources Inventory. The project does not include tree removal.
      Zone District/General Plan Designation: Residential Multi-Family (R-3) / High Density Residential (29 du/acre)
Coastal Zone: No  Archaeological Sensitivity: No  Historic Resources Inventory: Yes
Area of Special Biological Significance: Yes
CEQA Status: The proposed project qualifies for Classes 1 and 31 CEQA categorical exemptions for Residential Additions and Historical Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation, respectively.
Applicant/Owner: Eddie Hurt representing Robert & Donna Gionfriddo
Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner | ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org

9. Presentations and Trainings
   a. A Brief History of the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) presented by Chair Sawyer and Member Sheridan
      Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
      CEQA Status: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

      Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
      CEQA Status: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

10. Reports of HRC Members

11. Reports of Staff

12. Adjournment. Next meeting is on May 22, 2019

The City of Pacific Grove does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. City Hall is an accessible facility. A limited number of devices are available to assist those who are deaf or hard of hearing.

GENERAL NOTICE
Please note that Section 65009(b)(2) of the California Government Code provides that legal challenges to the City's action on a project may be limited to only those issues raised in testimony during the public hearing process. HRC will not consider any new items after 9:00 p.m. Any items remaining on the agenda will be continued either to the next regular meeting or to a special meeting at the discretion of HRC. This meeting is open to the public and all interested persons are welcome to attend.

NOTICE TO APPLICANTS
Judicial Time Limits: This serves as written notice that Pacific Grove Municipal Code (PGMC) §1.20.010 incorporates §1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure of the State of California and provides a ninety-day limitation for judicial review of any final administrative decision by the council, or any board, commissioner, or officer of the city.
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1. Called to Order - 3:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call
   HRC Members Present: Claudia Sawyer (Chair), Mark Travaille, Joseph Rock (Vice-Chair),
   Mimi Sheridan, Rick Steres, Geoff Welch

   Member Kleiss arrived at 3:03 pm and was not present during Roll Call and Approval of
   Agenda.

3. Approval of Agenda

   On a motion by Member Steres, seconded by Member Rock, the Committee voted 6-0-1
   (Member Kleiss absent) to approve the agenda. Motion passed.

4. Public Comments
   a. Written Correspondence
      None.
   b. Oral Communications
      Ms. Lisa Ciani addressed the Committee and expressed concerns pertaining to
      inconsistencies within the Historic Preservation Ordinance, and the HRI Update Survey
      Report.

5. Reports of Council Liaison

   Councilmember Tomlinson provided an update on the March 20th City Council meeting and
   actions taken.

6. Items to be Continued or Withdrawn
   None.

7. Consent Agenda
   a. Approval of February 27, 2019, HRC Minutes
      Recommended Action: Approve minutes
      CEQA Status: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section
      15378

      On a motion by Member Rock, seconded by Vice-Chair Sheridan, the Committee voted
      7-0-0 to approve the February 27, 2019 HRC minutes with corrections. Motion passed.
Chair Sawyer suggested a change to the January 23, 2019 HRC Minutes to include a reference to Mr. Donald Murphy’s public comment. Staff noted the change and subsequently changed the January 23, 2019 minutes.

8. Reports of HRC Members and Staff

Chair Sawyer provided a status update on the Downtown Commercial Design Guidelines Public Workshop. Chair Sawyer stated that the City is looking into extending contract with Page & Turnbull to further evaluate the properties recommended for removal from the HRI and to potentially identify historic districts.

Member Steres and Chair Sawyer also informed the Committee that the Planning Commission did not approve Architectural Permit (AP) 19-0020 for the Pacific Grove Public Library as proposed. They added that the Planning Commission approved the project with conditions and asked the project applicant to redesign the project.

9. Regular Agenda

a. California Preservation Foundation webinar– Brown Act Primer
   
   **Staff Reference:** Anastazia Aziz, AICP, Director
   
   **CEQA Status:** Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

   Staff played the pre-recorded California Preservation Foundation webinar on “A Commissioner and Planner’s Primer to the Brown Act”.

10. Adjourned 4:12 p.m.

    APPROVED BY THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE.

____________________________________  ____________________
Jill Kleiss, Secretary                  Date
TO: Chair Sawyer and Members of the Historic Resources Committee

FROM: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner

MEETING DATE: April 24, 2019

PERMIT & APPLICATION NO.: Architectural Permit (AP) Application No. 18-0970

LOCATION: 218 Park Street, Pacific Grove, CA 93950 (APN 006-304-002)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: An Architectural Permit for a 1,123 sq. ft. two-story addition to an existing 676 sq. ft. single-family residence which is on the Historic Resources Inventory. The project includes minor tree pruning and tree protection measures.

APPLICANT/OWNER: Eddie Hurt representing Robert and Donna Gionfriddo

ZONING/LAND USE: R-3 / High Density Residential (29 units/acre)

CEQA: Class 31, § 15331, and Class 1, § 15301(e)(2), Categorical Exemptions

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Historic Resources Committee (HRC) recommend approval of the Architectural Permit for the proposed residential addition. The recommendation of approval is subject to findings, conditions, and Class 1 and 31 CEQA categorical exemptions.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The project proposes to develop a 1,123 sq. ft. two-story addition to a small cottage currently consisting of two residential units. The project seeks to demolish 28’ linear feet of exterior wall from the west corner to which the proposed addition will be connected. The connection will be single-story with the two-story portion set slightly back. The addition includes a two-car garage fronting Short Street. The existing home is legal, nonconforming in terms of its setbacks onto both Park Street and Short Street. The proposed addition will comply with the setbacks and other development standards of the R-3 zoning district. The large oak tree and smaller conifer along the Park Street frontage are proposed to be retained.
BACKGROUND
Site Description
The property is approximately 3,558 sq. ft. in size, has some slope and is located on the southwest corner of Park and Short Streets. The existing 676 sq. ft. home is on the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI), but was completely renovated in 2012, removing much of its historic integrity. Previous renovations included the replacement of windows, siding, stairs and landings, roofing, and exterior lights. A Focused Phase II was prepared by Kent Seavey (Seavey, November 2018), a qualified historian, for this project. This report includes an assessment of existing conditions and evaluates the proposed project’s potential impact on the resource. The property is on the list of homes recommended for removal from the HRI due to its loss of historic integrity.

Surrounding Land Uses
The project site is in an area developed with one- and two-story one- and two-family residences.

DISCUSSION
Applicable General Plan Policies
The Pacific Grove General Plan provides a framework for future growth and development within the City. The Land Use Element includes goals and polices that call for orderly, well-planned, and balanced development, consistent with the historic nature of Pacific Grove, the capacity of the City’s infrastructure, and ability to assimilate new growth. The property has a general plan designation of Residential High-Density with an allowed density of up to 29 dwelling units per acre. The project will retain one of the small existing duplex units and modify the other to be incorporated into the new, larger primary residence, thus retaining two units in the City’s housing inventory. This type of residential development is allowed in all of the residential general plan designations.

Applicable Zoning Code Regulations
General Plan goals and policies are implemented by Title 23 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code (PGMC).

Chapter 23.24 of the PGMC describes the permitted uses and development standards of the R-3 zoning district. Per Section 23.24 of the PGMC, the intent of this chapter is to regulate multi-family development. The applicant has provided a Project Data Sheet indicating that the development standards of the zoning district, including building coverage, site coverage and gross floor area, have been met.

Architecture and Historic Resources
Although the cottage is currently included on the City’s Historic Resources Inventory (HRI), it is recommended for removal by Page & Turnbull, the City’s consultant currently working on updating the HRI. Given that the small cottage’s entire exterior was replaced in 2012, it no longer retains integrity of materials.

Given the timing of the project in relation to the adoption of an updated HRI, the applicant enlisted Kent Seavey, a qualified historian, to prepare a focused Phase II historic evaluation to address the proposed addition. This report concluded that, “the impact of the proposed addition is mitigated by the sensitive scale and arrangement of the new structure, and by
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the fact that the existing building is not original but a rebuilt structure that was previously remodeled in 2012.” (Seavey, Nov. 2018)

The proposed addition attempts to reflect the City’s Architectural Review Guidelines for Historic Buildings (Appendix 1) including, but not limited to:

- Placing the new addition on an inconspicuous side or rear elevation so that the new work does not result in a radical change to the form and character if the historic building;

- Setting an infill addition or connector back from the historic building wall plane so that the form of the historic building – or buildings – can be distinguished from the new work;

- Setting an additional story well back from the roof edge to ensure that the historic building’s proportions and profile are not radically changed.

In addition to the aforementioned Guidelines for Historic Buildings, the project conforms to several of the standard Guidelines which relate to general neighborhood compatibility.

Guideline #1 recommends that new buildings should blend well with neighboring structures in terms of mass, height, and design. Although the houses immediately adjoin the project are single-story, the larger neighborhood is an eclectic mix on one- and two-story residences of a variety of shapes. The site has a slight grade toward the street. To help keep the total height of the building as low as possible, approximately 3.5’ at the rear (west) of the property will be excavated allowing a finished overall height of 21’4”. The maximum height of the R-3 zone is 30’.

Guideline #7 recommends locating second floor balconies and decks where they will not affect neighbors’ privacy. This project, although a two-story addition, does not propose any second-story decks or balconies.

Guidelines #10 – 12 suggests installing exterior lighting that does not extend onto neighboring properties and that is compatible to architectural style of the project. These 3 Guidelines are included in the project’s conditions of approval.

Guidelines #21 – 22 recommend designing projects to avoid the removal or significant trimming of trees and to protect root systems as needed. This project intends to retain the existing 32” diameter oak in the center of a pervious slightly elevated deck. An arborist report (Ono, March 2019) was prepared to assess potential impacts and propose potential measures to mitigate such impacts.

**Tree Pruning and Protection, Landscaping and Fencing**

There is a healthy 38” Coast live oak tree and a 9” Monterey cypress on the property. A professional arborist prepared a report (Ono, March 2019) which assesses the health of the trees and potential impacts that the proposed addition and remodel might have on these trees’ health. No tree removal is proposed, but some pruning may be required. The Conditions of Approval include a requirement that grading, trenching and construction activities adhere to the recommendations in the report pertaining to tree protection and pruning. The City’s arborist reviewed the project arborist’s report and made several recommendations. The project plans (received March 20) have been revised to include
these recommendations and they have been added to the conditions of approval. No changes to the landscaping or fencing are proposed at this time.

**Sidewalks**
The Public Works Department reviewed the location of the project and did not require infill sidewalk along the Short St. side.

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)**
In reviewing this action, the City has followed guidelines adopted by the State of California as published in California Administrative Code, Title 14, §15000, et seq. The proposed project is found to be exempt under the Class 31, CEQA Guidelines Categorical Exemption, Section 15331, *Historical Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation*, and the Class 1, Section 15301(e)(2) exemption for *Residential Additions*.

The Class 31 exemption consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation, or reconstruction of historical resources in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitation, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (1995).

The Class 1 exemption consists of alterations to existing facilities, including additions of up to 10,000 sq. ft., where all public services and facilities are available to allow for maximum development permissible in the General Plan and the area in which the project is located is not environmentally sensitive.

The exceptions to exemptions in Section 15300.2 of the CEQA Guidelines do not apply to the Class 1 and Class 31 exemptions except for (f) which pertains to historic resources. The existing residence is proposed by the City’s consultants, Page & Turnbull, to be removed from the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) and the applicant’s qualified historic consultant concurs as the property “is not original but a rebuilt structure that was previously remodeled in 2012.” (Seavey, November 2018)

**ATTACHMENTS**
A. Application  
B. Project Data Sheet  
C. Draft Permit  
D. CEQA Exemption Form  
E. Seavey Phase II Historic Assessment (November 2018)  
F. Arborist Report  
G. Site Plan (revised 3-20-19), Elevations

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Alyson Hunter  
Associate Planner
**CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE**
Community Development Department – Planning Division
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Tel: 831.648.3190 • Fax: 831.648.3184 • www.cityofpacificgrove.org/cedd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Address: 218 PARK STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN: 006-204-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description: 2-STORY ADDITION TO EXISTING RESIDENCE ON HRI LIST (WAS REMODELED IN 2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Will the project create, add, or replace impervious surface?**
- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

**Will the project impact any tree(s) on site?**
- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

**Applicant**

| Name: EPDIE HURT ARCHITECT |
| Phone: (831) 917-2600 |
| Email: edhurt@pacbell.net |
| Mailing Address: 172 PACIFIC AVENUE PACIFIC GROVE CA 93950 |

**Owner**

| Name: ROBERT & DONNA GIOFFRIDD |
| Phone: (408)489-1200 |
| Email: bgioffdd@aol.com |
| Mailing Address: 50 CHESTER STREET LOS GATOS CA 95042 |

### Permit Request:

- CRD: Counter Determination [ ]
- AP: Architectural Permit [X]
- AAP: Administrative AP [ ]
- ADC: Arch Design Change [ ]
- ASP: Admin Sign Permit [ ]
- SP: Sign Permit [ ]
- UP: Use Permit [ ]
- AUP: Administrative UP [ ]
- ADU: Acc. Dwelling Unit [ ]
- LLA: Lot Line Adjustment [ ]
- IHS: Initial Historic Screening [ ]
- HPP: Historic Preservation [ ]
- A: Appeal [ ]
- TPD: Tree Permit W/ Dev't [ ]
- EIR: Environmental Impact [ ]
- VAR: Variance [ ]
- MMP: Mitigation Monitoring [ ]
- Stormwater Permit [ ]
- Other: ________ [ ]
- Other: ________ [ ]

### CEQA Determination:

- Exempt [X]
- Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration [ ]
- Environmental Impact Report [ ]

### Review Authority:

- Staff [ ]
- HRC [ ]
- PC [ ]
- ZA [ ]
- SPRC [ ]
- CC [ ]
- ARB [ ]

### Active Permits:

- Active Planning Permit [ ]
- Active Building Permit [ ]
- Active Code Violation Permit #: ________

### Overlay Zones:

- Butterfly Zone [ ]
- Coastal Zone [X]
- Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) [ ]
- Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) [X]

### Property Information

- Lot: 2 & 4
- Block: 48
- GP: High Density
- ZC: R-3
- Historic Resources Inventory [X]
- Archaeologically Sensitive Area [ ]

**RECEIVED**

**Staff Use Only:**

- Received by: [ ]
- Assigned to: [ ]
- City of Pacific Grove Community Dev Dept

**Date:** 11-20-18
**Total Fees:** $3,918.90

---
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INDEMNIFICATION CONDITION

In consideration for City review and approval of application in this matter, the Owner/Applicant shall indemnify, defend, protect and hold harmless the City, its elected and appointed officials, officers, agents, and employees (collectively "Indemnities"), using counsel approved in writing by the City, from and against, any and all liabilities, claims, actions, causes of action, proceedings, suits, damages, judgments, liens, levies, costs and expenses of whatever nature, including reasonable attorneys' fees and disbursements which may accrue against Indemnities by reason of the City's processing, approval or denial of the request and application in this matter. Indemnification shall include, but shall not be limited to any action, or proceeding brought to attack, set aside, void, annul, limit, or inhibit the approval of the application referenced above, and shall expressly include causes of action under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The obligation to indemnify shall include, but not be limited to, all costs relating to preparing administrative records, investigations, responses to discovery, retention of experts, and other costs, including attorney's fees or obligations related to this matter, including actions brought by the Owner/Applicant and also extend to any expense incurred in establishing the City's right to indemnification. City expenses shall be paid by Owner/Applicant upon City request notwithstanding final disposition of the matter has not yet occurred. If the City is later determined to not be entitled to indemnification, the City shall repay amounts so advanced.

This indemnification condition is the Owner/Applicant's inducement to the City to process and approve the application, which approval would otherwise be withheld by City due to its concern for liability or expense that may result from performance of the City's duties. Should any dispute arise regarding interpretation of this condition, the prevailing party shall recover all reasonable costs incurred, including court costs, attorney fees and related expenses. Recovery of expenses shall be as additional costs awarded to the prevailing party, and shall not require initiation of a separate legal proceeding.

This indemnification condition shall not require the Owner/Applicant to indemnify the City or other Indemnities: (a) to the extent that an obligation is actually paid by an insurer pursuant to an insurance policy; (b) in connection with any remuneration paid to the City, if it shall be finally adjudged that such remuneration was in violation of law; or (c) on account of the City's misconduct if such misconduct shall be finally adjudged to have been knowingly fraudulent, deliberately dishonest or willful.

Any permit or other approval given by the City to the Owner/Applicant Guarantor shall be valid only so long as this indemnification condition is given full force and effect. If this indemnification condition is revoked, the permit or other approval of the City shall then become null and void.

Owner/Applicant represents it (and any subsidiary) is (a) duly formed and organized, (b) validly existing and in good standing under state law, and (c) has all necessary power to execute and deliver this document and perform its obligations. Owner/Applicant also represents it is authorized to enter into this agreement by all requisite partnership, corporate or other action, and its terms are a valid and legally binding obligation. Neither execution nor delivery of this document nor performance of its obligations will violate any law or provision of any agreement, articles of incorporation, by-laws or other organizational or governing documents relating to Owner/Applicant, nor conflict with any court order relating to Owner/Applicant.

Applicant Signature: [Signature]
Date: Nov 18, 2018

Owner Signature (Required): [Signature]
Date: [Signature]
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# Panning Permit Fee Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Select</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Permit – Single Family</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>$2,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Architectural Permit</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Change</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – no new square footage</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – new square footage</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Historic Screening</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Permit</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Sign Permit</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Permit and Amendments – Single Family</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$1,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance and Amendment</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Variance and Amendment</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Fee</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Permit</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$1,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Permit with Development</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>25% of base permit fee or $1,000 whichever is greater plus noticing costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Additional Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Item</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Update Fee</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Exemption Fee</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>266.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Buffer Zone</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Special Biological Significance</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>146.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Mailings</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Herald Ad</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>334.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Fee</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County filing fee</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File maintenance fee</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Fees:** $3,918.90
### PROJECT DATA SHEET

**Project Address:** 218 Park Street (006-304-002)  
**Submittal Date:** FEBRUARY 25, 2019

**Applicant(s):** Eddie Hurt Architect  
**Permit Type(s) & No(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No. 8A</th>
<th>Page 8 of 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No. 8A</th>
<th>Page 14 of 77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required/ Permitted</th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Proposed Condition</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone District</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Site Area</td>
<td>3,600 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (multi-family projects only)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Coverage</td>
<td>1,800 SF (50%)</td>
<td>676 SF</td>
<td>1,799 SF (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>2,160 SF (60%)</td>
<td>676 SF</td>
<td>1,890 SF (52.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>676 SF</td>
<td>2,603 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Footage not counted towards Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Lateral Wall Length to be demolished* / Total Existing Wall Length</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>28 LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Lateral Wall Length to be built</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>134 LF (NEW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>30'-0&quot;</td>
<td>16'-0&quot;</td>
<td>21'-4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of stories</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>12'-0&quot;</td>
<td>1'-4&quot;</td>
<td>12'-0&quot; (*NEW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH Side Setback</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>31'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH Side Setback</td>
<td>10'-0&quot;</td>
<td>3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>10'-0&quot; (*NEW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>5'-0&quot; / 8'-0&quot;</td>
<td>32'-8&quot;</td>
<td>5'-0&quot; / 8'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st FLOOR / 2nd FLOOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Door Setback</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>10'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Parking Spaces</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncovered Parking Spaces</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Space (Interior measurement)</td>
<td>9' x 20'</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>18' x 20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Driveways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway Width(s)</td>
<td>18'-0&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eave Projection (Into Setback)</td>
<td>3' maximum</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3'-0&quot; (*PORCH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances Between Eaves &amp; Property Lines</td>
<td>3' minimum</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5'-0&quot; (*REAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Porch/Deck Projections</td>
<td>4' maximum</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4'-0&quot; (*FRONT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Feature Projections</td>
<td>3'-0&quot; porch @ Short St.</td>
<td>1'-6&quot; *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number &amp; Category of Accessory Buildings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Building Setbacks</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance between Buildings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Building Heights</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence Heights</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If project proposes demolition to an HRI structure, also indicate % of proposed demolition of the surface of all exterior walls facing a public street or streets, if applicable.

[Rev. 01/14/14]
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ARCHITECTURAL PERMIT (AP) 18-0970
FOR A 1,123 SQ. FT. TWO-STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING 676 SQ. FT. SINGLE-STORY RESIDENCE ON THE CITY’S HISTORIC RESOURCES INVENTORY

FACTS
1. The subject site is located at 218 Park Street, Pacific Grove, 93950 (APN 006-204-002)
2. The subject site has a designation High Density Residential (29 du/acre) on the adopted Pacific Grove General Plan Land Use Map.
3. The project site is located in the Residential Multi-Family (R-3) zoning district.
4. The subject site is approximately 3,558 square feet in size.
5. The subject site is currently developed with 676 sq. ft. duplex, the exterior materials of which were completely replaced in 2012 (AP 11-1201).
6. The subject site is located in the Area of Special Biological Significance and is listed on the City’s Historic Resources Inventory (HRI). This area is not known to be archaeologically sensitive, nor is it in the Coastal zone.
7. The proposed project qualifies for Classes 1 and 31 CEQA categorical exemptions for Residential Additions and Historical Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation, respectively.
8. A brief assessment of the proposed project’s potential impacts to the historic resource was prepared by a qualified historian and resulted in a finding of no impact (Seavey, November 2018).
9. The existing trees shall be protected as required by PGMC Title 12 and shall adhere to the recommendations in the arborist’s report (Ono, March 2019) and the City arborist on file in the Community Development Department (CDD) permit file.

FINDINGS
For the Architectural Permit: PGMC Section 23.70.060(f):
1. The architecture and general appearance of the completed project are compatible with the neighborhood;
2. The completed project will neither be detrimental to the orderly and harmonious development of the city nor impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood; and
3. The commission has been guided by and has made reference to applicable provisions of the architectural review guidelines in making its determinations on the structure.

The project design has also taken into consideration the City’s Architectural Review Guidelines (1, 7, 10-12, 21-22) and for Historic Buildings (Appendix 1) pertaining to the placement of a new addition, distinguishing new from old, and retaining the historic building’s proportion and profile. No exceptions to the R-3 zoning district’s development standards are proposed.

PERMIT
Architectural Permit (AP) 18-0970 for a 1,123 sq. ft. two-story residential addition to an existing single-story 676 sq. ft. house listed on the Historic Resources Inventory.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
1. Permit Expiration. This permit shall expire and be null and void if a building permit has not been applied for within one (1) year from and after the date of approval. Application for extension of this approval must be made prior to the expiration date.
2. **Construction Compliance.** All construction must occur in strict compliance with the proposal as set forth in the application, subject to any special conditions of approval herein. Any deviation from approvals must be reviewed and approved by staff, and may require HRC approval.

3. **Terms and Conditions.** These terms and conditions shall run with the land, and it is the intention of the Community and Economic Development Director and the Permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions, unless amended. Amendments to this permit may be achieved only if an application is made and approved, pursuant to the Zoning Code.

4. **Public Works, Fire and Building.** Review and approval by the Public Works, Fire and Building Departments are required prior to issuance of a building permit. Any work within the public right-of-way shall require an encroachment permit prior to issuance of the building permit.

5. **Tree Protection Standards During Construction.** Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapters 12.20 and 12.30, and the Urban Forestry Standards, all trees that are otherwise protected and will be impacted as a result of Development, both proposed for pruning or removal and where the development will impact the critical root zone of the tree are protected. Prior to issuance of the building permit, the Project Arborist shall review grading, drainage, utility, building and landscape plans to determine impacts to individual trees, to determine required minimum tree protection standards during construction and submit a report to the City Arborist for review and approval.

6. **Additional Tree Protection Recommendations.** In addition to the standards in 6. above and the recommendations of the project arborist in the report on file in the CDD (Ono, March 2019), the following recommendations provided by the City arborist and reflected on the revised plans date-stamped 3-20-19 shall be followed during grading, excavation and constructions activities:
   a. All trenching for grade change within 8 feet of the trunk be done by hand;
   b. An arborist must be “on-site” to monitor work in anticipation of encountering tree roots;
   c. Mitigate root impacts with minimal invasive arboriculture practices; and
   d. Review post construction treatment with city forester.

7. **Building Plans.** All conditions of approval for the Planning permit(s) shall be printed on a full size sheet and included with the construction plan set submitted to the Building Department.

8. **Exterior Lighting.** All exterior lighting fixtures shall conform to Architectural Review Guidelines #10-12.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE:**

1. The Committee determines that each of the Findings set forth above is true and correct, and by this reference incorporates those Findings as an integral part of this Permit.

2. The Committee hereby approves File No. AP 18-0970 as conditioned and pursuant to CEQA categorical exemption 15331, *Historical Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation*.

3. This permit shall become effective upon the expiration of the Committee’s 10-day appeal period.

4. This permit shall not take effect until the owner acknowledges and agrees to all terms and conditions and agrees to conform to and comply with those terms and conditions.
PASSED AND ADOPTED AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE ON THE 24th DAY OF APRIL, 2019, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: XXX
NOES: XXX
ABSENT: XXX
ABSTENTIONS: XXX

APPROVED:

______________________________
Claudia Sawyer, Chair

The undersigned hereby acknowledge and agree to the approved terms and conditions, and agree to fully conform to, and comply with, said terms and conditions.

_______________________________________
Robert & Donna Gionfriddo, owners

_______________________________________
Date
NOTICE OF EXEMPTION FROM CEQA

Property Address/Location: 218 Park Street, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
File No. AP 18-0970 / APN 006-304-002

Project Description: An Architectural Permit for a 1,123 sq. ft. two-story addition to an existing 676 sq. ft. single-family residence which is on the Historic Resources Inventory.

ZC: R-3 GP: Residential High Density Lot Size: ± 3,558 sq. ft.

Applicant Name: Robert and Donna Gionfriddo (Owner) Phone #: 408-489-1200
Mailing Address: 50 Chester Street, Los Gatos, CA 95042
Email Address: bfriddo@aol.com

Public Agency Approving Project: City of Pacific Grove, Monterey County, California

Exempt Status (Check One):

☐ Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1);15268))
☐ Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3); 15269(a))
☐ Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c))
☒ Categorical Exemption

Type and Section Number: Classes 1 and 31, Sections 15301(e) and 15331

☐ Statutory Exemptions

Type and Section Number: _____________________________

☐ Other: ____________________________________________________

Exemption Findings:
The Class 31 exemption consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation, or reconstruction of historical resources in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitation, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (1995).

The Class 1 exemption consists of alterations to existing facilities, including additions of up to 10,000 sq. ft., where all public services and facilities are available to allow for maximum development permissible in the General Plan and the area in which the project is located is not environmentally sensitive.

The exceptions to exemptions in Section 15300.2 of the CEQA Guidelines do not apply to the Class 1 and Class 31 exemptions except for (f) which pertains to historic resources. The existing residence is proposed by the City’s consultants, Page & Turnbull, to be removed from the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) and the applicant’s qualified historic consultant concurs as the property “is not original but a rebuilt structure that was previously remodeled in 2012.” (Seavey, November 2018)

Contact: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner Contact Phone: (831) 648-3127
Signature: Date: April 25, 2019
November 8, 2018

Planning Department
City of Pacific Grove
300 Forest Avenue
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

To Whom It May Concern:

Introduction:

This Focused Phase II Assessment has been prepared on behalf of Robert Gionfriddo as part of an application to connect an existing (and previously remodeled) historic building with two residential units to a proposed adjoining addition, increasing the overall building size significantly. The addition would incorporate the one unit along Park Street into its interior while not altering the remaining unit along Short Street. The subject property is located at 218 Park Street (APN: 006-304-002), in Pacific Grove, and would remain a two-unit residence after the remodel.

Historic Background and Description:

The subject property, an altered c. 1897 wood-framed vernacular cottage, remodeled to a duplex in c. 1926, is listed as #1145 in the Pacific Grove Historic Resource Survey dated January 1, 2007. Character-defining features of the property include pre-1926 vertical board-and-batten wall cladding (covered over with horizontal wood siding in later years), barn-like flared roof, central brick chimney, and tall, single, paired and banked wood casement windows. It should be noted that a major remodel, approved by the City of Pacific Grove in 2012, saw most of the original exterior materials of the historic building removed and replaced with matching materials and finishes, due to the unsalvageable condition of the original wood, which included extensive dry rot and lead-based paint residue. The exterior of the remodel, though largely of new materials, preserved the size, architectural character and exterior appearance of the original walls and roof, including the locations and configurations of the windows, doors and porches. The replacement board-and-batten material was solid redwood with a circular sawn texture applied to match that of the original wood siding. The original brick chimney was unaltered.
Evaluation:

In question is the proposed construction of a new addition adjoining the rear portion of the existing building along its south and west sides which would envelope approximately one quarter of the perimeter into the interior of the single-story portion of the proposed addition. A two-story portion as proposed is further back on the property and does not adjoin the one-story historic building, a sensitive arrangement respecting the lower building height of the existing building, which remains largely intact and maintains its visual prominence on the corner of Park Street and Short Street.

The exterior wall materials of the addition are a combination of board-and-batten siding at the first floor perimeter and wood shingles at the second floor perimeter. The first floor siding will be resawn plywood with applied battens that are narrower in profile than the wider battens of the existing building. The existing siding is slid redwood distinguished by a circular sawn texture that had been present in the original materials replaced in 2012. The second floor of the addition shall have panelized cedar shingle siding. All the new materials shall be compatible with but clearly distinguishable from the materials on the historic building, as is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard #10 for Rehabilitation to differentiate new work from old. The existing painted finish and color will be carried through to the addition, and the roof materials will match that of the existing as well.

The gable roof of the new addition at the first floor portion that adjoins the existing building is lower in height than the existing gable roof profile, largely masking the new roof profile from both streets. The new second story portion is placed farther back and will be masked from public rights of way by a mature oak tree along Park Street and a large setback along Short Street. It should be noted that the prominent forward corner location of the existing building, nearly on the property lines along both streets, results in a visual presence at the street intersection that dominates the view of the overall structure, even the two-story portion placed farther back toward the opposite corner of the property.

About one quarter of the original building’s perimeter walls will be incorporated into the interior of the new addition. These are not prominent street facing walls but rather face the interior of the lot at the rear corner, opposite and farthest back from the street intersection. Four existing windows and one entry door will be removed and re-used at new locations at the addition. It should be noted that these are replacement units that were installed in the 2012 remodel project, and are not original (see DPR on file). The impact of the proposed addition is mitigated by the sensitive scale and arrangement of the new structure, and by the fact that the existing building is not original but a rebuilt structure that was previously remodeled in 2012.

Submitted by: Kent Seavey
Tree Resource and Construction Impact Assessment
218 Park Street

Prepared for:
Eddie Hurt Architect

Prepared by:
Frank Ono
Urban Forester
Member Society of American Foresters #48004
ISA Certified Arborist #536
1213 Miles Avenue
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

March 11, 2019
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SUMMARY

Development is proposed for this site requiring excavation near a mature Coast live oak tree which is the focus of this report; there are several other smaller diameter trees (Cypress and Pittosporum) which are outside the construction area that should not be affected. The project proposes approximately 1123 square foot of addition to an existing 676 square foot single-family dwelling. The oak tree is considered to be in fair or better condition both structurally and in health. At this time, it appears the project does or does not require removal of any trees. This report assesses the potential affects that the construction project will have to the existing tree resources on site as well as a list of recommendations regarding retention of the tree for the project.

INTRODUCTION

This tree assessment/arborist report is prepared for Robert and Donna Gionfrido, the owners of the property located at 218 Park Street by Frank Ono, Urban Forester and Certified Arborist (member Society of American Foresters #48004 and International Society of Arboriculture Certified Arborist #536) due to the proposed construction. The City of Pacific Grove Municipal Code identifies native Coast live oak as a species requiring protection and special consideration for management.
ASSIGNMENT/SCOPE OF PROJECT

To ensure protection of the tree resources on site, the property owner, Robert and Donna Gionfrido, have requested Tree Resource Assessment and Construction Impact Analysis of trees in proximity to proposed development areas. The findings of the report are to be documented in an arborist report to work in conjunction with other conditions for approval of the building permit application. To accomplish this assignment, the following tasks have been completed:

- Evaluate health, structure and preservation suitability for each tree within or adjacent (15 feet or less) to proposed development of trees greater than or equal to six diameter inches at 24 inches above grade.
- Review proposed building site plans as provided by Eddie Hurt, architect.
- Make recommendations for alternative methods and preconstruction treatments to facilitate tree retention.
- Create preservation specifications, as it relates to a Tree Location/Preservation Map.
- Determine the quantity of trees affected by construction that meet tree criteria as defined by the City of Pacific Grove Municipal Code; as well as mitigation requirements for those to be affected.
- Document findings in the form of a report as required by the City of Pacific Grove Planning Department.

LIMITATIONS

This assignment is limited to the review of plans submitted to me dated February 25, 2019 by Mr. Eddie Hurt, architect to assess affects from potential construction to trees within or adjacent to construction activities. The assessment has been made of these plans specifically and no other plans were reviewed. Only minor grading and erosion details are discussed in this report as it relates to tree health. It is not the intent of this report to be a monetary valuation of the trees or provide risk assessment for any tree on this parcel, as any tree can fail at any time. No clinical diagnosis was performed on any pest or pathogen that may or may not be present. In addition to an inspection of the property, F.O. Consulting relied on information provided in the preparation of this report (such as, surveys, property boundaries, and property ownership) and must reasonably rely on the accuracy of the information provided. F.O. Consulting shall not be responsible for another's means, methods, techniques, schedules, sequence or procedures, or for contractor safety or any other related programs; or for another's failure to complete the work in accordance with the plans and specifications.
PURPOSE AND GOAL

This tree resource assessment and construction impact analysis report is prepared for this parcel due to proposed construction activities located at 218 Park Street, Pacific Grove CA. The purpose of the assessment is to determine if the subject tree will be affected by the proposed project. Oak trees are considered protected trees as defined by Chapter 12 of the City of Pacific Grove Municipal Code.

The goal of this report is to protect and maintain the City of Pacific Grove urban forested resources through the adherence of development standards, which allow the protection, and maintenance of its urban forest resources. Furthermore, it is the intended goal of this report to aid in planning to offset any potential effects of proposed development on the property while encouraging forest stability and sustainability, perpetuating the forested character of the community.

SITE DESCRIPTION

1) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 006-304-002-000.

2) Location: 218 Park Street, Pacific Grove CA.

3) Parcel size: 3600 square feet.

4) Existing Land Use: The parcel is zoned for residential use (ZONING).

5) Slope: The parcel mildly sloped. Slopes range from 5% to 10%.

6) Soils: The parcel is located on soils classified by the Monterey County Soils report as BbC-Baywood sand, 2 to 15 percent slopes. This is a gently sloping to rolling soil on stabilized sand dunes. The report states that with this soil type soil runoff is slow to medium, and the erosion hazard is slight to moderate. Permeability is rapid, and the available water capacity is 2.5 to 3 inches. Roots penetrate to a depth of more than 60 inches.

7) Vegetation: The vegetation on site is composed primarily of the Coast live oak, a small Monterey cypress sapling in good condition and health along Park street, and a medium sized Pittosporum in poor to fair health along the fence line. The site is Baywood series consists of somewhat excessively drained soils that formed in stabilized sand dunes; historical vegetation in this area would have consisted of Monterey pine of course as well as manzanita, chamise, annual grasses, and scattered oaks.
BACKGROUND

Assessment focuses on incorporation of the preliminary location of site improvements coupled with consideration for the general goals of site improvement desired of the landowner. Proposed improvements assessed included preserving the tree to the greatest extent feasible, maintaining the view shed and general aesthetic quality of the area while complying with City of Pacific Grove Codes. The study of the individual tree determined treatments necessary to complete the project and meet the goals of the landowner. The assessment of the trees concluded with an opinion of whether the tree should be removed, or preserved, based on the extent and effect of construction activity to the short and long-term health of the tree. All meetings and field review were focused on the area immediately surrounding the proposed development.

OBSERVATIONS/DISCUSSION

The following list includes observations made while on site, and summarizes details discussed during this stage of the planning process.

- The site is developed with an existing structure and graveled parking area. My understanding is the existing tree is to remain.
- There are several trees on this property.
  - The main one is a Coast live oak (#300) appearing to be native to the area. The tree is in fair condition; surrounding lots have had trees removed over time either due to disease or safety reasons. It has a crown spread that averages about 45 feet with its spread much longer running from east to west than the crown spread from north to south, making the trees critical root zone somewhat elliptical.
  - Another tree is a smaller diameter 9” Monterey cypress, that appears to be a seedling originating from surrounding upper canopy cypress. This tree is in good health and condition and is shown to remain.
  - The last is a Pittosporum along the fence line. This tree is in poor to fair condition. It is scheduled to remain.
- Soils have been disturbed on this property. Previous excavation for a small retaining wall with a French drain has occurred near the oak, which will be removed to facilitate the structure improvements.
- The site map submitted to me also shows further excavation will need to occur near the Oak tree on its west side to install a slab on grade for the finished floor for the new building addition. The tree exists at an elevation of approximately 74 and 74.5. The finished slab elevation is at 74 meaning that some soils will need to be removed to install the slab.
- In anticipation of the proposed excavation encroaching into the trees critical root zone and disturbance of support roots, a three foot soil probe was inserted into the soils at 2” intervals between the tree and the proposed foundation at a distance of five feet away from the tree, to look for potential structural roots. After inspection it appears construction is at a distance that encroachment, if at all, would be minimal and due to the soil type not many roots will be encountered. The tree is expected to satisfactorily survive construction provided work near the tree is monitored and the tree protected.
- An open spaced wood deck is also proposed around the tree. Typically, these types of decks are supported by a post and pier foundation and minimizes soil and root distance.
PROJECT ASSESSMENT

According to publication of Trees and Development, a Technical Guide to Preservation of Trees During Lan Development (Mattheny and Clark), the oak tree has good tolerance to contractor pressure and reacting to root pruning and construction well. The only caveat is to make sure that soils remain at the same grade throughout the entire construction project to prevent root crown rot. Success is due to the deep rooting that the tree has in this Baywood soil type where less than 20% of the trees root system will be reduced. With regard to potential support roots, according to the paper published by Bruce Hagen, State Urban Forester, “Tree Roots-Major Considerations for the Developer”, Hagen describes the fact that the large buttress roots which originate at the base of a tree rapidly decrease in diameter one to three meters (three to ten feet) from the base of the trunk. Few large roots are found beyond 10 feet from the trunk and much of a trees water absorbing roots are under and close to a trees base. This was found to be true through systematically probing the soil to locate roots. The foundation is to be a slab on grade to further minimize ground disturbance in the case of unknown deep rooting of the Oak.

Short Term Affects

Site disturbance will occur during building construction. Short term site affects are confined to the construction envelope and immediate surroundings some of the trees roots may be trimmed and the soils around the trees root system will be reduced.

Long Term Affects

No significant long term affects to the oak tree is anticipated. As stated previously the soil type, Baywood, allows the tree to be deeply rooted with root penetration to six feet deep. The soil is well aerated, and no significant lateral roots at a depth of 3.5 feet located in the building footprint area were found during soil probing

CONCLUSION

This proposal to build an addition to a single-family residence will not significantly affect the tree. Therefore, no tree removal for this site is proposed or expected due to construction. The project is planned to maintain the existing urban forested environment, allowing the City’s urban forest to continue to exist and regenerate over time. The tree is expected to survive when properly protected and monitored. Whenever construction activities take place near trees, there is the potential for the trees to experience decline in both the short and the long term. The greatest attempt has been made to identify for removal any tree likely to experience such decline.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Tree Pruning

It is to be understood that the pruning of the existing trees may be expected for this site, especially near building construction areas. Pruning will include trees with deadwood, minor structural defects or disease that must be compensated, and possibly vehicle or pedestrian clearance. Trees should be monitored on occasion for health and vigor after pruning. Should the health and vigor of any tree decline it will be treated as appropriately recommended by a certified arborist or qualified forester.
Tree Protection

Prior to the commencement of construction activities:

- Trees located adjacent to construction areas shall be protected from damage by construction equipment by the use of temporary fencing and through wrapping of trunks with protective materials.
- Fencing shall consist of chain link, snowdrift, plastic mesh, hay bales, or field fence. Existing fencing may also be used.
- Fencing must not be to be attached to the tree. It shall be free standing or self-supporting so as not to damage trees. Fencing shall be rigidly supported and shall stand a minimum of height of four feet above grade.
- Soil compaction, parking of vehicles or heavy equipment, stockpiling of construction materials, and/or dumping of materials should not be allowed adjacent to trees on the property especially within fenced areas.
- Fenced areas and the trunk protection materials must remain in place during the entire construction period.

During grading and excavation activities:

- All trenching, grading or any other digging or soil removal that is expected to encounter tree roots will be monitored by a qualified arborist or forester to ensure against drilling or cutting into or through major roots.
- Excavation adjacent to any tree within 6-8 feet of the tree should be done by hand where practical and any roots greater than 2-inches diameter should be bridged or pruned appropriately.
- Any roots that must be cut should be cut by manually digging a trench and cutting exposed roots with a saw, vibrating knife, rock saw, narrow trencher with sharp blades, or other approved root pruning equipment.
- Any roots damaged during grading or excavation should be exposed to sound tissue and cut cleanly with a saw.

If at any time potentially significant roots are discovered:

- The arborist/forester will be authorized to halt excavation until appropriate mitigation measures are formulated and implemented.
- If significant roots are identified that must be removed that will destabilize or negatively affects the target trees negatively, the property owner will be notified immediately and a determination for removal will be assessed and made as required by law for treatment of the area that will not risk death decline or instability of the tree consistent with the implementation of appropriate construction design approaches to minimize affects, such as hand digging, bridging or tunneling under roots, etc.
Best Management Practices to Observe (BMP)

The following best management practices must be adhered to:

A) Tree service Contractors will verify animal or bird nesting prior to tree work. If nesting activity of migratory birds are found, work must stop, and a wildlife biologist consulted before commencing work again (the typical bird nesting season ranges from February 22 to August 1).

B) Do not deposit any fill around trees, which may compact soils and alter water and air relationships. Avoid depositing fill, parking equipment, or staging construction materials near existing trees. Covering and compacting soil around trees can alter water and air relationships with the roots. Fill placed within the drip line may encourage the development of oak root fungus (*Armillaria mellea*). As necessary, trees may be protected by boards, fencing or other materials to delineate protection zones.

C) Pruning shall be conducted so as not to unnecessarily injure the tree. General-Principals of pruning include placing cuts immediately beyond the branch collar, making clean cuts by scoring the underside of the branch first, and for live oak, avoiding the period from February through May.

D) Native live trees are not adapted to summer watering and may develop crown or root rot as a result. Do not regularly irrigate within the drip line of oaks. Native, locally adapted, drought resistant species are the most compatible with this goal.

E) Root cutting should occur outside of the springtime. Late June and July would likely be the best. Pruning of the live crown should not occur February through May.

F) Tree material greater than 3 inches in diameter remaining on site more than one month that is not cut and split into firewood must be covered with thick clear plastic that is dug in securely around the pile to discourage infestation and dispersion of bark beetles.

G) A mulch layer up to approximately 4 inches deep should be applied to the ground under selected trees following construction. Only 1 to 2 inches of mulch should be applied within 1 to 2 feet of the trunk, and under no circumstances should any soil or mulch be placed against the root crown (base) of trees. The best source of mulch would be from chipped material generated on site.

H) If trees along near the development are visibly declining in vigor, a Professional Forester or Certified Arborist should be contacted to inspect the site to recommend a course of action.

---

Report Prepared By:  
Frank Ono, SAF Forester #48004 and ISA Certified Arborist #536  Date:  
March 11, 2019
PHOTOGRAPHS

Cypress and subject Oak
Distance to new foundation on north side of tree

Green valve box is drainage cleanout, site has been disturbed and soils excavated in this area, no roots exist in this area.
Probing of soil for roots
**SITE DATA**

**LOT SIZE:** 3940 SF

**EXISTING FLOOR AREA (shown in Grey):** 1799 SF

**ADDED (4TH FLOOR AREA):** 1123 SF

**TOTAL FLOOR AREA:** 2922 SF

**TOTAL FLOOR AREA (Existing & Added):** 2922 SF

**EXISTING COVER (50% Max. Allowable):** 1799 SF

**OTHER LOT COVERAGE (Covered Porch & Concrete Walk):** 189 SF

**TOTAL LOT COVERAGE:** 1918 SF (65%)

**COVERED PARKING:** 2 spaces (18 SF)

**UNCOVERED PARKING:** 1 space (9 SF)

**DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS**

**EXISTING STANDARDS AS PROPOSED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARDS</th>
<th>AS PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SETBACK: FRONT YARD</td>
<td>12'-0&quot; (4th Floor Entry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETBACK: SIDE YARD</td>
<td>12'-0&quot; (At Garage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETBACK: REAR YARD</td>
<td>12'-0&quot; (At Garage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOCABLE BUILDING HEIGHT</td>
<td>39'-0&quot; (Maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOCABLE BUILDING COVER</td>
<td>1123 SF (Maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOCABLE SITE COVER</td>
<td>1799 SF (Maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOCABLE FLOOR AREA</td>
<td>No Restriction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXISTING STANDARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARDS</th>
<th>AS EXISTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SETBACK: FRONT YARD</td>
<td>12'-0&quot; (4th Floor Entry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETBACK: SIDE YARD</td>
<td>12'-0&quot; (At Garage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETBACK: REAR YARD</td>
<td>12'-0&quot; (At Garage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOCABLE BUILDING HEIGHT</td>
<td>39'-0&quot; (Maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOCABLE BUILDING COVER</td>
<td>1123 SF (Maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOCABLE SITE COVER</td>
<td>1799 SF (Maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOCABLE FLOOR AREA</td>
<td>No Restriction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRACT DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>676 SF</td>
<td>0.175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**

**APN:** 006-304-002

**LOT SIZE:** 3940 SF

**TOTAL FLOOR AREA:** 2922 SF

**TOTAL ADDED FLOOR AREA:** 1123 SF

**ALLOWABLE FLOOR AREA:** 1890 SF (52.5%)

**ALLOWABLE SITE COVER:** 1890 SF (52.5%)

**ALLOWABLE BUILDING HEIGHT:** 39'-0" (Maximum)

**SETBACK**

| FRONT YARD | 12'-0" (4th Floor Entry) |
| SIDE YARD | 12'-0" (At Garage) |
| REAR YARD | 12'-0" (At Garage) |

**ZONING:**

**R-3 STANDARDS**

- 10'-0" Minimum
- 12'-0" (At Garage)
- 12'-0" (4th Floor Entry)
- 8'-0" (2nd Floor)
- 5'-0" (1st Floor)
- 30'-0" Maximum
- 6'-0" (At Front Entry)
- No Restriction

**PROPERTY LINE**

- 18'-0" (Perpendicular to Street)
- 12'-0" Minimum
- 10% of lot width

**EXISTING**

- 40'-0" Frontage on Park Street
- 75'-0" Rearage on Short Street
- 60.00' Property Line

**NEW BUILDING**

- 2603 SF
- 2603 SF
- 9' x 16'
- 9' x 20'
- 52.5%

**EXISTING BUILDING**

- 1799 SF
- 1799 SF
- 1890 SF (52.5%)

**EXISTING FLOOR AREA (shown in Grey):** 1799 SF

**ADDED (4TH FLOOR AREA):** 1123 SF

**TOTAL FLOOR AREA:** 2922 SF

**TOTAL FLOOR AREA (Existing & Added):** 2922 SF

**EXISTING COVER (50% Max. Allowable):** 1799 SF

**OTHER LOT COVERAGE (Covered Porch & Concrete Walk):** 189 SF

**TOTAL LOT COVERAGE:** 1918 SF (65%)

**COVERED PARKING:** 2 spaces (18 SF)

**UNCOVERED PARKING:** 1 space (9 SF)

**COMMENTS ADDED**

- FEBRUARY 25, 2019

**APN:** 006-304-002

**PHONE:** (408) 489-1200

**APPROVED:**

- MARCH 18, 2019

**PROPERTY LINE**

- 18'-0" (Perpendicular to Street)
- 12'-0" Minimum
- 10% of lot width

**EXISTING**

- 40'-0" Frontage on Park Street
- 75'-0" Rearage on Short Street
- 60.00' Property Line

**NEW BUILDING**

- 2603 SF
- 2603 SF
- 9' x 16'
- 9' x 20'
- 52.5%
TWO-STORY ADDITION TO EXISTING RESIDENCE

ROBERT & DONNA GIONFRIDDO
218 PARK STREET
PACIFIC GROVE, CA
APN: 006-304-002
PHONE: (831) 489-1200

No. C11821
REN. MAY 2019
CITY FORESTER

EXISTING UNIT

FIRST FLOOR PLAN

SECOND FLOOR PLAN

REVISED
5:18 pm, Mar 20, 2019

A2
OF 5 SHEETS
TWO-STORY ADDITION TO EXISTING RESIDENCE

ROBERT & DONNA GIONFRIDDO
218 PARK STREET
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REN. MAY 2019

EXISTING CHIMNEY

NEW ROOF
EXISTING ROOF

LOWER ROOF RIDGE (NEW)
UPPER ROOF RIDGE @ 94.83'
(21'-4" ABOVE FINISH GRADE)

EXISTING ROOF RIDGE @ 86.83'
(16'-0" ABOVE EXISTING GRADE)

UPPER ROOF
(SHOWN DARKER)
LOWER ROOF
(SHOWN LIGHTER)

GUTTER
DORMER RIDGE
LOWER ROOF

OVERALL ROOF PLAN (1st & 2nd LEVELS)
1/4" = 1'-0"
TYPICAL SECTION

1/2" = 1'-0"

NOTE: THE EXISTING GRADE PROFILE SHOWN IS THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT EXISTING NEAR THE ADJOINING PROPERTY ALONG PARK STREET.
NOTE: EXTERIOR COLORS FOR THE NEW SIDING, DOORS, AND WINDOWS WILL MATCH THOSE SAME ITEMS ON THE EXISTING BUILDING. LIKewise, THE NEW ROOFING MATERIAL WILL MATCH THE EXISTING COMPOSITION SHINGLES ON THE EXISTING BUILDING. NEW GUTTERS AND DOWNSPOUTS WILL BE PAINTED ALUMINUM, NOT THE COPPER MATERIAL ON THE EXISTING BUILDING.
SECTION THROUGH TREE AND NEAREST PORTION OF PROPOSED BUILDING  (REFER TO SITE PLAN, SHEET A1)
Historic list complete

A draft copy of the Historic Resources Inventory of Pacific Grove has just been completed and will be presented to the planning commission at its May 18 meeting.

The inventory goes beyond the scope of the planned project by researching 541 structures of historic significance within the Pacific Grove city limits. The original contract called for an inventory of 550 buildings.

According to Assistant Planning Director Tony Lobay, the inventory will be of immediate benefit to property owners, the public, and city review bodies interested in a particular older building.

"In the long range," Lobay writes in a memorandum to the city council, "the completed inventory and the proposed publication should provide a factual basis for future discussions regarding the conservation of historic resources within Pacific Grove.

"It will enable the public, the council and the planning commission to consider such questions as whether an historic preservation element and special regulations are needed for Pacific Grove," Lobay writes.

However, Lobay stresses, the report is no more than an inventory of the city's older buildings.

"It does not constitute an historic preservation plan in any way."

The next step for the Historic Resources Inventory is to prepare a publication based on the inventory. Project Coordinator Wendy Howe will present the inventory itself and specifics of the format of the publication at the May 17 meeting.

The project itself was funded in part by a grant from the State Department of Parks and Recreation. The local match was provided by in-kind services by Coordinator Howe; Ted Larson, A.I.A, Historic Officer and a member of the State Historic Building Code Committee; the County Historic Coordinator; several members of the Heritage Society and student interns with the Monterey Architectural Resources Inventory.

No city funds were expended.
LOCAL SURVEY CONTRACT
PROPOSAL FORM

1. Name of governmental agency authorizing the survey application: 
   City of Pacific Grove Planning/Building Department

2. Name of city, county or district to be surveyed: 
   City of Pacific Grove

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

3. (a) Are you reapplying for funding for a proposal which has received funding through this program for an ongoing survey? If yes, in what year did you receive funding? Yes No

   (b) Are you applying for funding for a proposal that was submitted in a previous year but which did not receive funding? If yes, in what year did you apply? Yes No

   (c) Are you receiving funding for this survey from another source (not local match)? If yes, from whom? Yes No

4. Assured sources of local matching share and amounts - (List in-kind services)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Date Available</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Attached Sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Amount of Local Share: $ 8,760 (64%)

6. Amount of Federal Share: $ 4,900 (36%)

7. Total Project Cost: $ 13,660 (100%)

COST BREAKDOWN (Indicate if Donated)

   (a) Coordinator's Salary or Honorariums for Review Board (specify which). See Attached Sheet: $ 4,000 (72% Donated)

   (b) Printing Costs: $ 1,135 (Donated)

   Itemize costs See Attached Sheet
(c) Administrator's Salary 100 hrs @ 10.00/hr $1,000 (50% Donated)
(d) Clerical Salary 150 hrs @ 4.50/hr $675
(e) Storage and Photographic Supplies $300 (33 1/3% Donat)
(f) Darkroom Fees or Developing Cost $450 (33 1/3% Donat)
(g) Mileage Cost for Field Inspection $200 (Donated)
(h) Other Research, Survey, Recording (See Attached Sheet) $5,900 (60% Donated)

Total $13,660

8. Has any survey of any type ever been conducted in your area?  X Yes  No
   If yes, please describe and attach any relevant information.
   In 1971 (with subsequent updates) the Planning/Building Dept. of the City conducted
   windshield surveys of housing conditions in project area. Summer interns with
   Planning/Building Dept. during summers of 1975, 1976 started a photo inventory of
   historic structures in project area. Dr. David Mills and Jeanne Mills et al of
   Heritage Society did in-depth survey of structures built 1875-1889. (See attached
   map.)

9. Describe area to be surveyed:
   (a) Entire city  X Yes  No
   (b) Entire county  X Yes  No
   (c) Certain districts  X Yes  No
   (d) List rationale for (c). Historic structures, with only a few exceptions, are
       known to be located within project area.
   (e) Attach map giving project boundaries.

10. Is the survey to be comprehensive?  X Yes  No
    Describe method of surveying sites.
    Sites to be surveyed and photographed. Historic information to be derived from in-
    formation contained in local public records (both City and County) and from interview
    with longtime residents. In addition to data prepared for Cal DPR 523 form, the
    Building Inspector will add housing condition data. Data to be used not only for
    Historic Preservation Plan but also development of Housing strategy and for Initial
    Studies pursuant to State EIR Guidelines.

11. What historic timespan will the survey cover? Describe other local criteria
    for selection of resources in inventory.
    1875-1930, includes the period between the founding of Pacific Grove and the Great
    Depression. Pacific Grove began as the Pacific Grove Methodist Christian Retreat
    in 1875. The original "tent city" quickly replaced its temporary structures with
    permanent homes. By the turn of the century the city had 2000 permanent residence
    living in a variety of "Victorian" homes. Pacific Grove was also the home of
    Chautauqua of the West and drew many notable personages during the early years.
    The project area still contains numerous examples of early Pacific Grove architec
    structures threatened by new development.
12. To what degree will the inventory be used by the applying governing body?
   (a) To comply with an established ordinance: ___________ (attach copy of ordinance).
   (b) To implement a preservation ordinance and commission: _x_ Yes ___ No
   (c) For an Historic Preservation element in a General Plan: _x_ Yes ___ No
   (d) To establish historic districts for nomination to the National Register: ___________
   (e) To designate sites for nomination to the National Register: ___________ Yes ___ No
   (f) To be used only for the Statewide Inventory: ___________ No ___

13. Will volunteers be used? _x_ Yes ___ No.
   If yes, what is the source for volunteers?
   If yes, in what numbers and in what capacities?
   Function ____________________________ Personnel ____________________________
   Historical Consultant Kent Seavey, County of Monterey Historical
   Architectural Consultant Ted Larson AIA
   Art Historian Lowell Northrop
   Coordinator/Administrator Wendy Howe
   Surveyors & Researchers 10 members of Heritage Society plus one student
   Other ____________________________

14. Describe volunteer training program:
   No. of Classes: three 2-hr training sessions
   Instructor’s Name: Kent L. Seavey, T. R. Larson AIA, Lowell Northrop
   Field Supervisor: Lowell Northrop
   Coordination Method: Periodic meetings/contact by Project Administrator

15. Where will the inventory be stored? Pacific Grove City Hall, Planning Department
   What is the degree of public access? Report to be available at Pacific Grove, Carmel, and U.C.S.C. libraries
   Hours: A.M. to P.M.
   Day: M-F 8 to 12 1 to 5

16. What method of storage will be used?
   File cabinets; copy of report for individual site to be placed in property file of Planning/Building Department

17. Is a publication of the inventory expected? If so, please describe:
   Give estimated cost: 1100

   Publication to include text and photographs 150-200 pages. Format similar to City of Santa Cruz Historic Building Survey (1976). Report to be distributed to City Council, Planning Commission, Architectural Review Board, libraries, and public.
18. Name of Governmental Representative responsible for program:
   Anthony W. Lobay

   Title:       Assistant Planning Director, City of Pacific Grove
   Address:    300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
   Telephone:  (408) 375-9861

19. Name of Survey Coordinator:       Wendy Howe

   Title:                Project Administrator/Coordinator
   Address:              300 Forest Avenue
   Telephone:            (408) 372-8459

   Attach resume.

20. Expected length of contract period. From ___________ to ___________.

21. Name of contact person:       Anthony W. Lobay

   Title:       Assistant Planning Director, City of Pacific Grove
   Address:    300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
   Telephone:  (408) 375-9861

22. Governmental Representative's Signature

   February 28, 1977

   Date form is submitted
For over thirty years the upkeep of the museum was provided by membership dues of one dollar a year and donations from interested people. The museum was poor. The selling of plants and flowers and the giving of entertainments helped to meet its expenses. Finally, an appeal, "Pacific Grove has to own the museum as a City possession or it can no longer contribute to its support; but the City must support it or it cannot stay in the town," brought about the City's ownership in 1917.

In 1919, a $5,000 bequest was given by Dr. Ann Lukens, who had become interested in the museum through her friendship with Miss Coffin. But its red-letter day came December 21, 1932, when the beautiful new $14,000 museum building of Monterey style, largely the gift of Mrs. Lucey Chase, one of Pacific Grove's much-loved citizens, was opened to the public. It was dedicated on the ninetieth birthday of the donor.

With the opening of this new museum, Dr. Harold Heath, Stanford University Professor Emeritus of Zoology, resumed his role as Scientific Director. Dr. Heath had long been an ardent supporter of the museum, had acted as president of the Association from 1906–1911, and since that time, except when his duties at Stanford University had prevented, had served on the scientific staff. He devoted forty-six years of effort to it and resigned his position in 1947.

In 1934, an apartment was built on the upper floor to provide a home for the curator.
LAVINIA GOODYEAR WATERHOUSE

One of the most active California women workers in the fight for Equal Rights (as it was called in the 19th century) is buried in Pacific Grove's El Carmelo cemetery. When she died at 81 on 13th street in 1890 she became the first to be buried there. It is said she had a funeral procession of carriages half a mile long. The headstone is gone and probably lies under Crespi pond on the golf course, dragged by a now young man with a bulldozer who inexpertly attempted to remove some ice-plant and dragged half a dozen tombstones away by force. Doris King of Applegate, great-grand-daughter, replace the marker.

This was the headstone of Lavinia Goodyear (Bradley) Waterhouse, whose husband died in 1854. In a day when women had no professional opportunities she succeeded in making for herself a very good living as a hydrophathic physician at a succession of addresses in Sacramento. Today hydrotherapy is known as hydrotherapy.

She was a constant summer visitor to old Pacific Grove and made investments in Grove property beginning in 1882. At the time of her death she owned 57 pieces of land on the Peninsula. At least two of the buildings she owned still stand, although the house in which she lived at the time of her death has been demolished. (Ed. note: 159 13th Street, which is still there, was built for her in 1884 and she sold it in 1887.)

Seven of the ten children born to Lavinia Waterhouse failed to survive.

At the same time she and a few other Sacramento women who paid taxes on their own property made a petition to Sacramento County in protest, stating on it that TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION IS TYRANNY. This was part of a national program of similar tax protest urged by Susan B. Anthony from her headquarters on the East coast. This led to much head-shaking about "strong-minded" women.

Lavinia Waterhouse had other talents. She wrote verse for the OVERLAND MONTHLY, one of which was called, "a Woman's Right to Propose." In 1880 she painted an eleven by thirteen foot canvas (now in storage at the California State Library), portraying a SLEEPING GIANTNESS. Women, Lavinia Waterhouse said, had great power for good, if they would only use it. From the artistic point of view, the work is primitive, but the content is of great interest. The SLEEPING GIANTNESS rests with her head on Half Dome at Yosemite Valley. The Goddess of Liberty stands at her head. Abraham Lincoln is a ghostly visage in the clouds. A procession of people is marching up the cliffs to awaken her, and another procession winds its way to the swamp below to rescue the "fallen."

At the time of her death, the Monterey ARGUS spoke of her plan to turn eight lots in Pacific Grove with a frontage of 240 feet into a retirement home for women, such as a home she had already established in Sacramento. Unfortunately she died before her plan could be put into effect.

Wherever Lavinia Waterhouse's ghosts wanders today, with its fully cultivated ethical quality, surely nobody need fear it. Perhaps it hovers near her last resting place at El Carmelo in the shade of the giant cypress near the shore.

Her story isn't a cheerful one, successful though she was in her occupation. The final comment is related by her grand-daughter:

"I never saw her smile," she said. "Not ever."

THANKS!
- to E. C. Davis for sending in the article on Lavinia Waterhouse and Down the Piny Path.
- to Mrs. Pendleton for her kind words and special donations.

Continued on next page
Emily Williams (architect)
From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Emily Eolian Williams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born</th>
<th>September 25, 1869</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>June 3, 1942 (aged 72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emily Eolian Williams (September 25, 1869 - June 3, 1942) was a pioneering woman in architecture\textsuperscript{[1]} who was active in Pacific Grove, San Jose and San Francisco in the early 20th century, at a time, when very few women were able to enter the profession,\textsuperscript{[2][3]} She mainly designed houses, with conveniently planned interiors, and a few institutional buildings and an exhibition stand at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco.
Works

- Williams-Palmer House/Cottage, 246 Chestnut Street, Pacific Grove, 1903
- Edith Williams 1st House, 242 Chestnut St, Pacific Grove, 1904
- Edith Williams 2nd House, 241 Alder St, Pacific Grove, 1904
- Edith Williams 3rd House, 243 Alder St, Pacific Grove, 1904
- Lucy Mabel Pray House, 1325 Spruce, Berkeley, 1904
- Reverend George W. Foote House (demolished), 475 Spencer Avenue, San Jose, 1906
- House near Beach (not found), beach, Carmel, 1906
- Sequoia Lodge by the Sea (Dr. Anna Lukens House), 529 Ocean View Boulevard, Pacific Grove, 1906
- Palmer House (now Arthur Monroe Free House), 66 S. Priest now S. 14th Street, San Jose, 1906
- Gertrude Austin House, 2728 Union Street, San Francisco, 1907
- Lillian Palmer House, 218 Chestnut, Pacific Grove, 1907
- Emily Williams House, 220 Chestnut, Pacific Grove, 1907
- Jordan House (demolished), NE corner of Camino Real & 7th, Carmel, 1907
- W.B. Richards House, 119 Grand Avenue, Pacific Grove, 1907
- Pacific Grove Lookout (demolished), Lovers' Point near Japanese Tea Garden, Pacific Grove, 1907
- House for a prominent man, (not located), Berkeley, 1909
- House in an interior town, (not located), 1909
- Alice Wright House, 1715 Dayton Avenue, Alameda, 1909
- Deer Park Inn Remodel, Highway 89/Alpine Meadows Rd, Tahoe City, 1909
- "Wake Robin" Weekend House, Black Road, Santa Cruz Mountains, Los Gatos, 1910
- Pac. Grove Woman's Civic Club (demolished), 172 Grand Avenue, Pacific Grove, 1910
- Howell House, 245 Ocean View Blvd., Pacific Grove, 1911
- McIntire House, 117 S.17th Street, San Jose, 1913
- Williams-Palmer House, 1037 Broadway, San Francisco, 1913
- PPIE exhibition booth, Palace of Varied Industries, PPIE San Francisco, 1914–15
- Williams-Palmer House, Addition of, 1037-39 Broadway, San Francisco, 1921
- second story Additions to TenWinkel Cottage, 1071-73 Lombard St, San Francisco, 1922
- Hill House, 426 36th Avenue, San Francisco, 1923
- Cassidy House, 424-26 Mississippi, San Francisco, 1924
- Kennedy House, 1027-31 Broadway, San Francisco, 1924
- Williams-Palmer House, 151 Whitney Avenue, Los Gatos, pre 1924
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Evaluating Properties for Association with Significant Person

One of the four criteria for eligibility for listing in the National Register is “associate with the lives of persons significant in our past.” California and Pacific Grove also have a similar criterion. Most such properties, even in the National Register, are significant at the local level, so we will focus on that.

As historic preservation has developed over the decades, there has been a tendency to see many properties as significant for associations with persons who may not have actually been very important, or who have only slight associations with the property (living there for only a short period. In other cases, the property has been altered beyond recognition. Therefore, the National Register has published detailed guidelines in National Register Bulletin 32 about this criterion. This serves as useful guidance for local evaluations as well.

Evaluating significance requires research to answer several questions:

- What role did the person play in the history of the city/area? How did these actions affect or influence the local growth or culture? This focuses on the person’s actions and their impacts, not on a person’s office, social standing, length of residence, etc.

- How does his/her influence compare to other similar people in the area?

- What is the evidence of the accomplishments or influence (documentation, oral histories, news articles, etc.)?

- How is the person associated with the property? How long did he/she live or work there? When was the period of historical association? Was it during the period when he or she was active and influential?

- How much integrity does the property retain? Has it been altered since it was associated with the significant person? Would that person recognize the property today?
Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Properties Associated with Significant Persons

Sequoyah

Lucretia Mott
As the Nation's principal conservation agency, the Department of the Interior has responsibility for most of our nationally owned public lands and natural resources. This includes fostering the wisest use of our land and water resources, protecting our fish and wildlife, preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historical places, and providing for the enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The Department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to assure that their development is in the best interests of all our people. The Department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in island territories under U.S. administration.

Cover Photographs:

Sequoyah, also known as George Guess (ca. 1760-1843), inventor of the Cherokee alphabet: copy of lithograph in Mchenney and Hall's Indian Tribes of North America (Bureau of American Ethnology).

Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Properties Associated with Significant Persons

Beth Grosvenor Boland
Historian
National Register of Historic Places
I. Introduction

II. Guidelines for Properties Associated with Significant Persons: Discussion and Examples

A. Significance Guidelines
1. Specific individuals must have made contributions or played a role that can be justified as significant within a defined area of American history or prehistory. 5
2. For properties associated with several community leaders or with a prominent family, it is necessary to identify specific individuals and to explain their significant accomplishments. 7
3. Contributions of individuals must be compared to those of others who were active, successful, prosperous, or influential in the same field. 10
4. Properties that were constructed within the last fifty years, or that are associated with individuals whose significant accomplishments date from the last fifty years, must possess exceptional significance to be listed in the National Register. 12
5. A property that is significant as an important example of an individual's skill as an architect or engineer should be nominated under C rather than B. 14

B. Association Guidelines
6. Significant individuals must be directly associated with the nominated property. 15
7. Eligible properties generally are those associated with the productive life of the individual in the field in which (s)he achieved significance. 16
8. Documentation must make clear how the nominated property represents an individual's significant contributions. 18
9. Each property associated with someone important should be compared with other properties associated with that individual to identify those resources that are good representatives of the person's historic contributions. 20

C. Methods and Integrity Guidelines
10. The significance of individuals, and their associations with nominated properties, must be substantiated through accepted methods of research and analysis. 22
11. A property must retain integrity from the period of its significant historic associations. 22

III. Appendices
A. Quick Reference List of Guidelines for Applying Criterion B 25
B. National Register Criteria for Evaluation 26
C. Recommended National Park Service Publications 26
INTRODUCTION

Criterion "B" of the National Register Criteria for Evaluation states that properties may be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places if they "are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past." Persons significant in our past are those whose activities have been important to the communities in which they are located, to the history of their state, or to the nation as a whole. The National Register generally defines "the past" as that period earlier than fifty years ago, but more recent properties may qualify for listing if they possess exceptional significance.

Three steps are involved in determining whether or not a historic property meets Criterion B through association with an important person. Each of these steps must be addressed in the registration form in order to meet National Register documentation standards.

1. Determine the importance of individuals associated with the property being evaluated by gathering information on their lives and on the broader historical context within which they may have made a significant contribution.

2. Determine the length and nature of a significant individual's relationship to the property under study and to other historic resources; then decide why the property is an important representation of that person's accomplishments.

3. Assess the historic integrity of the resource; that is, determine if the property retains enough authentic historic character to convey its significant associations or qualities.

The following guidelines are intended to assist anyone preparing National Register documentation to follow the steps enumerated above. They fall roughly into three categories, with some overlap. Guidelines 1—5 deal primarily with evaluating the significance of a person under National Register criteria. Those numbered 6—9 emphasize the evaluation of a property's association with that individual. Numbers 10 and 11 are general standards that must be applied to all properties after assessing the significance of the person and the resource.

Examples follow the discussion of each guideline, representing types of arguments and documentation that the National Register finds acceptable or not acceptable to justify significance under Criterion B. These examples, excerpted from nominations submitted to the National Register, quote only the essence of each argument and important contextual information, not all of the information that may have been provided in the original nomination. Comments follow each example to clarify the way in which it illustrates the guideline under which it is cited.

The use of actual nominations has resulted in certain biases appearing in the examples. The vast majority of individuals discussed in the examples are male caucasians, and most are businessmen or politicians. This reflects the fact that women, minorities, and historical themes other than commerce and politics/government have not been well-represented in nominations submitted to the National Register. There are also few properties associated with scoundrels, or others whose influence has been negative, but historically important nevertheless. We hope that reviewing this bulletin will encourage State and Federal Historic Preservation Officers to nominate properties that represent a wider variety of individuals and historical themes.

As of August 1988, there were 8366 properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places for significance under Criterion B. This number represents approximately 16 percent of the total number of listings in the National Register. Of the properties listed for associations with important persons, over half possess local significance. The homes of individuals comprise the vast majority of the properties listed under Criterion B, with the next four most common functional types being workplaces, agricultural resources, educational institutions, and religious facilities.

Most properties nominated for associations with significant persons also are nominated for other reasons, as indicated by the fact that almost two-thirds of the properties nominated under Criterion B are significant in the area of architecture as well as for the area in which the individual(s) achieved recognition. The other most common areas of significance for these properties are politics/government, commerce, social history, exploration/settlement, and industry.*

Guidelines for Properties Associated with Significant Persons
Discussion and Examples

1. Specific individuals must have made contributions or played a role that can be justified as significant within a defined area of American history or prehistory.

Documentation for every person identified as significant must identify the area or history—commerce, exploration/settlement, literature, politics, etc.—in which the individual made an important contribution. In order to determine how important the actions of an individual were in the evolution of any area of history in a community, state, or the United States, it is necessary to acquire background information on pertinent aspects of that area’s history or prehistory.

The type and amount of documentation in a National Register nomination will vary according to the geographical breadth of a person’s influence (local, statewide, or national), the area of history in which a person made an important contribution, and the extent of scholarly or public knowledge about a historic context or theme and the significance of specific people within that context. For example, for a local educator, a nomination should include basic facts on the development of a town’s school system or educational policies for a sufficient period of time to permit an understanding of the educator’s impact within that system. The nomination for a property associated with a nationally-known figure would likely require a less detailed explanation of historic context. This is not because the Register has less appreciation for local history inherently, but because the specifics are less widely known in these cases, and must be documented as part of the explanation of significance.

For several reasons, determining the local significance of individuals is often more difficult than determining state or national significance. At any level, a person’s importance may be determined in either of two ways. Using the perspective of local history: one may begin with the important themes in a community’s history, and then seek out those who were instrumental in the development, fluctuations, and major events in those themes. Conversely, one might start with information about certain individuals, and attempt to determine whether or not their activities were important in any aspect of the area’s history. In either situation, it is necessary to research both the individuals and the area(s) of history in which they played important roles.

Below are only a few examples of persons who would be considered locally significant:

- town founder
- author/artist whose works “put the town on the map”
- philanthropist responsible for major buildings, parks, and institutions in the community
- hero in an important local battle
- citizen who began a literary club that served as an important precursor to the town library
- entrepreneur who developed a local business into one of the community’s main economic bases
- developer responsible for the establishment, growth, and prosperity of an important subdivision or suburban neighborhood
- politician who secured water rights for an area
- judge or politician whose exceptional longevity in office, or cummulative roles in several offices, can be shown to have had a major influence on the community’s legal or political system
- farmer whose business acumen or practical innovations in agronomy established or revived an area’s agricultural prosperity
- negotiator who played a key role in maintaining peaceful relations between Native Americans and white settlers
- reformer whose leadership was a major factor in bringing about important political, social, economic, etc. changes
- Associations with one or more individuals in a particular profession, economic or social class, or ethnic group will not automatically qualify a property under Criterion B. The fact that we value certain professions or the contributions of certain groups historically does not mean that every property associated with or used by a member of that group is significant. The important accomplishments of specific individuals whose significance is associated with the property must be demonstrated to justify significance under Criterion B. For example, those who hold elected office are not automatically assumed to be significant in the area of politics/government without an explanation of their significant achievements or influence in the political history of their communities, states, or the nation.

Some properties that are not eligible under Criterion B may be eligible under Criterion A for associations with broad patterns of history, or for Criterion C for representing a type and period of construction. For example, a district may be eligible under Criterion A as a fashionable residential neighborhood built for and occupied primarily by wealthy business leaders at the turn of the century.

When specific individuals cannot be identified, or the significance of the activities, accomplishments, or influence of specific individuals cannot be identified or explained, significance rests more in a property’s representation of a pattern of history, and the appropriate criterion is A rather than B. This is true even when the careers or actions of various individuals are discussed to illustrate these important patterns of history. Certain patterns of development that can be seen in the lives of a group of persons linked by origin, class, profession, degree of civic involvement, etc., whose activities influenced a community in a profound way may constitute an important theme in an area. Still, it is important in such cases to be able to define the characteristics by which those contributing to the pattern can be identified, and to explain specifically how these people had a significant impact on the area’s historical development. Specific individuals should serve as examples, but unless their activities were individually important, the applicable criterion would be A rather than B. If contributions of one or more specific individuals associated with a property can be justified as significant within the broader pattern, then Criteria A and B both will be applicable.

The following are examples of nomination documentation that are acceptable or not acceptable in justifying the significance of one or more individuals under Criterion B.

*See Appendix B for a list of the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.*
Example #1; Acceptable:
Matthew E. Helme, a member of Huntington Beach's first Board of Trustees and its fourth mayor, played a significant role in the formation and settlement of this seaside town. He moved to Huntington Beach in 1903, living in this house. He contributed much to the formation and incorporation of the community of Huntington Beach. He fought for incorporation, was elected to the town's first Board of Trustees, worked to get that all-important commodity, water, functioning in a city system, helped to set up a modern fire department, helped set up the city manager system which still prevails, authored an ordinance setting up the sale of the city's first gas bonds, and introduced a substantial street paving and lighting program. . . .
Matthew Helme was pro-incorporation and felt strongly about forming a city which would provide adequate municipally-owned services for the safety and well being of the residents. He was one of five persons elected to the first city Board of Trustees. The election was conducted with all write-in votes as there was not time to print ballots. In the election of 1912 and 1916, he received the highest number of votes. On April 19, 1916, he was elected Mayor by a unanimous vote of his fellow Trustees. The Huntington Beach News reported: "the tribute is a fitting one for Trustee Helme, as he has been a member of the board since the city was incorporated and at the election of April 19 received the highest votes cast for any of the candidates for Trustees. He was accorded the same honor in the election four years, [sic] which gives him a standing in the community that any citizen might be elated over." On July 12, 1916, the City Manager system in the city was set up under his guidance and he was Mayor when the new city hall on Fifth Street was built (August 1916). He sponsored the ordinance authorizing the sale of gas bonds. . . . In December of 1916 he formed a committee to set up a municipal water system. He felt strongly about obtaining more modern fire equipment and worked hard toward that end. Gas lights were placed along Main Street to the city limits. Gas lights were placed along Main Street to the city limits. That stretch of street was paved. . . . This act recognized the change in methods of transportation from street car, train, and buggy to automobile. . . . Mr. Helme resigned as Mayor of Huntington Beach in May of 1917.

Comment: Not only does the nomination identify offices held by Matthew Helme, offices doubtless held by hundreds since 1900, it also explains Helm's distinctive achievements while in office. It is easy to see both that these are important contributions to the development of the community, and that they impart a significance to his political service not automatically incurred through merely having served one or more terms in an elected position.

Example #2; Acceptable:
The district encompasses what remains of the "commercial corridor," lining both sides of Main Street, which began to develop in the 1840s during Racine's earliest days as a Great Lakes port and flourished after the 1880s when Racine was growing as a center of manufacture. . . . It contains buildings which are associated with a number of . . . "firsts" in the history of the city. . . .
The earliest commercial development in the district was, of course, the establishment of stores and workshops to serve the early settlers. . . . The successful shopkeepers became involved in the economic development and in the government of the Village and of the City of Racine. . . . Nicholas D. Fratt and his brother Francis built the store at 420 Main (No. 18), . . . [and] operated the Washington Market, as their store was called, until 1850. Nicholas was one of the founders of the Racine County Bank and became its president in 1858. In 1859 he was the state senator from Racine. He also served as the president of the Racine County Agricultural Society and of the State Agricultural Society. In both 1881 and 1884, he was the Democratic candidate for Governor of Wisconsin. . . .
The first Racine banks were organized in the district, and during the period of the Old Main Street

Helme-Worthy Store, Huntington Beach, California, in 1907 and 1986 (1907 photographer unknown; 1986 photograph by Guy Guzzard).
District's commercial importance, they all maintained their offices in the district or very close by. . . . The first bank to succeed seems to have been the Racine County Bank, which was incorporated in January of 1854. . . . In 1864, the bank was reorganized as the First National Bank of Racine, and therefore, it became the oldest national bank in the county. . . . The building no longer exists, and the First National Bank of Racine is now known as the Marine Bank South.

Comment: The documentation explains the context within which successful merchants expanded their influence, and specifies the important role that Nicholas Fratt played within that context. The nomination clarifies the importance of this particular bank among many others, and although Fratt was only one of the bank's founders, and one of its presidents, the fact that he served as both suggests a more distinctive role than other founders or presidents. His presidency of several organizations involved in the area's commerce, and his election to the state senate and nomination for governor underscore his importance. The bank building is gone, and the store best represents Fratt's significance, which is in the area of commerce. Although Fratt served in the state senate and ran for governor, there is no context or analysis provided on which to evaluate his significance in the area of politics/government.

Example #3; Not acceptable:
The Wilson House is significant under criterion B for its associations with the emergence of the traveling salesman as an important figure in American economic life. This association with an important historical development arises directly from the association of the property with Robert Cowan Wilson, a prominent Belton citizen, who made his living as a traveling salesman during a large portion of the period when he occupied the house. . . . The life of R. C. Wilson (1856-1942) is somewhat typical of a prosperous businessman of his era.

Comment: The problem is indicated in the last sentence of the paragraph. Although the nomination identifies Wilson's profession, and goes on to summarize the significance of that profession and give details of Wilson's life and professional activities, it does not explain Wilson's individual significance within his profession.

Example #4: Not acceptable:
It was during his farm years that Blair served three times in the state senate. . . . In 1877 he retired from the senate, left the farm to his two youngest sons, and built a large brick house in town. Prior to the time he purchased the farm, Blair had been a village trustee and served three terms as village president. Upon his return to town he re-entered village politics, and he remained active in the bank until his death in 1880. . . . Because of its associations with the Honorable William Blair, a local political leader and state senator for six years, the farm has local significance in the area of politics and government. After serving three terms as state senator and holding numerous local political offices, it is clear that William Blair was highly respected . . . —Blair School was named after him. The little Greek Revival farm house is most clearly associated with Blair during his years in the state senate, the period of his broadest-reaching political significance.

Comment: Although William Blair lived in this house during his six years in the state senate, the nomination does not explain how Blair's role as a state senator had "broad-reaching political significance" within a context of local or state political and governmental history. Also, since his role in local politics occurred while he lived "in town" rather than at the farm, his political achievements at that time would be associated with his residence(s) or office(s) in town, and not with the farm.

2. For properties associated with several community leaders or with a prominent family, it is necessary to identify specific individuals and to explain their significant accomplishments.

Residential districts in which a large number of prominent or influential merchants, professionals, civic leaders, politicians, etc. lived will be eligible under Criterion B only if the significance of one or more specific individuals is explicitly justified. It should be clear which area(s) of significance is represented by each individual. When it is difficult to pinpoint the specific significance of individual residents because significance rests more in the cumulative importance of the collection of many prominent citizens, Criterion A is more appropriate because the district reflects a "broad pattern" of community development by having evolved historically into a neighborhood where this "class" of citizens resided.

For family seats, or other properties associated with a prominent family, it is essential to identify the specific accomplishments of individual family members to qualify the property under Criterion B. In cases where a succession
of family members have lived in a house and collectively have had a demonstrably significant impact on one or more aspects of the community's development, as a family, the house is more likely to be significant under Criterion A for a pattern of events.

Example #1: Acceptable:
Lumbering was and is one of the most significant industries in the state and region, and lumber company towns, prior to modern highways, played a significant role in that industry. . . . Potlatch's significance lies in its representation of company town planning and building design and its history. Potlatch is the best example of a lumber company town in Idaho, and it was one of the largest and longest-lived of the many Western lumber company towns. . . .

Most of the significant individuals associated with the Potlatch Lumber Company lived in the Nob Hill Historic District, since virtually all the company's managers lived here. The two most significant were William Deary, the company's first general manager for whom the town of Deary, Idaho, is named, and Allison Laird, the first assistant general manager, then general manager upon Deary's death. Laird Park in northern Latah County, Idaho, is named for him. These two men directed the affairs of the company for nearly the first thirty years of its existence.

Comment: The district is eligible under Criterion A as the residence of most of the managers of an important company, as well as other prominent local businessmen. It is the best resource representing the pattern of collective influence exercised by these men. The district also meet Criterion B because the nomination identifies the two specific individuals who were the most important managers in the company's history.

Example #2; Not acceptable:
The district is associated with the early settlement and growth of Opelika, some of its earliest pioneer families and its most prominent commercial families. Here the families of the town founders built and maintained homes, and here the most prominent bankers and merchants lived. . . . In 1865 successful Lee County planter John Edwards (b. 1838) and his wife of five years, Sara, built the district's most distinguished residence. . . . James McNamee was the Vice President and Director of the Bank of Opelika and a charter trustee of the Opelika Seminary. . . . Surveyor William Barnes, Jr. (born 1848) . . . was the son of distinguished attorney W. H. Barnes (1824-87) and the brother of two Opelika mayors. . . . Josh C. Condan, a local jeweler, was a founder of the First National Bank and a town alderman.

Comment: Although the documentation may justify the district under Criterion A, because the neighborhood reflects a pattern of history by having developed as a focus of civically-active, prosperous, and well-connected citizens, the information on individuals is not adequate to qualify the district under Criterion B. The nomination either would have to specify how the activities of one or more of the persons discussed had a significant impact or influence on an aspect of the community's history, or would have to clarify how one or more specific individuals were distinguished in a significant way from other business or civic leaders by the number, type, or particular offices or activities in which they were involved. The significant achievements would have to have been accomplished by residents of the district, not by relatives of those living in the district. Additional information on those mentioned in the nomination might supplement the existing documentation sufficiently to show that the district meets Criterion B.

Example #3; Acceptable:
The Exchange Bank of Golden is significant historically in that it represents an important step in the evolution of a business complex begun by a pioneer immigrant Illinois prairie family. The progression of business interests of the Emminga family from Germany served as the Cox-Shoemaker-Parry House, Manti, Utah: home of Orville Southerland Cox, a leading Mormon colonizer; Jezreel Shoemaker, an influential church and political official; and Edward Parry, the Welsh master mason of the Manti Temple (Tom Carter).

Comment: The district is eligible under Criterion A as the residence of most of the managers of an important company, as well as other prominent local businessmen. It is the best resource representing the pattern of collective influence exercised by these men. The district also meet Criterion B because the nomination identifies the two specific individuals who were the most important managers in the company's history.
wellspring of development of the
town of Golden and its surrounding
rural community. Beginning with a
county windmilling operation, the
family entrepreneurship in turn in-
cluded grain elevator and shipping
businesses, flour processing and ex-
port, banking on a local and regional
scale, sponsorship of the local
newspaper, and through its banking
functions, real estate development
and underwriting of a myriad of local
commercial and public enterprises.
Collectively, the Emminga interests
accounted for a major portion of
local employment. . .

By 1891 the bustle, noise, and dust
of the milling operations created the
need for a new mill office removed
from the mill itself. For this purpose,
Harm Emminga built a new com-
mercial block just across the railroad
tracks from the mill elevator com-
plex. . . In planning the office com-
plex Harm had included a large walk-
in vault as well as a free-standing
safe. It was common practice for the
mill office to hold sums of money for
clients and frequently to make short
term loans against grain receipts. It
was natural, then, that the Exchange
Bank would evolve at the opening of
the new business block and in the
same room as the mill office. While
at first some of the mill personnel
conducted bank business, as bank
operators grew more sophisticated
tellers, cashiers, and accountants were
added to the bank payroll.

As loans were made not only for
farming operations but also for varied
business ventures, the commerce of
the bank impacted significantly on
the employment and business
development of the Golden com-
unity. During these increasingly rapid
growth years Harm Emminga was
also developing real estate tracts in
Golden and building some homes for
some of his key personnel. The in-
fluence of Harm Emminga . . . was
now felt in every aspect of commu-
nity life. . . The bank and the Em-
ingas so prospered that by 1921 they
had become partners in all of the
banks in Quincy, a regional center 35
miles west.

Comment: In addition to discussing the
evolution of the family's business enter-
prises and their impact on the commu-
ity (most of which documentation is not
quoted above), the nomination explains
the significant activities of a specific in-
dividual in the family, Harm Emminga.
Therefore, the Exchange Bank meets Na-
tional Register Criteria A and B.

Example #4; Acceptable:

Miller Brothers [Department Store]
was founded in 1889 by Frank Miller
Sr. and Gustavius H. Miller. . . The
original Miller Brothers store was
located at 510 Market Street; . . .
upon completion of the [current]
Miller Brothers building [in 1898],
company ads boasted "the greatest
display of merchandise that has ever
been shown in a Southern store." . . .
The new location was highly suc-
cessful for the firm; . . . several other
department stores provided competi-
tion but Miller Brothers overshadowed
all rivals with their number of
customers and sales volume. . .

In addition to their interest in the
department store, each of the Miller
brothers played a role in other com-
mercial development in Chattanooga.
Frank Miller Sr. helped to found and
manage the United Hosiery Mills
Company and was active in banking
and land investments. His brother
Gus Miller served as Vice-President of
the Hamilton National Bank. He also
helped found the United Hosiery Mill
and the Miller-Smith Mill. By the
early 1920s the Miller brothers had
helped to make Chattanooga the na-
tion's second leading manufacturer of
women's hosiery. . .

Both Gus and Frank were in-
novators in providing services to
Chattanooga. Their store became a
landmark in the city. . . A 1972
newspaper article stated that Millers
was regarded by many as a "Chatt-
anooga institution" for its role in
commerce and merchandising.

Comment: It is sometimes difficult to
separate the degree of contribution by
individual siblings or partners who
simultaneously ran a significant business
or other enterprise. If the documentation
identifies specific important individuals,
justifies the significance of their
endeavor, and provides enough informa-
tion to show that each person played an
important role in rendering the endeavor
significant, then the associated resource
will be considered eligible under
Criterion B for associations with both
partners, even if it is not always clear
which partner made a particular decision
or conducted a specific activity. In the
case of the Miller Brothers Department
Store, the nomination supports the
claims about the success and influence of
the store in the city's commercial history
with several pages of detailed documen-
tation. All references to the store's
management, including those quoted
above, discuss the brothers as a pair.
Additional activities of each brother in-
dicate that both possessed business sense
and ability.

This principle does not apply to cases
where a business or homestead is
associated with several generations of a
family over the course of time, or with a
large board of directors, in which cases
the specific significant contributions of
individual family or other members
must be documented (see the next ex-
ample).

Example #5; Not acceptable:
The Jarman Farm . . . derives
historical significance from the Jar-
man Family who were prominent
early settlers in the northeast corner
of Rutherford County. . .

Robert H. Jarman emigrated . . .
from North Carolina in 1796. At an
unknown date, he built a house off
Cainsville Pike. . . It is likely that
he was one of the earliest settlers in
the area. He appeared in the Wilson
County Census as aged 50-60 with a
wife and seven children. Jarman was
apparently a successful farmer as is
indicated by the fact that he owned
dozen slaves. By 1850, Robert H.
Jarman must have died since the cen-
sus lists only his wife, Susan
(Age-64), his son, Robert Hall
(Age-27), and his daughter, Christian-
na (Age-20). Susan was born in
Virginia but both children were born
in Tennessee.

Between 1850 and 1860, Jarman's
son, Robert Hall Jarman (1822-1884)
built a house just south of his parent's
[sic] home across the county line in
Rutherford County. His farm pros-
ered and by 1860, he owned nine-
teen slaves and had three slave houses
on his property. After his death in
1884, the property passed to his son,
Rufus E. Jarman. Rufus and his wife
had been living in a small house just
south of his father's house which had
been built expressly for them a year
earlier. Rufus and his wife moved in-
to his father's home in 1884. Rufus
Jarman was heavily involved in com-
unity affairs and helped build both
the Lascassas School and the
Lascassas Baptist Church. Records
reveal that in 1882, he helped erect a
Comment: There is not enough information on any individual member of the Jarman family to explain how he was "significant in our past." The information on the early settler Robert H. Jarman is very sketchy and does not explain how his success was significantly distinctive from other prosperous early farmers. Moreover, the house that is nominated is not associated with him, since it was built after his death by his son, Robert Hall Jarman. The statement of significance does not address Robert Hall Jarman's significance, stating only that he prospered. Finally, although Rufus Jarman was "heavily involved in community affairs" and "helped build" a school and several church structures, the nomination does not explain his significance within the context of all those who were civically-active in the community.

3. Contributions of individuals must be compared to those of others who were active, successful, prosperous, or influential in the same field.

Part of establishing the historic context for evaluating a person's significance is discussing others who were involved in the same type of interests or activities. Many, many people have held positions of alderman, mayor, school trustee, bank president, union leader, hospital board member, business founder, and the like over the course of an average community's history. Some of them undoubtedly played important roles in the town's development, but it is unlikely that they all could be considered truly significant by having had a major individual impact or influence on the life of the community. Therefore, it is important to distinguish those whose activities, initiatives, or conduct in elected offices or other prominent positions made a significant difference in an area's history.

Nominations of properties for associations with leading local citizens must explain how selected individuals have been defined as leaders among their fellow citizens. It is not enough to show that an individual has acquired wealth, run a successful business, or held public office, unless any of these accomplishments, or their number or combination, is a significant achievement in the community in comparison with the activities and accomplishments of others. Otherwise, any property associated with any citizen who has attained the same level of success would meet National Register criteria. Unless that level can be demonstrated to have been distinctive, the concepts of leadership and significance have been lost. This does not mean that only the most prominent person in any given field can be considered important enough to be recognized with a National Register nomination, but each person must be shown to have played a distinctively significant role in comparison with others to qualify a property under Criterion B.

In some cases, the context for evaluating an individual's contributions may be provided by establishing the significance of a historic theme to a community, and then explaining the types of contributions that would qualify an individual as significant within that theme. Consider, for example, a community whose economic base during a specific period is linked to a particular industry such as flour-milling. If the nomination justifies the significance of the industry, and if the documentation adequately explains the types and degrees of accomplishments required of an individual to have played a significant role in the industry's history, then a property may be eligible for associations with an individual shown to meet those requirements. This would be true even if there are many other individuals and surviving properties associated with flour-milling. The key factors are specifying and adequately justifying within the community's (state's, or nation's) historical development, the activities or contributions defined as significant, and then documenting that a particular individual has made these contributions.

If a person's important contributions are unique, it is unnecessary to compare them with others. It is essential, however, to adequately document that the accomplishments are both unique and significant.

If a person is very well-known on a national scale for his or her accomplishments in an area of history, then it is not necessary to explain that significance in detail. However, the nomination should provide a general summary of that significance, such as "James J. Hill, later known as the 'Empire Builder,' was to fashion from this beginning the largest rail system in the nation." The nomination must also demonstrate the relationship and the significance of the nominated property to the individual's acknowledged significance. For people who are less well known, including most of those having local significance, it is necessary to provide context in sufficient detail to understand why the person was important.

One test of whether an individual's national significance is sufficiently acknowledged to preclude a detailed justification would be to ask if that person is included in the Dictionary of American Biography, the bibliographical section of the Encyclopedia of American History, or other reference works of similar recognized authority, or if (s)he is highlighted in college American history survey courses. Examples of individuals who meet this test are Cotton Mather, Harriet Tubman, George Washington Carver, J.P. Morgan, Georgia O'Keeffe, Norman Thomas, and others of similar stature.

If a property is being nominated for associations with a well-known figure of national importance for reasons other than those for which (s)he is widely famous, then the context and justification for that area of significance must be explained.

Example #1; Acceptable:

The community's platting coincided with the arrival of the Port Huron and Lake Michigan Railroad in 1870, and growth followed swiftly. In only three years, the community was incorporated as a village. In the 1870s, lumbering and agriculture were the key industries. Imlay City was developing rapidly as a wood products and agricultural center and, by 1883, the village had a population of 1000 people, farm produce for shipping, and a second rail connection. By 1887, the village had even grown bold enough to challenge Lapeer for the county seat.

The town did not become the county seat, but continued to grow slowly in the 1880s, 90s, and early twentieth century, with agriculture the mainstay of the economy once the short-lived lumber boom ended.

The construction of the railroad line opened up a previously only very thinly settled area and provided markets for locally produced lumber.
and agricultural goods. Farming in Imlay City and other southern Michigan towns was not of the subsistence type, but involved the raising of cash crops, such as wheat, which were processed near the source. The resulting products were shipped to markets—often in the east or northeast—by rail. The provision of elevators and other storage facilities on the railroad line and at a conventional central point for the area was also a necessary prerequisite for commercial-scale farming. The location of the elevators and other storage and shipping facilities at the central site formed the nucleus of a market town/agricultural service center.

Imlay City had one elevator when Walter Walker (1850-1923) and his younger brother Robert settled in 1873. Jacob Lamb. . . . had erected a grain elevator in 1870-71. During Lamb's first two years of operation, he disbursed half-a-million dollars to farmers in return for their wheat. County histories of the period proclaimed the Lamb elevator to be the largest one standing between Port Huron, Michigan and Chicago.

In spite of the competition from Jacob Lamb, however, the Walker Brothers elevator also prospered and reflected the strength of Imlay City's economy. Beginning in 1874 with the construction of a second grain elevator and a storehouse for the storage for shipping of other local agricultural produce, the Walkers quickly became the larger of the two local firms engaged in the elevator/storage/agricultural supply business. By 1887 Walter Walker & Co. . . . had two of the three grain elevators in town with a total capacity of 60,000 bushels. The firm continued on as the leading agricultural products-storage and agricultural supply business in town until Walter Walker's death in 1923 and remained in operation until the 1930s. Of the Walter Walker & Co. buildings, only a single warehouse survives today.

Comment: Despite Jacob Lamb's earlier, also highly successful, and possibly larger, grain elevator, the context makes clear that Walker's business also was important to the city's agriculturally-based economy.

Example #2; Acceptable:
The St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway Company Shops . . . are historically significant as the oldest existing Railroad Company Complex in the state, and as the railroad facility which provides the most concrete historical link to the St. Paul and Pacific Railroad, Minnesota's first successful railroad company, and to James J. Hill, the state's most powerful and influential railroad magnate. . . .

Despite . . . early success, the company suffered financially, and in 1879, it was purchased by James J. Hill and three other St. Paul investors who organized the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway Company. James J. Hill, later known as the "Empire Builder," was to fashion from this beginning the largest rail system in the nation. To construct this vast network, Hill needed a railroad shop complex larger than the original St. Paul and Pacific shops in downtown St. Paul. In 1882 he began to supervise the construction of the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway Company Shops on a thirty-six acre site south of Oakland Cemetery. . . .

James J. Hill spent much of his time at the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway Company Shops, overseeing the development of new technology and supervising work.

Comment: James J. Hill is well-known as one of the major railroad magnates of the late nineteenth-early twentieth centuries, and his significance need not be justified in the nomination in any detail, as long as it is summarized, as it is in the above excerpt. The way in which the nominated resource represents his significance does need to be justified, and since his empire grew from his takeover of the St. Paul and Pacific Railroad, and since the nomination states that Hill spent a considerable amount of time in those shops overseeing work, the resource meets Criterion B.

Example #3; Not acceptable:
The Richard Murphy-Walter Walker House is significant for its associations with businesspeople who helped establish the economic foundations of Imlay City. Richard Murphy, who built the home in 1896, was an early Imlay City carriage and wagon maker. . . .

In 1874, Richard Murphy . . . immigrated to Imlay City from Canada. Murphy opened a cabinet and woodworking shop on the corner of Third Street and Almont Avenue and, over the next five years, expanded his business to include the production of carriages and wagons and began to invest in real estate. The operations must have met with success because on October 28, 1879, Richard and Arabella Murphy purchased property
David T. and Nan Wood Honeyman House, Portland, Oregon, ca. 1909: home of progressive leader and reformer Nan Wood Honeyman, the first woman from Oregon to serve in the U.S. Congress (from the collection of the Oregon Historical Society, Neg. No. 35935, #1822).

from Jonathan Hunt for $500 and on August 2, 1883, The Lapeer Democrat reported that "Richard Murphy intends building, at once, a fine residence on his five-acre lot on Almont Avenue."

Comment: This example is taken from the same nomination as that which included the discussion of Walter Walker (see Example #1 on p. 10), but in the case of Richard Murphy, the context does not provide any information that would help us evaluate the significance of Murphy's success as a businessman. Although Murphy "must have met with [financial] success," in his cabinet/woodworking business, carriage construction, and real estate dealings, the documentation does not explain the significance of Murphy's business or of his individual accomplishments, either within the context these professions, or in comparison with other successful and prosperous businessmen of the period.

4. Properties that were constructed within the last fifty years, or that are associated with individuals whose significant accomplishments date from the last fifty years, must possess exceptional significance to be listed in the National Register.

To ensure professionalism and objectivity in assessing our history, the National Register criteria require that a property have acquired significance at least fifty years ago, or that more recent characteristics or associations possess exceptional significance. This requirement helps protect against transitory interest in recent persons and events that may not withstand the test of time, and allows a sufficient passage of time for scholars to have developed an interest in, conducted research on, and made critical judgements about past events, themes, and people.

Because it is important to be able to evaluate the accomplishments of an individual objectively, with the benefit of historical perspective, the function of the Register would be substantially changed if the National Register were to become a means of honoring living figures. The impossibility of maintaining historical perspective in the listing process ultimately would have the effect of devaluing the recognition afforded by listing in the National Register.

Therefore, properties associated with living persons generally are not considered eligible for inclusion in the National Register.

If a person has ceased making contributions in a field of achievement for a sufficient length of time to allow a scholarly and objective assessment of his or her role within that field, the National Register will consider listing a property that represents the person's assessed significance. The National Register criteria define a sufficient passage of time as fifty years unless the individual's accomplishments can be documented as having been exceptionally significant. Exceptional significance must be clearly established and broadly recognized in scholarly literature and public consciousness.

A person does not have to be nationally known and recognized to have made an exceptionally significant contribution to our history. The standards for evaluating exceptional significance are the same whether a resource is important to a community, state, or the nation.*

*Additional guidance on this issue appears in National Register Bulletin #22, "How to Evaluate and Nominate Properties Less than Fifty Years Old;" Bulletin 6, "Nomination of Properties Significant for Association with Living Persons;" and Bulletin #15: "How to Apply National Register Criteria for Evaluation."
Example #1: Acceptable:
The Elijah Pierce Properties are significant for their affiliation with Elijah Pierce, the internationally recognized wood carver/folk artist, who is considered to have made a significant contribution to the black American folk tradition. The basis of this legacy was established in the 1920’s and 1930’s. The two properties included in this nomination are 1) his former residence . . . and 2) his former barbershop. . . . Both properties are associated with Elijah Pierce’s productive life as a wood carver.

The Elijah Pierce Properties have achieved significance within the last fifty years. They are exceptionally significant. . . . Past performance (the demolition of eleven other structures associated with Elijah Pierce) has illustrated the need for additional means to foster awareness, promotion, respect and preservation of these resources. . . . Elijah Pierce (b.1892) . . . arrived in Columbus, Ohio in 1924. He worked and lived in as many as fourteen different locations in the near eastside neighborhood of Columbus. The residence and barbershop being nominated are two of only three such structures still standing. . . . [The third is] not included in this nomination because of its more recent association with Elijah. . . . In all types of wood Elijah’s untrained hand has carved out the images and then embellished them with brightly colored house paints, varnish, glitter and rhinestones. "Unlike many other carvers and painters of the twentieth century who are described as ‘folk artists’ but whose work reflects an individual as opposed to communal aesthetic, Mr. Pierce merits the title ‘folk artist’ in the strict academic sense. . . ." (Robert T. Teske, Arts Specialist, Folk Arts Program, National Endowment for the Arts)8

Elijah Pierce’s works consist of both free standing figures and bas reliefs. "He has taken traditional craft techniques, shared by African-American and Anglo-American practitioners, and used them in combination with a particularly powerful personal religious vision to create a body of work that is simply unparalleled in the field." (Timothy Lloyd, Traditional Arts Program, Ohio Arts Council)5 "The religious aspect of Pierce’s work reached an apogee with two works, the monumental Crucifixion and The Book of Wood. The former was carved in numerous small pieces in 1933 and only later mounted in its present form. The Book of Wood was completed over about a six month period in 1932. . . ." (LIVINGSTON, 1982)6 . . . Folk artists were not considered within the mainstream of art criticism until fairly recently, but well qualified individuals have evaluated Pierce’s work and their conclusions have established his prominent place in American art. The fact that Pierce’s national [sic] has been evaluated in a national context in such primary folk art references as American Folk Art by Robert Bishop and Twentieth Century Folk Art and Artists by Hemphill and Weissman evidences that art historians believe sufficient time has passed to evaluate his work in an historical context. Since the early 1970’s art galleries and museums which have recognized Elijah Pierce include the Museum of Modern Art, Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Folk Art Center, The Renwick Gallery of the National Museum of American Art, The Corcoran Gallery and the International Meeting of Native Art in Zagreb, Yugoslavia where he took his first prize. Although much of this attention to Elijah Pierce and to folk art in general has been of late, it is important to recognize that many of Pierce’ most noteworthy carvings date back more than fifty years ago. . . . Elijah Pierce’s barbershop . . . was built in 1954. It was the first and only shop he had built for himself. . . . The shop was more than just a place where Elijah practiced his trade and art, but the special arrangements of carvings hanging on the walls, and the selection of colors for the decor, for instance, are all extensions of Pierce’s creativity. The barbershop is essentially unchanged from when it was an active barbershop. Significant features include the barber chair, sink and the table and chair where Elijah had whittled away between customers. . . . Elijah Pierce’s residence . . . served as his home from 1946 until 1970. It was his primary place of residence in the city of Columbus, having served him for 24 years (the longest he ever lived at one location). It too is significant for its integral role with the creative spirit of Elijah Pierce. He carved both at home and at his shop whenever he had a spare moment.

Comment: The use of footnotes and other references to specific sources demonstrate that Pierce’s work has been the subject of scholarly assessment for some time, and has been evaluated as significant by numerous experts. The National Register does not require footnotes, but referencing sources in the statement of significance often strengthens a case by showing that various materials listed in the bibliography have been cited as more than general reference works in the field, and that they actually discuss the person or property under consideration. A comprehensive bibliography, copies of or excerpts from articles on the significant person, and letters from scholars and other experts assessing the person’s significance also can help support exceptional significance. Evidence of prizes, awards, and recognition such as gallery exhibits by individuals and organizations with expertise also help strengthen the case.

The critical acclaim accorded many of Pierce’s early carvings provides some evidence that sufficient time has elapsed to allow his work to be assessed with historic perspective. Nevertheless, his significance also rests in the accumulated body of work over the course of his career, which appears to have extended at least until his retirement in 1980.

Although no properties exist that represent his early career, the two nominated buildings are directly associated with the creation and display of Pierce’s works, and possess exceptional significance as rare surviving properties associated with the career of this renowned artist. These buildings meet Criterion B rather than Criterion C because they are significant for associations with the career of the artist rather than as examples of his work.

Example #2: Acceptable:
Clarence Chamberlain was one of that generation of aviators, including Charles A. Lindbergh, who contributed to the exciting and spectacular development of American aviation after W.W. I. Chamberlain is best known for his June 4-6, 1927 flight across the Atlantic which, by reaching Germany, broke Lindbergh’s 2-week old distance record. . . .
In less spectacular, but perhaps more valuable ways, Chamberlain before and after his flight contributed to the growth of American aviation. He was a test pilot for Giuseppe Bellanca, a pioneer designer of aircraft who also built the "Columbia"[the plane in which Chamberlain made his historic June, 1927, trans-Atlantic flight], flying all of Bellanca’s early planes to test their speed, mileage, handling, and safety. In August, 1927, he made the first trans-Atlantic airmail flight. In later years, he continued to test aircraft for a variety of companies, and served as chairman of the New York City aviation commission.

Chamberlain has been elected to the Aviation Hall of Fame in Dayton, Ohio.

Comment: Although Clarence Chamberlain was still living when the National Register received this nomination, his house was accepted because the “pioneer” era in aviation is clearly over, and contributions to the early development of aircraft and air travel can and have been evaluated.

Example #3; Not acceptable:
The Todd Downing House is a two-story structure that was built in the late 1910s. . . . It is primarily important because Todd Downing (1902-1974) lived there and owned the structure for most of his life. . . . He took his B.A. in 1924 and M.A. in 1929; . . . . Downing made his most important contribution to his region as a writer. By 1973, he had published eleven different books, the first ten of which were mystery novels which had their setting in Old Mexico. . . . Two of Downing's books were selections of the Crime Club which characterized him as "the most promising mystery writer in America." His last book, Mexican Earth, was a non-fiction historical, ethnological and travel book about Mexico; it was named by the National Library of Mexico as one of the best books published in English about Mexico. . . .

Downing made another important contribution to his region as a linguist. In 1970 he completed Chahta Anompa, A Choctaw Grammar. Now in its third edition, this publication stimulated a revival of interest in the Choctaw language.

Comment: Although the house itself is over fifty years old, Downing’s achievements took place primarily, possibly entirely, within the last fifty years. The documentation dates only one of his numerous publications, but because of the dates of his degrees, it appears that he did not begin his writing career until 1930 at the earliest, and his most acclaimed works were completed only within the last fifteen-twenty years. The recent nature of much of his work raises the question as to whether there has been sufficient passage of time to allow an objective assessment of the importance of his works. The documentation contains no historic context and no scholarly analysis of his work on which to judge whether or not his contributions to the fields of literature or education can be considered exceptional.

5. A property that is significant as an important example of an individual’s skill as an architect or engineer should be nominated under Criterion C rather than Criterion B.

Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, that represent the work of master, or that possess high artistic values meet National Register Criterion C. A property that illustrates a person’s skill as an architect or the development of skill, technique, or design preference through his or her career or body of work is eligible under Criterion C. Properties associated with another aspect of an architect's life or career rather than or in addition to illustrating his or her architectural talent, may meet Criterion B. For example, the home and studio of an important architect, whether or not (s)he designed it, may be eligible for associations with his or her career. A famous architect also may be significant in areas other than architectural design, such as community planning, philanthropy, politics, education, or some other field, and a resource associated with the person’s achievements in any of those areas may meet Criterion B.

Example #2; Not acceptable:
The Reno County Courthouse (1929-1930) is being nominated to the National Register under criteria B and C for its historical association with William Earl Hulse (1882-1943) and for its architectural significance. Designed by Hutchison based architect Hulse, the stepped, five-story brick and limestone Reno County Courthouse is a fine and rare [state] example of the Art Deco style. . . . The Art Deco courthouse is Hulse’s eighth and last . . . county courthouse [in the state] and is his only example in that style. His other court-
houses were built in the 1910s and 1920s in the prevailing Neo-Classical styles. The Reno County Courthouse maintains a very high degree of interior and exterior architectural integrity and is a significant example of the Art Deco style as interpreted in a pre-Depression designed public building.

Comment: As a significant example of Hulse’s skill as an architect, or as an unusual stylistic example in the body of work of an architect prominent in the construction of public buildings in the state, which therefore represents something important about Hulse’s work and career as an architect, the courthouse would be most appropriately nominated under Criterion C alone (work of a master), and not Criterion B. The courthouse also meets the portion of Criterion C that pertains to a type, period, or method of construction.

6. Significant individuals must be directly associated with the nominated property.

In order to be considered an important historic resource that represents a person’s significance in our history, a property must have some connection to the life of that individual. The reason that the National Register criteria single out commemorative properties for special consideration is that these properties are not associated directly with the persons or events that they commemorate.

Types of resources that possess direct associations with an individual include that individual’s homes, offices or workplaces; businesses (s)he ran; and locations of important events in which the person played a key role. Associations that, by themselves, would generally not be sufficient to qualify a property as an important representation of a person’s historic significance include ownership, ownership by a relative or associate, a single visit, or other types of brief or tangential relationships. If such associations can be shown to be significant—for example, if an individual signed a major treaty or made a critical scientific discovery while on a short visit—then that connection, though brief, could qualify a property for National Register listing under Criterion B.

Example #1: Acceptable:
St. Philip’s Episcopal Church is historically significant for its associa-

Comment: The church is directly associated with Corser in several ways. He led the group that constructed the church building and he served as rector of the church until his retirement. The
church also was the location of some of Corser's significant activities, such as the operation of a free night school.

Example #2; Not acceptable:
The Marbut house is significant as the creation of one of America's foremost scientists who led the national soils survey program in the early twentieth century, was a major contributor to international soil research, and was the founder of much of Missouri's soils, geological, and geographical academic disciplines as they have been taught and practiced in higher education throughout the twentieth century.

Marbut had occupied a small house in Columbia on Lowry Street where the University of Missouri library now stands. But his professional success away from home allowed him to realize a life's ambition—to own land in the seat of his family's Missouri Ozarks heritage. At the turn of the century, following a European trip, he bought land which bordered on his father's and grandfather's farms. . . . Though a tenant house was occupied on "Orchard Farm," as it was called, Marbut would wait some thirty years before he planned and built his retirement home.

For several years Marbut gave summer lectures at Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts. While there he was a guest of the university president, Dr. Wallace Atwood [who] lived in a New England Cape Cod shingle style house. As Marbut decided to follow in the tradition of rural Ozarks men by building his own house, he used Dr. Atwood's as a model. . . .

Marbut drew up his plans and mailed them to his brother and manager of the apple orchard, . . . who supervised the construction. . . . During the summer, 1935, Marbut spent a week with his daughter, Helen, checking on the final construction. But a call from Washington presented him with the opportunity to go to Manchuria, China, which he did. . . . In travel through Oxford, Moscow, and the Trans-Siberian railroad, he contracted a cold resulting in pneumonia and his death in Harbin, China, August 25, 1935.

Example #1; Acceptable:
The Laura Ingalls Wilder House is historically significant as the residence of Laura Ingalls Wilder, famous children's literature author. Beginning her writing career at the age of 65 in 1932, Mrs. Wilder wrote The Little House Series of children's books while residing in this modest homestead in Southwest

7. Eligible properties generally are those associated with the productive life of the individual in the field in which (s)he achieved significance.

Associations with an individual should have occurred during the period of time when the person was engaged in the activities for which (s)he is considered significant. Birthplaces, childhood homes, schools attended as children, retirement homes that are not associated with an individual's significant contributions, graves, and cemeteries generally are not considered eligible for the National Register on the basis of associations with that person. Some properties associated with a person's formative years may qualify if it can be demonstrated that the individual's activities during this period had historical significance, or were important in understanding his or her later achievements. Retirement homes may qualify if the person continued significant activities in that home, or if it can be documented that the house is significant in representing the culmination of an important career.

Some properties might be eligible as the only surviving property associated with a significant individual. Such a property might include a person's last home, even if most or all of his or her significant accomplishments occurred before (s) he lived in the house.

Example #2; Acceptable:
The Oscar B. Jacobson House is . . . significant because . . . it is historically associated with Oscar B. Jacobson who, as director of the University of Oklahoma's School of Fine Arts, revolutionized the course of art study for the university.

Jacobson designed his house, completed construction in the summer of 1918, and lived there until his death on September 18, 1966 . . . .

Oscar B. Jacobson was an internationally known artist and educator whose influence extended far beyond his local environment. As director of the University of Oklahoma School of Fine Arts from 1916 to 1945, Jacobson revolutionized the course of art study, replacing the Academic style of old copy work with the fresh attitude and palette of the French moderns (see Good 1947) . . .

Jacobson is perhaps best known, however, for his pivotal role in the history of Plains Indian art:

An additional derivative of Jacobson's annual New Mexican sojourns was exposure to the incipient art movement in Indian art taking place in the Rio Grande pueblos. Jacobson became the carrier, the transmitter, of this Native American muse revival to Oklahoma. He drew on many local resources to involve as many Oklahoma-based tribesmen (sic) as possible. (Gibson 1986)

As its Director, Jacobson was instrumental in opening the doors of the School of Fine Arts to a group of young Plains Indian artists. Through his sponsorship, in 1928 five young Kiowa painters were accepted into the University as special students. This would prove to be a seminal event in the history of Plains Indian art:

In the late 1920's a new school of Indian art emerged at the University of Oklahoma. The "Kiowa Five" artists, under the direction of Oscar B. Jacobson, became leaders in a movement con-
sidered to be the “renaissance” of Southern Plains Indian art. The interest spurred by showings of paintings by Spenser Asah, James Auchiah, Jack Hokeah, Stephen Mopope, Lois Smoky and Monroe Tsatoke was a turning point in the promotion and acceptance of Indian art in the United States and Europe. (Zahrai 1985)

During the Depression, Jacobson acted as technical advisor to Roosevelt’s Public Works of Art project in Oklahoma. Through his influence, many murals executed by Oklahoma Indian artists were commissioned for state post offices and schools as well as the Oklahoma Historical Society building and a public building in Washington, D.C. . . .

In the 1920s and 1930s, the Jacobson House became a focal point for the artistic and literary ferment arising out of the interaction between the Norman, Santa Fe, and Taos artistic communities. The Jacobson’s [sic] home was frequently the scene of art showings and gatherings of talented and creative people from all over the world. . . .

Thus the Jacobson House is worthy of preservation . . . because it was the home of a man who, through his work as Director of the School of Fine Arts University of Oklahoma, revolutionized art study there and encouraged the career development of some of the best known Plains Indian artists of the era.

Comment: The house is associated with Jacobson’s productive life both because it was his home during the period of his greatest historic contributions, from 1918 until 1936 (it then continued to be his home until his death much later), and because some of his activities relating to his acquaintance with, appreciation for, and promotion of Indian artists occurred there.

Example #3; Acceptable:

No. 238 Ocean Avenue in Portland is the only surviving structure closely associated with John Brown Russwurm (1799-1851), who resided there intermittently in the period 1812-1827. Russwurm was this nation’s second black college graduate, a founder and editor of America’s first black newspaper, and one of the major black proponents of African colonization.

Russwurm was the son of a white Virginian planter and a slave-woman who worked on his father’s Jamaican plantation. The elder Russwurm relocated in Portland as a merchant in 1812, bringing his son with him and introducing him with pride to Portland society. The younger Russwurm . . . attended Hebron Academy (a Maine preparatory school) in the early 1820’s. Although his father had died in 1815, Russwurm continued to reside in the Portland house when not in school. The house had passed into the hands of William Hawes, a North Yarmouth mill owner who had married Susan Blanchard, Russwurm’s stepmother, but the family continued to consider Russwurm an integral member.

With the help of Susan Blanchard and her husband, Russwurm attended Bowdoin College in Brunswick and matriculated in 1826, becoming the second black man in the nation to receive a college degree . . .

Russwurm moved to New York City in 1827 to found and co-edit Freedom’s Journal, the nation’s first black newspaper. The Journal supported both abolition and assimilation at a time when most white abolitionists favored black emigration. Russwurm is known to have been an emigrationist during his college years, a view he apparently suppressed while co-editor of the Journal. After becoming its sole editor, however, Russwurm gradually changed the paper’s tone to favor emigration, for which action he was harshly criticized by contemporaries. Russwurm had come to believe that editorializing on negro citizenship in the United States was “a mere waste of words,” and chose the path of emigration himself in 1829, joining the fledgling colony of Liberia.

Russwurm quickly gained prominence in Liberia, serving as Superintendent of Education and then Colonial Secretary, while simultaneously editing the Liberian Herald. In 1834 however, he left Liberia to accept the governorship of the neighboring colony of Las Palmas, [becoming] the first black governor of a black overseas colony. During his seventeen-year tenure, Russwurm introduced currency in place of barter, outlawed slavery, instituted education for females as well as males, and eventually merged his colony with the Republic of Liberia.

Comment: Although this was the home of Russwurm’s youth and school years rather than his home during his adult life when he made his most significant contributions, it is important in representing Russwurm’s life because it is the only surviving structure closely associated with him. In addition, the documentation makes clear that during the period that Russwurm lived in this house, he received the type of social and educational opportunities not commonly afforded blacks of that time, that helped prepare him to excel later.
Example #4; Not acceptable:
The Governor Robert E. Pattison House . . . reflected the style and grace that became Overbrook Farms, . . . one of the more exclusive nineteenth century suburban developments in [the city]. . . .

Initially pursuing a career in law, Pattison's eloquence and public presence led him to enter the world of politics. . . . His name was . . . placed in nomination . . . for City Comptroller. At the time, this office was rife with corruption, and in, and populus [sic] revolt against official mismanagement. Pattison was elected by a wide margin. . . . Under his administration, major reforms were instituted and the City's financial situation greatly improved. The Governor's new found reputation as a reformer and smart businessman insured his re-election by a large popular vote.

Pattison's success . . . brought him the Democratic nomination for Governor in 1882, a position he won handily. . . . Again, his business acumen prevailed and the State's financial situation improved during the Governor's term in office. Pattison returned to private life . . . and his years as a private citizen proved to be as illustrious as his public life. . . . Again, in 1890, Pattison was nominated to the office of Governor on a reform platform, winning by a state-wide margin. His second term was, however, marred by labor strikes and bank closings.

At the end of his second term, Pattison made plans to retire to an elegant new home . . . in Overbrook Farms.

Comment: This is the house to which Pattison retired after accomplishing the significant achievements discussed in the nomination. There is no information on Pattison's activities while living in the house, and no information on the existence or strength of associations of Pattison's homes during his active political career. In order to demonstrate eligibility under Criterion B, the nomination would have to show that Pattison's retirement home represents his productive life, or an important aspect of his life or career not represented by other properties; or that this house is important as the only, or the most important, remaining property with integrity that represents Pattison's life.

Example #1; Acceptable:
The farm is associated with one of the most important national political figures to come from Illinois in the early 20th century—Henry T. Rainey. Rainey gave thirty years of service to his district, state, and country in a national legislative capacity from 1903-1934—providing leadership in such areas as conservation of natural resources, determination of tariff and tax rates, waterway transportation, and establishment of programs beneficial to farmers, laborers, and veterans. . . . The entire Rainey farm is significant since it served as the basis for Henry T. Rainey's development as champion of the American farmer and American agriculture. Farming activities at Walnut Hall [Rainey Farm] such as the demonstration of scientific agricultural techniques, diversification of farm production, and the fostering of self-help programs among farmers all provided Rainey with the perspectives he needed to assume agricultural leadership in Congress. . . .

Congressman Henry T. Rainey was one of Illinois' most influential, national political figures in the first third of the twentieth century. As a 15 term congressman from Illinois (1903-1934), he skillfully influenced major legislation in a number of key areas. In 1916, a national voters' organization said that Rainey was one of the 10 percent of Congress who controlled the legislative process. He gained a reputation as a reformer, skilled debater and orator, muckraker, and a fiercely partisan Democrat. . . .

He helped draft some of the nation's first laws controlling dangerous drugs, and sought and won adoption of a commission to set tariffs. The commission replaced politics with scientific principles in setting tariff rates. Agricultural aid programs and flood control, especially for his Illinois constituents, were other of his priorities. . . .

For fourteen years, Rainey was involved in the promotion of water conservation legislation, culminating in the passage and signing into law by President Wilson on June 11, 1920 of the Water Power Act of 1920. The passage of the act inaugurated a new policy of continuing public ownership and federal trusteeship of water power sites. . . .

Rainey's greatest political success was an [sic] instigator and promoter of the Great Lakes to Gulf of Mexico waterway, which provided transportation and flood control along the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers. Rainey said he wanted to "bind the corn fields of the north to the cane fields of the south" and fought for the waterway from the start of his term in Congress until it was completed in 1933. . . .

Rainey's ownership of his Carrollton farm, along with a large rural constituency, were key factors in his involvement in the national agricultural issues of the 1920's. It was during this era that farm leaders fought to achieve two principal objectives: wresting control of agricultural policy from representatives of the industrial community, and a national
policy commitment to equalize agriculture with manufacturing interests. Since Rainey represented the largest agricultural district in the state, he became deeply involved in the farmer’s plight for a better rural economy and political power.

Rainey’s farm operation was a showplace of modern agriculture and he became an enthusiastic supporter of purebred livestock and improved farming techniques. The farm was also used by the University of Illinois College of Agriculture as administration center for scientific agriculture.

Rainey was also instrumental in the establishment of the Greene County Farm Bureau and the Bureau’s newsletters were filled with references to his activities on behalf of local agricultural issues.

Comment: The documentation shows the importance of the farm in understanding Rainey’s significance by explaining both how operation of the farm gave Rainey useful perspective on farm issues and influenced his actions in Congress, and how his operation of the farm contributed to local and state agricultural practices.

Example #2; Acceptable:
The Bonniebrook Homestead is significant as the one site chiefly [associated with] the life and work of Rose O’Neill, the world-famed author, artist, sculptor, illustrator, and creator of the Kewpie doll. Rose O’Neill always considered the Bonniebrook Homestead to be a “home.” The majority of her years were lived there; at no time was she long absent. No buildings are extant upon the site, although subsidiary structures survive.

The Bonniebrook Homestead was the Ozark home of Rose O’Neill. Here she created the illustrations and artwork that made her famous and the highest paid female illustrator in the world. Rose was taken by the natural beauty of the area when she first saw Bonniebrook [in 1894]. From Bonniebrook, she launched her career as an illustrator, sending her drawings to New York publishers.

Rose O’Neill’s writings were affected by the national beauty of the surroundings at Bonniebrook. Her career as an illustrator continued after she moved from New York to Bonniebrook in 1894. In her unpublished Autobiography she described how the Enchanted Forest influenced her illustrations.

Not counting her Autobiography and her Kewpie books, she wrote four other major works. Two of them were written at Bonniebrook and influenced by her surroundings. Her serious drawings were influenced by nature and the rugged rocks near her home. She displayed these drawings to critical acclaim in Paris in 1921 and in New York in 1922. Perhaps her best description of the effect of the Bonniebrook Homestead on her life and works is contained in a statement she made to a friend one day standing in the front lawn of Bonniebrook:

“I love this spot better than any place on earth. Here I have done my best work. Among my lovely hills I want to live and die and be buried out there beneath the big oak tree . . . .”

The property was rustic when the O’Neills arrived there, and it is rustic now. The clearing is exactly the same as it was when the O’Neills lived there. The beautifully-described stream is just like it was when the O’Neills were there. The beautiful woods have not been cut, the landscape lawn of the mansion is still maintained by a neighbor. The “physical integrity” of the property is remarkable for the time that has passed since the O’Neills left. The reason is that they did not encroach much on the woods, the stream, or other natural features.

There are many ways in which (the) property today reflects the work and life of Rose O’Neill.

Comment: Although the house in which Rose O’Neill lived burned in 1949, the nomination describes in great detail the natural setting of the property, both historically and today, and documents, through numerous quotes from the author’s works and other sources, the way in which the natural features of the nominated property are associated in a significant way with the career of this author and illustrator.

Example #3; Not acceptable:
The Sanford (Conant) Hotel is significant . . . in the area of social/humanitarianism by its direct association with its developer and owner, internationally know ophthalmologist and locally prominent philanthropist, Dr. Harold Gifford.

The seven story Sanford Hotel was built in 1916-17 at a cost of $140,000 for its owner and financier Dr. Harold Gifford. Dr. Gifford (Oct. 18, 1858 - Nov. 28, 1929) was known internationally as a pioneer in ophthalmology and locally as a kind, generous man of medicine and lover of nature.

Dr. Gifford achieved international recognition for his efforts in diagnostic evaluation, clinical research and eye surgery. Equally significant, Dr. Gifford helped found one of Omaha’s largest medical
centers, Methodist Hospital, and organized the Omaha Medical College—today known as the University of Nebraska College of Medicine—and acted as its dean.

Dr. Gifford's humanitarian efforts equaled his medical accomplishments. An avid naturalist, Dr. Gifford also helped to establish many City parks and donated much of the land to create the Fontenelle Forest wilderness preserve along the Missouri River. Although an avowed socialist and agnostic, Dr. Gifford invested continuously in Omaha real estate and hotels. In 1915 he built the Castle Hotel...and also developed the Sanford Hotel in 1916.

Comment: The documentation clearly establishes Dr. Gifford's local significance in the areas of health/medicine and social history. It is not evident, however, how the Sanford Hotel, a commercial investment, is associated with, or represents in a significant manner, Gifford's medical or philanthropic contributions to the community. His home during the period of his achievements, the hospital or medical facility in which he conducted his research, the hospital he helped found, one of the city parks, or the Fontenelle Forest Wilderness Preserve would appear to better represent Dr. Gifford's importance in Omaha. If Dr. Gifford also played a significant role in the city's commercial history through his real estate activities, and if the Sanford Hotel represents that, then that significance would have to be explained within an appropriate context.

Example #4: Not acceptable:
The James Bean Decker House, constructed in 1898, is significant for its association with James B. Decker, one of the original settlers of Bluff, and important in the development of livestock in Southeastern Utah at the turn of the century. The Decker house in Bluff is one of four houses still remaining that were constructed with money earned from livestock. This prosperity was made possible after a shift in emphasis on farming to livestock in 1885. . . . The shift from a subsistence level existence, based on farming and working at odd jobs (such as mining), which took place in 1885 when Francis Hammond was sent by church authorities to direct Mormon efforts in San Juan country, [sic] marked an important change in the economy and lifestyle of the Mormon settlers. James Decker was one of the leaders of the "Bluff Pool," a cooperative organization among Mormon livestock men which successfully challenged the non-Mormon cattlemen for control of the area. The success of the Bluff Pool was . . . reflected . . . in the financial rewards which the new policy and direction brought to the San Juan pioneers. This house constructed by James Bean Decker reflects the success of this change . . .

James B. Decker soon became a man of considerable importance in Bluff. He was elected San Juan County's first sheriff, was a member of the district school board for many years and operated large cattle and sheep ranches. Active in the Mormon church, he was the first superintendent of the Bluff Sunday School, and was locally known for his encouragement of music as director of the Bluff choir. He died December 15, 1900 when a diphtheria epidemic struck the community.

Comment: James Decker was a significant individual in Bluff's history, but the way in which the house is directly associated with Decker and constitutes a significant representation of his contributions, has not been made clear. The years of Decker's significant activities are not specified, but appear to have occurred primarily before the construction of this house, since Decker died two years after its completion. There is also no information on Decker's residences prior to the construction of this house, or whether he divided his time among more than one residence (one of his ranches, for example). Although this house may meet Criterion B, the justification is not yet present because the documentation does not adequately demonstrate how this house is important in representing Decker's significance. As one of only four properties remaining in Bluff that represent the prosperity generated by a transition of the area's economic base from farming to livestock, the Decker House illustrates an important pattern of events in the community's history, and meets National Register Criterion A.

9. Each property associated with someone important should be compared with other properties associated with that individual to identify those resources that are good representatives of the person's historic contributions.

The length of time that a resource was associated with an individual, the strength of association with the person's productive life and important achievements, and historic integrity should be considered in determining which properties are most appropriate in representing his or her significance.

This does not mean necessarily that only the best examples are eligible for the National Register. In some cases, different properties may represent different significant accomplishments or activities of a person's life, whether at different times, in different communities, or in different fields. Therefore, several properties may qualify for National Register listing under Criterion B for associations with the same person. On the other hand, when there are many resources representing different aspects or phases of a person's productivity, a property that is associated with only a minor facet of the person's life may not be significant in comparison with other properties.

Example #1; Acceptable:
The Lewis Downing Jr. House is significant for its associations with Lewis Downing, Jr., president of Abbot, Downing & Company, which manufactured world-renowned coaches. Downing built 33 Pleasant Street for his own residence in 1851 and remained here until his death in 1901. . . .

The Lewis Downing Jr. House is the only building that survives intact which is associated with any of the key people who shaped the Abbot-Downing coach business. The family homestead, which stood on South Main Street . . . is no longer standing. Similarly, J. Stephens Abbot's house . . . has been demolished. Most of the factory buildings where the coaches were produced . . . have been removed as well. Lewis Downing & Sons factory site . . . has been completely rebuilt. At the time Downing erected 33 Pleasant Street in 1851, he had been working in his father's business for fourteen years. It remained his sole occupation for the remainder of his life. . . .

In 1865 Lewis Downing Sr. retired from the business, and Lewis Jr. succeeded him as president, a position he held until his death in 1901. . . .
Moses Brown School, Providence, Rhode Island: school (est. 1819) whose contributions to the state's educational, religious, and social development reflect the ideas and objectives of its principal founder, for whom it is named (Warren Jagger).

Downing's first few years as president brought the company to its peak of prosperity. Its success spurred the city of Concord's own growth and development. The company drew large numbers of skilled workmen to Concord who were well-off financially and, as property owners and office-holders at city and state levels, men of some stature within the community.

Comment: The documentation identifies other properties that have been associated with this important business and the people instrumental in its success. It then explains, in relationship to the other properties, why the nominated resource is an important representation of the company and the home of one of its most influential presidents.

Example #2; Acceptable:

The church is the principal surviving structure associated with the life of the Rev. John A. Deal, who served as a missionary and circuit riding priest in the far western section of the state. Because of his presence, St. Agnes Church was the "mother church" for the spread of the Episcopal denomination throughout the southwestern North Carolina mountains. The church is the building best associated with Rev. Deal's productive career as the church. . . .

St. Agnes Church is significant to the religious development of Macon County and all of far western North Carolina, serving as the base or "mother church" for the spread of the Episcopal denomination in that part of the state. Although Anglicanism was firmly established in coastal North Carolina during the colonial period, it made few inroads into the interior, particularly few into the mountains. Most Anglicans or Episcopalians who settled in the southwestern mountains converted to the Methodism or Baptist faith of their neighbors. As late as the third quarter of the 19th century, there were only a handful of Episcopalians scattered throughout the mountains and those were unserved by clergy. These few Episcopalians persuaded their bishop to send a missionary to organize churches throughout the region. The Rev. John Archibald Deal took up that missionary work in 1876. . . . The Rev. Mr. Deal employed the technique of his many Baptist and Methodist colleagues by riding a circuit over many counties, serving many small congregations. After the completion of St. Agnes in 1888, that church served as a base for missionary activities in Macon, Jackson, Clay, Cherokee, Graham, and Swain counties. A number of churches . . . were organized and, to a large extent, administered from St. Agnes.

Comment: The documentation explains the significance of Deal's accomplishments within a context of the region's religious development, and also presents the reasons that this church best represents his achievements.

Example #3; Not acceptable:

The Dickens Opera House is . . . the most important building associated with original owner, William Henry Dickens, a prominent and influential . . . pioneer, stockman and businessman. After a year of working on a local ranch, Dickens homesteaded 160 acres of land adjoining the town . . . where he started farming and raising stock. By 1900, Dickens had become one of the most prosperous men in [the] county with some eight farms that covered 680 acres. . . . Dickens' early enterprises included raising horses and hay for the stage line. . . . He served for a time as the town marshal . . . and was one of the founders and president of the . . . Farmer's Mill and Elevator Company. Dickens was also an incorporator and vice president of the Farmer's National Bank, which was located in his opera house building. He initiated the construction of a number of [the town's] commercial and residential buildings. Dickens was active in affairs of the . . . community until his death in 1915. . . . Dickens bought the opera house site on October 15, 1873, but did not begin construction until February of 1881 with Dickens himself hauling the brick. 2

Comment: It is not clear why this building is a significant representative of Dickens' role within the community. Aside from that fact that Dickens served as vice president of a bank located in the opera house, his significant achievements do not appear to be related to this building. Among the properties that existed at one time to represent Dickens' career were "some eight farms" and "a number of . . . commercial and residential buildings." The nomination would have to explain what aspect of Dickens' significance is represented by the opera house, and
why it was selected as “the most important,” or even an important, building associated with him.

Example #4: Not acceptable:
In 1930, the farm was bought by J. Henry Roraback as part of a 3000 acre fishing and hunting retreat he assembled. . . . Roraback was by most estimates the single most important political figure in [the state] in the years 1912 through 1937, during which he served as state chairman of the dominant Republican party. . . .

The Wilson farm was one of eighteen which Gibbs sold to Roraback. . . . The Wilson-Gibbs farmhouse was thus one of several houses which ended up as part of the estate: Roraback’s personal residence was Roraback Lodge, a large stone and frame Adirondack-style building, still standing in the central part of the estate. . . .

Roraback in 1912 became chairman of the state party’s central committee, a post he held until his death in 1937. Roraback used his position to become kingmaker, personally selecting state-level Republican candidates . . . and directing the vote-by-vote actions of the legislature from his . . . hotel suite. Reportedly, his power even extended to leading Democratic bosses. . . .

Roraback became wealthy because of his early involvement with electrical utilities. Starting from ownership of a small . . . company he gained control over . . . the state’s largest supplier of electricity. Favorable legislation and regulation by a sympathetic state Public Utilities Commission enabled Roraback to gain control over . . . the state’s largest supplier of electricity. Favorable legislation and regulation by a sympathetic state Public Utilities Commission enabled Roraback to combine his business and political careers with happy results.1

Ideologically Roraback stressed efficient government, low taxes and limited public spending. When the Great Depression struck, he held the line against any excessive government spending for relief. Because Roraback Republicans continued to control relief efforts in the state even after [a] Democrat . . . was elected governor, Roraback’s vision of minimal government involvement had a profound effect on [the state] even when his party was roundly rejected by voters suffering the effects of the Depression.

Comment: Although Roraback owned this property and was an important person in the state’s political history, the nomination does not demonstrate that the farm is significantly associated with him. The documentation does not explain how his 3000-acre estate relates to his political career in comparison with other extant properties with which he is associated, either locally or statewide. Even if the estate is shown to have significant associations with Roraback’s political career, the nomination is for only one portion of only one of the eighteen farms that comprised his estate, and it is not clear why this portion of his vast estate was chosen to represent him.

10. The significance of individuals, and their associations with a nominated property, must be substantiated through accepted methods of historical research and analysis.

Statements of significance in National Register nominations should be based on an analysis of hard evidence, primarily in the form of written documentation, the physical resource, or both. Oral history is a legitimate methodology for gathering evidence, of course, when it is conducted according to recognized standards. Nominations should not be based on speculation or assumptions not based on evidence. The National Register requires no more detailed a referencing of sources than a bibliography. Yet many states choose to use direct quotes, weave assessments by contemporary or modern critics into the narrative, insert parenthetical references to sources, or footnote facts and conclusions. Such devices facilitate a greater understanding of the analytical process used and the conclusions drawn. The acceptable examples throughout this bulletin include those that do and those that do not employ one or more methods of scholarship beyond a bibliography in support of the information in the statement of significance; therefore, there is no separate acceptable example provided below.

Example # 1; Not acceptable:
The frame house at 510 West Burleson Street in Marshall is claimed to have been the residence of noted political figure Louis Trezevant Wigfall. . . .

Wigfall’s ownership of the property in question is substantiated by court records in Harrison County, but it is not clear when he came into possession of the property. No deed of sale to Wigfall has been located, but a suit brought against Wigfall by J. M. Saunders in March of 1860 cites Wigfall as the owner. It is interesting to note that Saunders is listed in the county deed records as having purchased the property in 1856. The same court case resulted in the sale of the property by the county sheriff in January 1861, with Saunders acquiring it for the sum of $750.00. According to the legal records, Wigfall could have acquired the property at some time between 1856 and 1860. On the basis of the prices paid for antebellum property in previous sales, it is plausible that a house was already standing in the site when Wigfall acquired it.

Wigfall’s association with the property reportedly led to its being used by a number of Confederate military officers during the Civil War, including Generals H.H. Sibley and E. Kirby Smith. The famous meeting in May 1865, between Kirby Smith and members of his staff who wished to effect a change of command in the Trans-Mississippi Department of the Confederacy, is believed to have been held at the home.

Comment: Although court records indicate that Wigfall owned the property on which the nominated house is located, apparently there is no evidence to substantiate that Wigfall lived there, or had any other direct relationship that would qualify the property as a significant representation of his importance. In fact, it is not certain that the nominated house had been constructed at the time when Wigfall owned the property. Similarly, the claim that a “famous” Civil War meeting took place in this house appears to be based on tradition or hearsay rather than concrete evidence.

11. A property must retain integrity from the period of its significant historic associations.
Historic character and associations are embodied in and conveyed by the physical features of a resource. All properties change over time, but a basic test of the integrity of a property significant under National Register Criterion B is whether the significant person(s) associated with the resource would recognize it as it exists today. Interiors should be considered as well as exteriors; often interiors have been too radically remodeled to retain integrity, but many historic buildings still have fine, intact interiors. Occasionally, the importance and integrity of an interior may be so extraordinary that extensive exterior alterations might be more tolerable than they would be otherwise. While the past and present appearance and condition of a nominated property should be thoroughly discussed in the description, historic photographs can be invaluable in assessing historic integrity. These photographs are not required, but when available, they can greatly enhance one’s understanding of the property.*

*For more detailed guidance on applying National Register criteria for integrity, please refer to National Register Bulletin 15.

Example #1; Acceptable:

The William Knight House in Canby, Oregon is a two-story vernacular building in the tradition of architecture of the American Federal period. It was built by its original occupant, a builder and businessman, in 1874 and 1875. . . . The house is significant . . . under criterion "b" for its long association with William Knight. . . . Knight occupied the property from the date of construction to his death in 1922. He made substantial contributions to the upbuilding of Canby by his activities in public education, local government and commerce. His house . . . is the building which best represents his productive life. . . .

Presumed to be of balloon frame construction, the Knight House is rectangular in plan with a one-story rear addition, or ell added in the early 1900s when the original lean-to used as a kitchen was removed. The main mass of the house is two stories in height covered with a gable roof, and sided with narrow weatherboards. Two interior brick chimneys were originally at each gable end. The house now has a concrete foundation. The construction appears to have been carried out by William Knight himself from lumber milled at his brother Joseph’s lumber mill. . . .

Both historical and more recent alterations have been made to the Knight House. Originally, there was no porch on the facade. Simple wooden steps led to the front door. A porch was added to the house in the early 1900s, according to Mrs. Martha Elliott, the granddaughter of William and Martha Knight. The porch covered the length of the front facade, being surmounted by a simple balustrade on the second story. The original six-over-six window centered over the front door was replaced in the early 1900s by a door which led to the second story porch deck. In the early 1940s the full-length porch was reduced, leaving the smaller existing porch. The original windows in the house were all six-over-six, double-hung sash windows. It is compatible with the character of the Knight House and has remained virtually unaltered on the exterior since its attachment to the main volume. The eaves of the ell are supported by exposed rafter ends and knee braces at the gable end. . . .

Though there have been both historical and more recent modifications to the Knight House, the building continues to convey its historic period. The proportion and organization of the facade, basic plan and mass, size and shape of window and door openings, and siding of the residence remain. Historical alterations which have occurred, including the addition of shutters to the exterior windows, probably were a matter of convenience and fashion which the Knight family accepted as "keeping up with the times." The more recent changes
were made in a practical attempt to weatherproof the building and add the necessary electrical service and plumbing.

Comment: Many of the alterations, including the addition of the rear ell, occurred during the period of significance, while Knight was living here; these alterations do not affect the integrity of the house. The need to “weatherproof” buildings does not exempt a property from National Register standards for historic integrity, and in some properties, the modern alterations might impair historic integrity to the degree that the buildings no longer convey a strong enough sense of their past associations to meet National Register criteria. The Knight House retains sufficient integrity of materials, design and workmanship, as well as location, setting, feeling, and association, to meet National Register standards. The house retains its overall form and plan, its exterior materials, the fenestration pattern, simple design, and historic ell.

Example #2; Acceptable:

The interior retains much of its original integrity. The wide central stairway runs from the double doors in the front facade to a hallway, shaped like a cross. The hall to the back is an extension of the front hall and leads to the second floor covered porch. The four apartments are arranged along the halls with one in each quadrant. A large skylight is centered in the main hallway. All of the rooms have the original wide woodwork with molding across the top of the lintels. . . . The first floor has had a wall added down the center to form two store spaces. The mezzanine is still visible in the south store, but has been fronted with a wall in the north store. An apartment has been added into the back. The rooms on the north end are original and the high tank toilet is still working. The store on the south is occupied by a furniture restorer and the store on the north contains a dance studio. The apartment across the back was added in the 1920’s and is two-storied, filling in the back part of the first and mezzanine floors. The 1917 addition to the north side is unchanged and presently used for storage. Both the exterior and interior of the building retain their integrity of feeling and association and have a strong visual character.

Comment: The documentation explains both the retention of character-defining historic features, and the changes that have occurred, indicating that there is enough historic integrity for the interior to be considered contributing to the building’s historic significance.

Example #3; Not acceptable:

Wigfall-Heim House . . . is an asymmetrical, frame, one-story house whose present design reflects the popularity of the Queen Anne and Eastlake styles of the later 19th century . . . .

Wigfall, 1816-1874, is one of the most colorful political figures of mid-19th century [state history] . . . . Wigfall, who resided in Marshall from the late 1840s until the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861, had a stormy political career. . . . According to the legal records, Wigfall could have acquired the property sometime between 1856 and 1860.

Comment: The nomination documents Wigfall as a prominent political figure in the state during the mid-19th century. At most, his associations with the house lasted from 1856 to 1861. The house was substantially remodeled in the 1880s or 1890s, however, and currently “reflects the popularity of the Queen Anne and Eastlake styles of the later 19th century,” by which time Wigfall was no longer living, and two to three decades had passed since he owned the property. The exact construction date of the house and its original appearance are unknown, but since the Queen Anne and Eastlake styles are quite different from those popular in the antebellum South, it is unlikely that Wigfall still would have recognized the house as his.
Appendix A
Guidelines for Applying Criterion B

1. Specific individuals must have made contributions or played a role that can be justified as significant within a defined area of American history or prehistory.

2. For properties associated with several community leaders or with a prominent family, it is necessary to identify specific individuals and to explain their significant accomplishments.

3. Contributions of individuals must be compared to those of others who were active, successful, prosperous, or influential in the same field.

4. Properties that were constructed within the last fifty years, or that are associated with individuals whose significant accomplishments date from the last fifty years, must possess exceptional significance to be listed in the National Register.

5. A property that is significant as an important example of an individual's skill as an architect or engineer should be nominated under Criterion C rather than Criterion B.

6. Significant individuals must be directly associated with the nominated property.

7. Eligible properties generally are those associated with the productive life of the individual in the field in which (s)he achieved significance.

8. Documentation must make clear how the nominated property represents an individual's significant contributions.

9. Each property associated with someone important should be compared with other properties associated with that individual to identify those resources that are good representatives of the person's historic contributions.

10. The significance of individuals, and their associations with nominated properties, must be substantiated through accepted methods of research and analysis.

11. A property must retain integrity from the period of its significant historic associations.
Appendix B

The National Register Criteria for Evaluation

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

A. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
C. that 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. that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations (Exceptions): Ordinarily cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years shall not be considered eligible for the National Register. However, such properties will qualify if they are integral parts of districts that do meet the criteria or if they fall within the following categories:

A. a religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or
B. a building or structure removed from its original location but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event; or
C. a birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no other appropriate site or building directly associated with his or her productive life; or
D. a cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or
E. a reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived; or
F. a property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own historical significance; or
G. a property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance.

Appendix C

Recommended National Park Service Publications


