



UNIVERSITY PARK HPOZ PRESERVATION PLAN

JULY 14, 2005





CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

President, Mabel Chang
Vice President, David L. Burg
Joy Atkinson
Ernesto Cardenas
Susan Cline
Mary George
Michael Mahdesian
Bradley Mindin
Thomas E. Schiff

SOUTH AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

President, Frederick L. Jackson
Vice President, James E. Silcott
Betty Ann McKinney
D'Ann Morris
Cecila Nunez

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

Con Howe, Director of Planning
Robert H. Sutton, Deputy Director
David Gay, Principal Planner
Charles J. Rausch, Jr., Senior City Planner
Diana Lowrance, City Planner
Kevin Jones, City Planner
Erick Lopez, Planning Assistant
Melinda Gejer, Planning Assistant
Graphic Services Section

PROJECT STAFF

Eileen Schoetzow, City Planning Associate

HPOZ BOARD

Jim Childs, Secretary
Jean Frost, Chair
Tom Michali
David Raposa
Janice Robinson

I. Table of Contents

PAGE

PART I - OVERVIEW

CHAPTER I – MISSION STATEMENT	1
CHAPTER II – GOALS & OBJECTIVES	1
CHAPTER III – FUNCTION OF THE PLAN	3
3.1 Role of the Preservation Plan	3
3.2 Organization of the Preservation Plan	4
3.3 Exemptions	5
3.4 Delegated Authority to the Director of Planning	5
CHAPTER IV – CONTEXT STATEMENT	6
4.1 The History of HPOZ	6
4.2 HPOZ Periods of Significance	15
CHAPTER V – HISTORIC RESOURCE SURVEY	16
5.1 Introduction	16
5.2 National Register	16
5.2 Contributing or Non-Contributing?	18
5.3 Other Historical Documents	20

PART II - DESIGN GUIDELINES

CHAPTER VI – DESIGN GUIDELINE OVERVIEW	21
CHAPTER VII – ARCHITECTURAL STYLES	25
7.1 Architectural Styles History of University Park	25
7.2 University Park HPOZ Subdivision Groupings	27
7.3 Introduction to University Park HPOZ's' Architectural Styles	28
19 TH CENTURY STYLES	29
Eastlake/Stick	29
Italiante	30
Queen Anne	31
Shingle	32
Victorian	33
TURN OF THE CENTURY STYLES	34
American Foursquare	34
Arts and Crafts	35
Colonial Revival	36
Commercial Vernacular	37
Craftsman	38
Mission Revival	39
ECLECTIC REVIVAL STYLES	40
Chateauesque	40
Dutch Colonial Revival	41
Mediterranean/Italian Renaissance Revival	42
Spanish Colonial Revival	43

	PAGE
EARLY MODERN STYLES	44
Art Deco	44
Prairie	45
CHAPTER VIII – RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES	46
RESIDENTIAL REHABILITATION	
Introduction	46
Preservation Principles	47
8.1 Setting – Streetscape, Development Pattern, Landscape Features, and Open Space	48
8.2 Windows	53
8.3 Doors	58
8.4 Porches/Balconies	62
8.5 Roofs	66
8.6 Architectural Details	70
8.7 Building Materials and Finishes	74
8.8 Mechanicals	79
8.9 Additions	81
RESIDENTIAL INFILL	
Introduction	84
Design Approach – Single Family Housing	85
Design Approach – Multi-family Structures	86
8.10 Location and Site Design	90
8.11 Massing and Orientation	91
8.12 Roof Forms	94
8.13 Openings	96
8.14 Materials and Details	99
8.15 Constructing New Detached Secondary Structures - New Garages, Accessory Structures, and Detached Units	102
8.17 Relocating Historic Structures	104
CHAPTER IX – COMMERCIAL /INDUSTRIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES	105
COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL REHABILITATION	105
Introduction	105
Preservation Principles	106
9.1 Site Design	108
9.2 Storefronts	110
9.3 Windows and Doors	112
9.4 Roofs	115
9.5 Architectural Details	117
9.6 Building Materials	119
9.7 Additions	121
9.8 Signage	123

	PAGE
COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL INFILL	125
9.9 Location and Site Design	126
9.10 Building Mass, Scale, and Form	127
9.11 Materials and Details	129
9.12 Openings, Store Fronts, and Entries	130
CHAPTER X– PUBLIC REALM	132
10.0 Streetscapes, Alleyscapes, Parks, and Public Buildings	132
CHAPTER XI – DEFINITIONS	137
APPENDICES	
Appendix B University Park HPOZ Boundary Map	
Appendix C University Park HPOZ Historic Monuments List	
Appendix D Historic Preservation Overlay Zone Ordinance (Ordinance No. 175,891)	
Appendix E HPOZ Process Overview	
Appendix F Forms	
Appendix G Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation	
Appendix H University Park HPOZ Reference List	
Appendix I Other Historical Resources	

PART I OVERVIEW

1. Mission Statement

The University Park Historic Preservation Overlay Zone Mission Statement is:

To maintain and enhance the quality of life and sense of place and character in the University Park HPOZ (UPHPOZ) area, using preservation principles as a planning and management tool and stabilizing the community for future generations. The UPHPOZ shall: promote education by encouraging interest in the cultural, social, economic, political, and architectural phases of its' history; preserve and enhance the buildings, structures, Natural Features, sites and areas which are reminders of University Park's history and unique and irreplaceable assets to the City; insure that new development will fit into the existing neighborhood by respecting it's surrounding architectural context, appropriate setting and environment; develop and maintain the appropriate settings and environment to preserve these buildings, structures, Landscaping, Natural Features, and areas; provide Guidelines for both existing and new development; secure the economic benefits of preservation; enhance property values; gain the cooperation of other government bodies whose decisions affect the area's physical character; and ensure that all procedures comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

2. Goals and Objectives

GOAL 1 Identify historic places, both architectural and natural, that gives the community its special character and that can aid its future well-being.

Objective 1.1 The Historic Resource Survey be continually evolving to reflect periods in history and architectural character that are reflective of the periods of significance and can adapt new information regarding contributors, non-contributors, and contributors that have been altered.

Objective 1.2 Understand the significance of the major landscape specimens that are largely un-surveyed be inventoried and preserved.

GOAL 2 Adopt the preservation of historic places as a goal of planning for land use, economic development, housing, and transportation.

Objective 2.1 Encourage and create organizational, regulatory, and incentive mechanisms to facilitate preservation, and provide the leadership to make them work.

GOAL 3 Capitalize on the existing value of historic residential and commercial neighborhoods and properties

Objective 3.1 Utilize the Preservation Plan Guidelines and develop revitalization strategies that encourage appropriately designed and compatible development.

2. Goals and Objectives

GOAL 4 Ensure that policies and decisions on community growth and development respect the University Park HPOZ heritage and enhance overall livability.

Objective 4.1 Recognize the importance of historical development patterns and lot configuration and their relationship to the streetscape.

Objective 4.2 Retain historic landscape features by encouraging the use of Landscaping appropriate Natural Features to improve the streetscape.

Objective 4.3 Recognize the importance of accessory buildings and structures in providing historic character to the district and encourage accessory building and structure development as additional space for the primary structures.

GOAL 5 Demand excellence in design for new construction and in the stewardship of historic properties and places.

Objective 5.1 Utilize the Preservation Plan Design Guidelines and the Secretary of Interior Standards to ensure that rehabilitation of existing structures and new infill development is consistent with the historic community character.

GOAL 6 Use the community's heritage to educate citizens of all ages to build civic pride.

Objective 6.1 To build awareness and improved knowledge of historic architecture and the neighborhood.

Objective 6.1 To build pride by distinguishing University Park HPOZ's uniqueness.

Objective 6.1 To build understanding of the importance of preservation and restoration.

GOAL 7 To encourage and support a feeling of community within the neighborhood and the greater Los Angeles area.

Objective 7.1 Communicate with the residents and property owners by newsletters and others means including neighborhood tours and information and demonstration sessions.

3.0 Function of the Plan

3.1 ROLE OF THE PRESERVATION PLAN

This Preservation Plan is a City Planning Commission approved document that governs the University Park Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ). The main function of this plan is to provide Design Review Guidelines which clarify and elaborate upon criteria established under the HPOZ Ordinance. The plan aims to create a clear and predictable set of expectations as to the design and review of proposed projects.

The Department of City Planning uses Preservation Plans as the basis for its determinations. The University Park HPOZ Board uses the University Park Preservation Plan to make recommendations on all proposed exterior work within University Park based on the applicable criteria are guidelines within this document. All Projects within the Preservation Zone is to be reviewed by the HPOZ Board, unless exempted from review, or the authority to review has been delegated to the Director of Planning.

This plan has been prepared specifically for the University Park community and articulates University Park's vision and goals in regards to Historical Preservation by establishing design guidelines for the development, rehabilitation, and restoration of single and multiple-family residential structures; commercial structures; the public realm including streets, parks and street trees; and other types of development within University Park.

The Adams Normandie 4321 Urban Design Program (AN/4321) was prepared in 1991, jointly by the Adams Normandie Project Area Committee and the Community Redevelopment Agency. The elements within the program served to reinforce the physical character of the community by promoting development that was compatible with and enhanced existing structures. *The University Park HPOZ Urban Design Guidelines* were derived from that 1991 AN/4321 program document in August of 2000 by the University Park HPOZ Board as part of the *University Park Preservation Plan (version 2000)*. The AN/4321 *Design Guidelines* are intended to provide continuity in the transition from Community Redevelopment Area to Historic Preservation Overlay Zone. These AN/4321 *Design Guidelines* are incorporated into Part II of this University Park HPOZ Preservation Plan.

The University Park Preservation Plan serves as an implementation tool of the South Los Angeles Community Plan (a part of the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan). An HPOZ is one of the many types of overlay districts, policies, and programs that serve to advance the goals and objectives of the Community Plan.

The South Los Angeles Community Plan provides an official guide to the future development of the District for use by the City Council, the Mayor, and the City

Planning Commission; other concerned governmental agencies; residents, property owners and business people of the Plan area, along with private organizations concerned with Planning and civic improvement. One of the objectives for housing in the South Los Angeles Community Plan is to conserve and improve the varied and distinctive residential character of the Plan area. Some of the policies that affect the University Park Preservation Plan listed in the South Los Angeles Community Plan are as follows:

Historic - The historic resources are a valuable asset to this Community. They offer significant opportunities for developing neighborhood identity and pride within the Community. It is important to retain the currently available inventory of such buildings.

Issues

- Preservation and rehabilitation of existing historic places.
- The need to increase understanding and appreciation of preserving historic resources.
- New development and rehabilitation projects that are sensitive to the character of established historic areas.

Neighborhood Character - Preserve and enhance the positive characteristics of existing uses which provide the foundation for community identity, such as scale, height, bulk, setbacks and appearance.

Issues

- Scale, density and character of structures housing adjacent to Historic Buildings.
- The need to preserve and rehabilitate historic areas with sensitivity to the character of the established neighborhood.

The University Park Preservation Plan serves as a resource for property owners who plan exterior repairs or alterations to their property. It can also serve as an educational tool to inform existing and potential property owners, residents, investors, and the general public how to rehabilitate existing properties and/or build new infill construction within the unique University Park HPOZ of the City of Los Angeles. The Preservation Plan is to be made available to property owners and residents within the University Park HPOZ, and shall be reviewed by the HPOZ Board every two years.

3.2 ORGANIZATION OF THE PRESERVATION PLAN

Each Preservation Plan is required by the HPOZ Ordinance to contain seven elements: The Mission Statement, Goals and Objectives, Function of the Plan, the Context Statement, the Historic Resources Survey, Design Guidelines, and the Preservation Incentives/Adaptive reuse policies located in the Appendix. The University Park HPOZ Preservation Plan contains two parts.

Part I contains five chapters: The Mission Statement establishes the community's vision for their Preservation Plan. The Goals and Objectives chapter

states the Goals to accomplish and offers specific programs or actions (Objectives) as the means to accomplish these Goals. The Function of the Plan reviews the role, organization, and process of the Preservation Plan. The Context Statement briefly outlines the history and significance of the community's development. The Historic Resources Survey identifies all Contributing and Non-Contributing structures and includes Contributing landscaping, natural features and sites, and vacant lots. The Historic Resources Survey also serves as the starting point for the Architectural Style pages and the Rehabilitation and Infill Guidelines found within this Preservation Plan.

Part II is the Design Guidelines which contains five chapters: Design Guideline Overview, Architectural Styles, Residential Design Guidelines, Commercial Design Guidelines, and Public Realm. The Architectural Styles pages provide an overview of the predominant architectural styles present within University Park. The Residential and Commercial Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation/Infill identify the detailed character defining elements of the various architectural styles, and the Public Realm chapter provides preservation guidelines for public spaces within the HPOZ district. The Architectural Style pages are intended to work together with the applicable chapters of the Residential and Commercial Design Guidelines, as well as the Public Realm chapter.

An appendix of other useful information is found at the back of this Plan. This appendix includes a compilation of preservation incentives and adaptive reuse policies, process charts, and the HPOZ Ordinance.

3.3 EXEMPTIONS

Please refer to specific Design Guidelines sections for exempted work within the University Park HPOZ district.

3.4 DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

There is no project review delegated to the Planning Department within the University Park HPOZ district.

4.0 Context Statement

SECTION 4.1 HISTORY OF UNIVERSITY PARK HPOZ

University Park within its boundaries offers a unique insight of the history of Los Angeles from its Pueblo period, through its days as agricultural land, to one of the earliest subdivisions the Hoover Tract of 1975, and subsequent subdivisions by the entrepreneurs of the boom of the eighties, the development of elite enclaves, and finally multiple dwellings to provide housing adjacent to a vibrant downtown. The University Park built form provides a unique chronicle of the development of the City of Los Angeles and the interesting mix of people and social classes that provide a glimpse into our dynamic history as Angelinos. In 1781 the pueblo that later became the City of Los Angeles was founded on the banks of the Los Angeles River by 44 Spanish settlers of mixed ancestry. The pueblo grant included the four square leagues (36 square miles) surrounding a central plaza. The approximate boundaries of the original pueblo are Hoover Street, Fountain Avenue, a line continued east from Exposition Boulevard, and a line continued north from Indiana Street. The intersection of Hoover and Union shows the contrast between the city's rectangular grid determined from a compass base line and the Spanish pueblo land grant boundaries that required NE/SW orientation. The zanja madre (irrigation ditch) remains in front of St. Vincent's Church and the Stimson residence, a vestige of the days when irrigation flowed from the pueblo. The zanja along Figueroa Street brought water from the pueblo to irrigate the lands.

University Park contains one of the best, and most intact, groupings within Los Angeles of residential architecture constructed between 1887 and 1930, significant examples of which are the scarcely known works of major turn-of-the-century architects and builders. The St. James Park Subdivision portion of the district is a much noted and rare example in Los Angeles of nineteenth-century private residential park planning. University Park was home to significant numbers of persons who assumed prominent roles in the professional, economic, and social life of Southern California between 1890 and 1925.

University Park shows the full range of late nineteenth and turn-of-the-century domestic architecture in Los Angeles, including upper middle class two-story Italianate Style homes from the late 1880's; charming middle-class Victorian cottages with unusual decorative features from the 1890's; 1 and 1 1/2-story Queen Anne cottages/two-story Queen Annes from the early 1890's. During the late 1890's and opening years of this century upper-middle and upper-class families, such as the Creightons and Stearns commissioned mansions around the edge of St. James Park in American Colonial and Classical Revival styles. University Park district contains significant numbers of architect-designed buildings; many of those identified representing the most

distinguished firms working in the Los Angeles area during the 1890's and first decade of the twentieth century. This is logical given both the prestigious tone of much of West Adams before and after the turn-of-the-century, and the elite middle to upper-middle class economic and social standing of the majority of its residents.

Phase One: Agriculture and the Hoover Tract (1875)

Agriculture and Other Industries Prior to the late 1880's, University Park was largely unsubdivided large acreage devoted to orchards, barley cultivation, and vegetable farms. A dense eucalyptus grove covered the easternmost portion of University Park. The area within University Park was owned by ranchers who controlled large parcels of land for cattle grazing and orchards, reflecting the predominant agricultural pattern in the land west of downtown Los Angeles. The earliest residents of University Park were well-to-do individuals whose fortunes had been derived primarily through real estate and mining investments locally, and from resources brought with them to California from other sections of the country.

The first residential subdivision within the boundaries of University Park was recorded in May 1875 by Vincent A. Hoover: Hoover Tract (originally it extended from Adams Boulevard on the south to 23rd Street on the north along the west side of Toberman Street). This proved to be an optimistic gesture, for serious suburban settlement within the district did not underway until 1887, and lots in the Hoover Tract went largely unsold.

Phase Two: Pioneer Settlement (1875-1886)

The subdivision of most of University Park is a direct manifestation of the famous Southern California Real Estate Boom of 1886-88 – A spiral of speculation triggered by the advent of Santa Fe Railroad service to Los Angeles in 1885. A group of notable developers transformed the land within the district from small ranch acreage to residential tracts starting in 1886.

The pioneer families in University Park, began subdividing their land for residential development in 1886, Charles Ellis forming a partnership with Dan MacFarland and Leman T. Garnsey, to develop the Ellis Tract, and the Severance family subdividing their property (south of Adams Boulevard) during this time period. In 1887, Ellis built the first commercial facility within the district: The Marlborough Hotel (Scarff and Oak Streets) (Carroll H. Brown, Architect), probably to promote tourist-based real estate investment in the neighborhood (the hotel survived one year and then became Mary Caswell's Marlborough School for Girls).

Pioneers within the district were joined by prominent Southern California developers, who did not reside in University Park but who acquired land here with the express purpose of subdividing it, including Theodore Wiesendanger, J. Downey Harvey, and Charles M. Wells, as well as builders like Henry Martz, who acquired lots to build speculative houses.

Phase Three: Initial Suburbanization: (1887-1890)

The coming of the Santa Fe Railroad in 1885 sparked a tremendous wave of real estate speculation in Southern California, and was a principal motive in the 350% increase in population of Los Angeles between 1880 and 1890.

Only scattered development occurred prior to 1891 however, most of this on Scarff Street, 23rd Street, Bonsallo and Estrella Avenues. 2119 Estrella (1888) by builder Henry Martz, the Seaman-Foshay House (2431 Scarff)(1887), and the George King House (917 West 23rd Street)(1887), by architect Abraham Edelman, are characteristic of this period, and reflect two stylistic trends of the late 1880's locally: The Italianate Revival and the modish Eastlake/Queen Anne Style (viz., Seaman-Foshay House).

Helping to establish the high social tone of this neighborhood were several noteworthy individuals and families prominent in local historical, and in some cases, national terms.

Mary S. Caswell, (-1924) whose preeminence as an educator is reflected in a profile in *Who's Who in America* (1920-21), founded the Marlborough School along the model of her previous Caswell School, Portland, Maine (1883-87) and St. Margaret's, Pasadena California (1887-88) (predecessor of the Ann Orton School for Girls). The current school originated at the north side of 23rd Street at Scarff Street in the very core of University Park. The school was housed in the Marlborough Hotel building (1887) (Carroll H. Brown, Architect) (demolished), after the hotel became insolvent and closed its doors. This prestigious school survives today as the oldest independent preparatory school for girls in Southern California (the school moved from the district in 1916).

Caroline and Theodoric Severance: (1820-1914 and 1814-1892 respectively). The Severances, who moved to Los Angeles from Boston in about 1875, were prominent figures within the nations' top literary/intellectual circles.

Mark Severance's importance in the cultural life of West Adams however was matched in the impact made by the construction in 1888-89 of his home at 758 W. Adams (Cullett, Eisen & Cuthbertson, Architects; 1888) (demolished), – known fondly within the St. James Park neighborhood as “The Big Red House,” this was probably the first time a Los Angeles home was showcased this way in a major, national architectural periodical – a point of major importance in understanding the social and architectural evolution of this neighborhood, between 1889 and 1910.

The 1894-95 Blue Book lists only eight elite private schools among its classified ads. Of these two were located in or abutting the district at that time (Marlborough School and the Froebel Institute). However, two schools listed but not then located in the district would be relocated there within the next nine years. This fact shows that a market for private preparatory schools existed in West Adams and further underscores its elite character.

As a Los Angeles society grew, so did demands for education, cultural institutions, and law enforcement. The University Addition of 1899 included Agricultural Park (now Exposition Park), the University of Southern California, and residential tracts such as the Park Villa Tract, the Brearly and Sinsabaugh Tract, and the West Park Villa Tract, among others. Primary motivation for the annexation of this area was the effort to restrict the bullfights, liquor, and gambling activities in Agricultural Park, which disturbed conservative citizens in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Phase Four: Further Suburbanization

In addition to the influence that the four previously profiled households had in shaping the genteel social tone of University Park, there were other developments by nearby residents that further reinforced its emergent character. The most salient of these was Thomas D. Stimson's (1828-1898) decision in 1891 to build an extravagant \$130,000 sandstone mansion (2421 Figueroa Street) (Carroll H. Brown, Architect; 1891) of unusual design. Local historians describe this house as being the most expensive home built in Los Angeles up to its time. The Thomas D. Stimson House is representative of the large estates built along Figueroa and Adams Boulevard between the mid-1880's and 1900.

This was followed by the building of Judge Charles Silent's estate in Chester Place (formally subdivided into a residential park in 1899). The subdivision of Judge Silent's property as Chester Place in 1899 provided tracts which featured the largest lots in University Park: 70' x 172'. The Stearns-Dockweiler Mansion (27 St. James Park; John Parkinson, architect; 1900) reflects this trend, as did the other elegant homes sited around the border of St. James Park. The most prolific of the architects designing in St. James Park and Chester Place was Sumner P. Hunt.

This second group of residents purchase homes or built them knowing that they were residing in an emerging urban neighborhood. Typically less financially established than the pioneer settlers, these middle and upper-middle class residents, included professionals, government officials, and a large number of real estate developers – the numbers of later class reflecting the explosive real estate market in Southern California at the time. In at least two instances, individuals moved between occupational categories over time. These included:

Freeman G. Teed (Architect, 1870's; and City Clerk for the City of Los Angeles, 1887-88, 1889; City Councilmember, 1890's), 2365 Scarff Street (1889).

Edwin C. Hodgman (Real Estate Developer/Builder, 1880's; Los Angeles County Tax Collector, then Recorder, 1890's), 2377 Scarff Street (1889).

W.H.H. Russell (Attorney, 1880's; Real Estate Title Abstractor, 1890's), 2341 Scarff Street (1887).

William H. Allen (Real Estate Investor), 2125 Bonsallo Avenue (Ca. 890).

George W. King (Real Estate Investor, capitalist), 917 W. 23rd Street (1887).

Richard Alexander (U.S. Army Physician), 2115 Estrella Street (1888).

Park Villa Tract (Period of Significance 1887-1910)

Park Villa Tract is noteworthy for the early construction dates of the majority of its buildings – Among the earliest extant residential buildings in the University Park area. Several of these early buildings (1887-89) are the work of builder Henry Martz, and all are readily discernable from the later buildings in the grouping on account of their two-story floor plans, and Italianate Revival detailing. Because of the number of buildings designed by him, his work is a major component defining the architectural character of this neighborhood.

The St. James Park Tract (Recorded: September 12, 1887) of J. Downey Harvey, of San Francisco. Harvey was the nephew of former-governor John Downey (one of the three donors of the land on which the University of Southern California was built, 1879), and is best known for the development of the Rancho Providencia of David Burbank – site of the present day City of Burbank. The St. James Tract was named for one of the sons of Judge Charles Silent, an eminent jurist who resided on the large estate on the eastern border of the district later subdivided (1899) into Chester Place Tract. St. James Park is a rare, possibly unique local example of nineteenth century residential parks like those found in St. Louis and Washington D.C.

St. James Park Tract is an example of a feature denatured over time that nonetheless possesses an over-riding merit as a rare local example of nineteenth century residential community planning and urban design. The original 36-lot subdivision by J. Downey Harvey, consisted of a double row of lots between Adams Boulevard and St. James Park (originally 25th Street), and a single row of lots riding a square on three sides – the entire setting beautifully landscaped. Although much of the landscaping is now gone, and most of the mansions ringing the square razed, the original layout is still discernible from the more usual street patterns in the surrounding area, and conveys some of the character of the original development.

Phase Five Streetcar Suburb (1892-1900)

From the early 1890's the development of University Park proceeded rapidly. Many middle and upper-middle families move into the neighborhood, and with the flowering of St. James Tract and Chester Place around 1900, a new stream of upper class families settled and

built large architect-designed homes there and along Adams Boulevard. In the period between 1890 and 1905, University Park and the West Adams Boulevard corridor supplanted the older south downtown and Bunker Hill neighborhoods of the 1870's and 1880's as the most prestigious neighborhood in the city in which to live. And although the lavish developments in West Adams Park and West Adams Heights began to compete with University Park starting in the early 1900's, it still retained its genteel character until the early 1920's, when the creation of many lower income rental units mark its decline as an elite neighborhood.

University Park developed in two large growth spurts, the first dating from roughly 1893 to 1895, the second dating from 1900 to 1912. By 1905, in fact, the project, area had assumed much of its present form, including its mix of higher density apartment buildings with single-family residences (viz., The Albemarle, 2343 Scarff Street; A. Dudley, Architect; 1903). The 1905 G.W. Baist Real Estate Atlas indicates that University Park was largely developed by this time, with only scattered vacant parcels, there being four vacant lots on Scarff Street, seven in Park Villa Tract, and five on Portland Street (most of these on the southern end of the block where 1920's apartment buildings and a bungalow court stand today).

Along 24th Street, 22nd and 21st Streets (west of Toberman Street) and Park Grove another type of development for the middle class was occurring during the mid-1890's—Nicely detailed attractive Victorian cottages, some in the Colonial Revival Style (generally 1895 and later); others in the Queen Anne/Eastlake Styles (generally pre-1895). Although some architects participated in their design, (viz., Fred Darn (2122 Bonsallo Avenue): James H. Bradbeer (1038: 1042 W. 24th Street), most of these homes were designed and constructed by builders. The Johnson Keeney Company (1893-1900) and Lucien L. Bowen are salient among the builders. The former building firm built virtually all the homes on the southern half of the 1900 block of Park Grove between 1894 and 1895, while Bowen built several cottages on 22nd and 21st Streets.

The Urmston Tract (1886). The coming in 1891 of streetcar service down 23rd and Hoover Streets to USC, brought about a more earnest development of this area, both in the early 1890's, and during the opening years of this century. University Park east of Hoover consists almost entirely of one subdivision: The Urmston Tract (1886). Prior to 1891, probably no more than a dozen homes were constructed, most of these near Adams Boulevard. The vast majority of these homes were built by individual owners who hired builders rather than architects to build individual homes for their own use.

Park Grove Tract, (Period of Significance: 1894-1915), consists of primarily of a delightful and fairly homogeneous collection of Victorian cottages along the 1900 block of Park Grove Street, each differentiated from one another with a diverse assortment of Colonial Revival, Renaissance Revival, and Queen Anne details. This grouping on the 1900 block is one of the finest examples of Los Angeles subdivisions created by the Johnson &

Keeney Company (1893-1900), and a turn-of-the-century building firm that specialized in residential developments. At the time of the Park Grove development in 1894-96, it was seen as a trend-setting example of smaller house design. Each step toward the completion of this subdivision was covered in the local newspapers of the period, including the Los Angeles Daily Journal, and the real estate section of the Los Angeles Times. Accordingly, Park Grove drew a discriminating and distinguished group of early residents (as reflected in the social and biographical directories of the period).

In addition to Henry Martz-designed/built homes at 1970, 1976, and 2111 Bonsallo Avenue, and 1978, 2119, and 2110 Estrella Avenue, there are other individually significant buildings by architects James H. Bradbeer (2124 Bonsallo Avenue; 1892), Fred R. Dorn (2122 Bonsallo Avenue; 1893). These beautifully detailed and intact homes are among the best examples in the West Adams area of Queen Anne cottages. There is also a stunning example of the Shingle Style by an as-yet unidentified architect at 2121 Bonsallo Avenue (Ca. 1889) that ranks as one of the best examples of its style in the West Adams area.

Of the 479 households listed in the 1894-95 Blue Book, 68 or 14% resided in the relatively small area bounded by Figueroa Street on the east; Washington Boulevard on the north; Orchard Avenue on the west; and 28th Street on the south. A further survey of social directory listings over the period from 1895 to 1935 reveals that approximately 12% of the properties within this boundary had a Social Register-listed individual or family associated with it. Similarly, 11% of the district properties had individuals associated with them who were listed in various elite professional biographical directories (viz., Who's Who in the Pacific Southwest (1913); the Press Reference Library (1912); The History of the Bench and Bar of California (1912); Southern California: A Historical and Biographical Record (1902), etc.). These individuals included a large number of distinguished attorneys (Table 1), and business people whose services mirrored the Southern California economy of the period. Allowing for some slight duplication between Social Register/Blue Book and professional directory listings more than 30%, or nearly one-third of the neighborhood properties had associations with members of the Los Angeles professional and/or social elite.

Phase Six: Final Development Luxury Apartments, Institutions, and Businesses 1905-1934

Between 1903 and the early 1920's development occurred in two forms, for the most part: Luxury Apartment and Small middle class bungalows were built on the smaller parcels, or by subdividing larger lots. The homes built on these parcels ranged in size from small to large (2211 Toberman versus 2109 Toberman). 1903 brought the first large apartment house within University Park; The Albemarle. Early apartment houses such as The Albemarle and the Power Double House (2325 Scarff Street; George Wyman, Architect;

1908) were clearly designed as luxury units with large suites of rooms.

In 1916, Marlborough School moved from the neighborhood to Hancock Park, the city's new emerging elite neighborhood. After 1920, the decline of St. James Park-Park Grove continued in a gradual way over the next several decades. The mid-1920's, however, starting in 1924, are marked by a flurry of subdividing activity. At that time many of the earlier groups of residents, or their heirs, had moved out of this neighborhood to Hancock Park, West Adams Park, Beverly Hills, etc. Carving their homes into apartments, or to develop their property for large apartment complexes (e.g., 848 West 23rd Street; 1928) geared to lower income residents.

Local commercial buildings in University Park included the retail facilities and offices, which formed the "main streets" at the nucleus of the residential area. The buildings that housed stores, offices, banks, groceries, and other commercial uses were often originally simple, low-rise structures, constructed of wood or brick; or, if two story, featured residential above and commercial on the first floor.

Phase Seven: Mortuary Row (1920-1940)

In addition to local commercial buildings, along Washington Boulevard a series of buildings were developed as funeral homes. Mortuary Row consisted of over two dozen funeral parlors clustered together on a half-mile strip that provided services to Los Angeles residents for over thirty years. That so many competing business entities operated in such close proximity was the result of several factors: a zoning philosophy of the time that called for "like" activities to be allowed in certain areas, the importance of having the socially right address on a prestigious Boulevard, accessibility to resources such as Rosedale cemetery, the Alameda Rail Corridor, and the Adams Boulevard Churches. Development of Mortuary Row occurred beginning in the 1920's and continued to the 1950's when the area was ripped apart by the construction of the Santa Monica Freeway Project. The influence and importance of "Mortuary Row" is recognized by the magnitude of its influence on the City. The 1930 Directories of the period list 19 mortuaries, eight of which or 42% of which were on the "Row", reflecting the tremendous influence. By the 1940's, with the dramatic growth in population of the City, 24 of 70 mortuaries or 33% were on the row, only a half-mile strip. The Mortuary buildings represent the work of pre-eminent Southern California architects and their facades continue to generate a serene dignity. Mortuary Row is linked to a pattern of events that define a development style of building related to the mortuary business; the developers of Mortuary Row were leading businessmen of their era, and the mortuaries create a property type with unifying architectural features, designed by preeminent architects that relate to their historic context. Further, many of the remaining mortuaries, have been adaptively reused while retaining their character defining features.

Summary

University Park is the largest remaining grouping of Victorian and Victorian transitional architecture in the City of Los Angeles. Approximately 70% of University Park's structures and sites are contributing. The pattern of its development, the front yards, massing and scale of buildings on each block, the lot coverage, tells a story of how that block was subdivided and developed. To preserve the context of this historic neighborhood, the City of Los Angeles created the University Park HPOZ by Ordinance in 2000, after over a decade of research and community encouragement of such action. Among the community's goals, is infill housing that moves on of a compatible structure from the University Park's period of significance, to vacant land. This was accomplished by the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) moving the last Victorian at the Staples Center Development to 1965 Bonsallo (sold by lottery to a moderate-income family), and by a private developer on 22nd Street in 2003. The Urban Design Guidelines Program, established by CRA and City Council in 1991, creates the essential guidelines to preserve the character of University Park. This preservation Plan builds on that context; key is that contributing structures be preserved pursuant to the Standards, and that infill development be compatible in terms of massing, scale, setback, lot coverage, and patterns of development in order to preserve this areas character defining features. This is further explained in the Urban Design Guidelines.

SECTION 4.2 UNIVERSITY PARK HPOZ PERIODS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The University Park HPOZ is predominantly built in styles from the first three periods of significance, which correspond with the three building booms mentioned in the history above. They are 19th Century - High Victorian, Turn of the Century, and Eclectic Revival Styles. There are also styles within the district that come from a later Period of Significance - the Early Modern Style period.

19th Century Styles (circa 1860's-1900's)

- Eastlake/Stick
- Italianate
- Queen Anne
- Shingle
- Victorian
- Victorian Transitional

Turn of the Century (circa 1890's-1920's)

- American Foursquare
- Arts & Crafts
- Colonial Revival
- Commercial Vernacular
- Craftsman
- Mission Revival

Eclectic Revival Styles (circa 1915-1940)

- Chateauesque
- Dutch Colonial Revival
- Mediterranean/Italian Renaissance Revival
- Spanish Colonial Revival

Early Modern Styles (circa 1900-1950)

- Art Deco/Moderne
- Prairie

5.0 Historic Resource Survey

SECTION 5.1 INTRODUCTION

The Historic Resources Survey is a document which identifies all “Contributing” and “Non-contributing” structures and all contributing landscaping, natural features and sites, individually or collectively, including street features, furniture or fixtures within a HPOZ, and has been certified as to its accuracy and completeness by the Cultural Heritage Commission.

SECTION 5.2 NATIONAL REGISTER

National Historic Landmarks are nationally significant historic places designated by the United States Secretary of the Interior because they possess exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting the heritage of the United States. Today, fewer than 2,500 historic places bear this national distinction. Working with citizens throughout the nation, the National Historic Landmarks Program draws upon the expertise of National Park Service staff who work to nominate new landmarks and provide assistance to existing landmarks. The National Historic Landmark Stewards Association also works to preserve, protect, and promote National Historic Landmarks.

Listed on the National Register of Historic Places

The major source of information for this category is the U. S. Government publication of the Federal Register. This source represents sites approved for Listing on The National Register of Historic Places by the Keeper of the National Register and the Office of the Secretary of the Interior. The listing of this source is followed by the date listed on the National Register, when available. This report was obtained from the National Park Service in the form of their National Register Information System (NRIS).

Determined Eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places

Sources of information for this category include the Federal Register, the NRIS, and a list compiled by the California State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO) which includes resources listed on or determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

If the Federal Register list or NRIS was used, the date the structure was determined eligible (if available) accompanies the entry. Inclusion in documentation from the Federal Register publication or NRIS ensures that the resource has undergone all necessary review and documentation at both

the state and national levels to be officially approved by the Keeper of the National Register as having been either listed on or determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. This approval can only be changed by additional review and documentation undertaken to either list a site which has been determined eligible, or to decertify a site from its present level of significance.

If the California State Office of Historic Preservation list was used, the following category has been developed to distinguish the source.

California Historical Resources Inventory

The source of information for this category includes a list compiled by the California State Office of Historic Preservation which includes resources previously surveyed throughout the state. The evaluations used in this list correspond to the same evaluation levels 1-7 adopted for the Community Plan Revision Historic Resources Studies. This list was obtained from the State Office of Historic Preservation.

California Historical Landmark Number

A California Historical Landmark and its appropriate number as assigned by the State of California Department of Parks and Recreation. These sites have been assigned an evaluation of “5” until verified or reevaluated in the field.

Los Angeles County Points of Historical Interest Listing

The Los Angeles County portion of the list of California Points of Historical Interest is maintained by the Office of Historic Preservation of the California Department of Parks and Recreation. The entry includes the appropriate list number and the date approved.

City of Los Angeles Historic - Cultural Monument Number

The Historic-Cultural Monument List of the City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Commission and the appropriate Monument number. These sites have been assigned an evaluation of “5” until verified or reevaluated in the field.

SECTION 5.3 CONTRIBUTING OR NON-CONTRIBUTING?

To find out if a particular structure, landscape feature, natural feature, or site is contributing, consult the Historic Resource Survey or consult with your

HPOZ board. Depending on the contributing/non-contributing status of a structure, feature, or site, different elements of the Design Guidelines will be used in the planning and review of projects.

CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURES

Contributing structures are those structures, landscape features, natural features, or sites identified as contributing in the Historic Resources Survey for the University Park HPOZ. Generally, “Contributing” structures will have been built within the historic period of significance of the HPOZ, and will retain elements that identify it as belonging to that period. The historic period of significance of the HPOZ is usually the time period in which the majority of construction in the area occurred. In some instances, structures that are compatible with the architecture of that period or that are historic in their own right, but were built outside of the period of significance of the district, will also be “Contributing”. Work involving contributing structures should follow the Chapter 8 - Rehabilitation Guidelines.

Contributing Altered

Contributing Altered Structures are structures that date from the period of significance, built in the same time period as contributing structures, that have retained their historic character in spite of subsequent alterations or additions and the alterations or additions are deemed reversible.

In some instances, a structure that has been designated as a non-contributor, if restored to it’s original historic character, (i.e., the character defining features have been restored pursuant to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards) can be deemed a contributor and the survey can be amended to reflect it’s updated status per the Ordinance.

Contributing – from period of significance infill on vacant lots

Contributing infill structures are those structures from the period of significance relocated to a vacant lot within the zone and rehabilitated pursuant to historic standards; further these structures may be listed as a contributor and the survey may be modified to reflect this status as provided for in the Ordinance.

NON-CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURES

Non-contributing structures are those structures, landscapes, natural features, or sites identified as non-contributing in the Historic Resource Survey for the University Park HPOZ. There are two types of Non-Contributing Structures: those that date from the period of significance and those that do not.

Non-Contributing - from period of significance

Non-contributing structures that date from the period of significance are structures that were built in the same time period as contributing structures, but they have not retained their historic character through subsequent alterations or additions. As such, elements from both the Rehabilitation Guidelines and the Infill Guidelines in Chapter 8, will apply to these structures where appropriate.

Non-Contributing – not from period of significance or vacant lots

Non-contributing structures not dating from the period of significance are those buildings that were constructed too recently to contribute to the historic nature of the district. An example might be a more recent apartment block or an infill house constructed much later than its neighbors and in a different style. The infill guidelines will apply to these structures, as well as to new infill construction on vacant lots.

The Historic Resources Survey also serves as the starting point for the Architectural Styles, Rehabilitation and Infill Guidelines, and the Public Realm chapters found within this Preservation Plan.

When adequate documentation of an historic building's features and qualities does not exist an assessment of the existing conditions and their relationship to the original or historic architecture is a logical starting point when planning the reuse of a structure. Assessments of such significant structures should be conducted by a preservation professional or an architectural historian.

The Historic Resources Survey also serves as the starting point for the Architectural Styles, Rehabilitation and Infill Guidelines, and the Public Realm chapters found within this Preservation Plan.

The Historic Resource Survey for the University Park Historic Preservation Overlay Zone was prepared by Myra Frank & Associates Inc. on behalf of the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning beginning on January 10, 1999.

The University Park Historic Resource Survey is located at multiple locations for review:

City Hall
 Los Angeles City Planning Department
 Metro Division, HPOZ Unit
 200 N. Spring Street, Room 667
 Los Angeles, CA 90012

University Park HPOZ Board
 P.O. Box 15881
 Los Angeles, CA 90015

University of Southern California (USC)
 Doheny Library
 University Park Campus
 Los Angeles, CA 90089

Mount St. Mary's College Library
 Doheny Campus
 10 Chester Place
 Los Angeles, CA 90007

Los Angeles Central Library
 500 South Flower Street
 Los Angeles, CA 90071

Exposition Park - Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune Regional Branch Library
 3665 S. Vermont Avenue
 Los Angeles, CA 90007

Pico-Union Branch Library
 1030 S. Alvarado Street
 Los Angeles, CA 90006

SECTION 5.4 OTHER HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS

The following is list of other historical documents that are located in the Appendices as follows:

- Appendix A** City of LA Cultural Heritage Commission list of Historical Monuments
- Appendix B** University Park HPOZ Boundary Map
- Appendix C** University Park HPOZ Historic Monuments List
- Appendix D** Historic Preservation Overlay Zone Ordinance (Ordinance No. 175,891)
- Appendix E** HPOZ Process Overview
- Appendix F** Forms
- Appendix G** Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation
- Appendix H** University Park HPOZ Reference List
- Appendix I** Other Historical Resources