

UNINCORPORATED ALAMEDA COUNTY
HISTORIC SURVEY AND PRESERVATION ORDINANCE

Alameda County, California

April 4, 2008



Prepared for
County of Alameda

Prepared by



CAREY & CO. INC.
ARCHITECTURE



Unincorporated Alameda County Historic Survey and Preservation Ordinance

Alameda County, California

April 4, 2008

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The County of Alameda engaged Carey & Co. to conduct a survey of historic properties in Unincorporated Alameda County, including the Castro Valley canyons, Fairview, Hayward Acres, Hillcrest Knolls, Fairmount, and El Portal Ridge. This survey consisted of five broad tasks: (1) preparing a historic context statement; (2) completing a reconnaissance survey of properties constructed before 1960; (3) preparing a short list of 100 properties that appear to be the most historically significant; (4) conducting an intensive survey of 49 properties selected by the County of Alameda Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission (PRHC) from the short list; and (5) preparing a historic preservation ordinance.

Carey and Co. prepared a historic context statement that provides the County of Alameda with the necessary information to evaluate the historic significance of resources under its jurisdiction and that identifies important themes, geographic areas, and time periods. It begins with a chronological history of the county, focusing on major historical developments that impacted the evolution of the built environment. It also includes an overview of common architectural styles identified during the field survey.

The reconnaissance survey included a windshield survey of 1,688 buildings within the county's unincorporated areas that were constructed before 1960. Carey and Co. surveyed and photographed individual structures and compiled the survey results into a database, providing the county with basic information on each property. The database also integrates information on 940 properties that were identified in three previous historical surveys that focused on the East County, Ashland/Cherryland, and San Lorenzo areas, respectively. The "Summary of Findings" section provides an analysis of the reconnaissance survey.

From the reconnaissance survey, Carey and Co. prepared a list of 100 properties ("short list") that appeared to be eligible for listing in the Alameda County Register of Historic Resources, the California Register of Historical Resources, or the National Register of Historic Places (Rank 1) and those that appeared potentially eligible pending additional archival research (Rank 2). Carey and Co. based the selection primarily on visual observation during the initial

reconnaissance survey, on the information gathered in the historic context statement, and on previous architectural surveys. The selected properties represent a broad range of architectural styles, building types, and historic associations within unincorporated Alameda County. While this survey was not directed toward district documentation, Carey and Co. also made recommendations regarding potential historic districts and distinct resource types.

Drawing on the short list of 100, the PRHC selected 49 properties that appeared to be the most historically significant. Carey & Co. conducted an intensive survey of each property in order to gather sufficient information to assess its historic significance and integrity. The intensive survey included additional site visits and in-depth archival research at local repositories and culminated in the completion of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms for each surveyed property. The DPR 523 forms provide the County with a detailed description and evaluation of significance for each property. Carey and Co. also determined that 25 of the 49 properties appeared to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places. Appendix G outlines the criteria for listing properties in the CRHR and NRHP.

In conjunction with conducting the survey, Carey & Co. drafted a Historic Preservation Ordinance that codifies the regulatory processes pertaining to historically significant properties in unincorporated Alameda County. As such, the ordinance includes several components:

- The ordinance specifies the composition and duties of the PRHC and describes the role of the planning department in relation to historic resources.
- The ordinance establishes the Alameda County Register of Historic Resources and describes how properties are added to the Register, including specification of the significance criteria a property must satisfy to be nominated. The ordinance also describes how properties may be deleted from the register, and describes the notice and hearing processes related to nomination for addition or removal.
- The ordinance specifies what kinds of alterations to historic resources (including demolition) will trigger project review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and describes the review process. The ordinance describes the standards that reviewing bodies should use in evaluating a project and includes several sample mitigation measures that are commonly used to reduce impacts to historic resources.
- The ordinance describes the many incentives associated with historic preservation, including local zoning modifications or fee waivers, the California State Historical Building Code, the Mills Act, preservation easements, and Federal tax credits.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction and Methodology
II.	Historic Context
III.	Summary of Findings
IV.	Recommendations
V.	Bibliography
VII.	Appendices
Appendix A.	Survey Matrix of Properties Selected for Intensive Survey
Appendix B.	DPR Primary Record (523A), and Building, Structure and Object Record (523B) Forms
Appendix C.	Photographs of Intensively Surveyed Properties
Appendix D.	Historic Preservation Ordinance
Appendix E.	Key PRHC Decision Points
Appendix F.	Alameda County Register of Historic Resources, March 2008 Draft
Appendix G.	Regulatory Framework
Appendix H.	Reconnaissance Survey Database

I. Introduction and Methodology

Introduction

The County of Alameda engaged Carey & Co. to conduct a survey of historic properties in the county's unincorporated areas. This report provides the county with a historic context statement, an integrated database of surveyed properties, a summary and analysis of the reconnaissance survey, California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms for properties that appear to be highly significant, and a preservation ordinance.

Methodology

Historic Context Statement

Carey and Co. prepared the historic context statement using a range of bibliographic sources, including primary and secondary texts, maps, and photographs. The context statement is organized chronologically, with particular emphasis given to historical trends and events that played the most significant role in the development of the built environment. It begins with the inhabitation of the survey area by Native Americans and concludes with the end of the historic period in 1960. This follows guidelines outlined by the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, which state that the historic period ends 50 years prior to the current date, while allowing for a margin of additional years that bring the period of significance to the nearest decade.¹

The context statement also discusses, in general terms, the resource types identified in the survey area. The resource types are based on field observations and survey findings. The descriptions and historic background on each type are based on information from architectural history and historic preservation texts as well as the knowledge of the consulting architectural historians.

Reconnaissance Survey and Database

Using assessor parcel maps, Sanborn fire insurance maps, and historic street maps, Carey and Co. identified areas with high concentrations of buildings constructed before 1960. Historic street maps from the 1950s and early 1960s showed the extent of development in the survey area before 1960 and allowed Carey & Co. to eliminate roads which had been plotted after that decade. In order to define as precise a survey area as possible, Carey & Co. generally assumed that no historic resources were located on streets that did not exist on the historic maps. The survey undertaking also excluded any areas that had been addressed in the previous surveys of Ashland/Cherryland (1998),² San Lorenzo (2000),³ and East Alameda County (2005).⁴

¹ U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, National Register Bulletin 15 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1997), 2.

² Siegel and Strain Architects, "Preliminary Cultural Resources Survey, Ashland and Cherryland Districts, San Lorenzo, Alameda County, California." April 30, 1998. The survey prepared by Siegel & Strain identified 285 properties in the Ashland and Cherryland neighborhoods in San Lorenzo. The survey area was generally bounded by 150th Avenue to the north, Foothill Boulevard and Route I-580 to the east, Hesperian Boulevard and the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks to the west, and the Hayward city limits to the south.

³ Jody R. Stock and Michael Corbett, "Unincorporated San Lorenzo Historic Building Survey, Alameda County, California." November 2000. The survey identified 247 properties in unincorporated San Lorenzo.

However, Carey and Co. used the historic resources identified in these previous surveys as points of reference and verified whether they were still extant.

Carey and Co. surveyed properties constructed before 1960 that retained at least a moderate level of integrity. The survey excluded buildings constructed before 1960 that retained a poor level of integrity, since they would not be able to convey whatever historic significance they may possess. For each surveyed property, Carey and Co. created a detailed record that included such information as building type, construction materials, and notable features. The information was compiled into a database organized by street address.

The database also comprehensively integrates information on properties identified in the three previous surveys. Each of these surveys used its own system to rank properties' historic significance. The East County and San Lorenzo surveys each used four ranking categories, and the Ashland/Cherryland survey used three categories. Each ranking system outlined different codes (both alphabetical and numerical) that followed the general categories of "appears eligible," "more research needed," "eligibility unlikely," and "not eligible/lack of integrity." Carey and Co. verified that resources within each rank share similar levels of architectural significance and integrity.

The following chart outlines the ranking systems from the previous surveys:

Ashland/Cherryland Survey	San Lorenzo Survey	East County Survey
Y (Appears Eligible)	1 (Probably NRHP Eligible)	K (Likely Individually Significant)
P (Possibly Eligible)	2 (More Research Needed)	Q (More Research Needed)
	3 (Eligibility Unlikely)	E (Eligibility Unlikely)
N (Not Eligible)	4 (No Integrity; Not Eligible)	Z (No Significance/Integrity; Not Eligible)

Short Lists of Historically Significant Properties

Following the completion of the reconnaissance survey, Carey & Co. prepared an initial list of 684 properties that appeared to be historically significant and retained a sufficient level of integrity. This list was submitted to the County and the PRHC in May 2007 and included properties from both the reconnaissance survey and the three previous surveys.

This list of 684 properties included properties in the top two ranks from the three previous surveys.⁵ Using these prior ranking systems as a guide, Carey and Co. ranked properties identified in the reconnaissance survey that appeared to be eligible for historic designation or appeared to be potentially eligible pending additional research. Carey & Co. gave these categories of properties rankings of 1 and 2, respectively. According to this integrated ranking system, the top rank of 1 indicates that a resource appears to be eligible for listing in the Alameda County Register of Historic Resources, the California Register of Historical Resources, or the National Register of Historic Places. A rank of 2 indicates that more research needs to be done to

⁴ Michael Corbett, "Historical and Cultural Resource Survey, East Alameda County," Prepared for Lisa Asche, Planner, Alameda County Community Development Agency. June 17, 2005. The survey identified 408 properties primarily located in the San Leandro hills, including Niles Canyon.

⁵ This includes properties ranked as "Y" or "P" in the Ashland/Cherryland Survey, as "1" or "2" in the San Lorenzo Survey, or as "K" or "Q" in the East County Survey.

determine a resource's significance, but that, based on visual observation, the resource appears to have some significance. Such resources, for example, may possess notable architectural features or be of such age that they may be associated with historic persons, events or trends in the County's history. The remaining unranked properties were deemed to not possess historic significance or retain sufficient integrity.

In August 2007 Carey & Co. submitted to the County and the PRHC a short list of 100 properties (drawn from the previous list of 684) that appeared to be the most historically significant and to retain sufficient integrity. Following review of this short list, the PRHC selected 49 properties for Carey & Co. to research in-depth and document on California State Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms.⁶ These selected properties, some of which were not taken from the short list of 100, represent a broad range of architectural styles, building types, and historic associations within unincorporated Alameda County.

Intensive Survey

Following the guidelines outlined in the California Office of Historic Preservation's *Manual for Recording Historic Resources*, Carey & Co. prepared DPR 523 forms by conducting an intensive survey of the 49 properties selected by the PRHC. Site visits were conducted between October 2007 and February 2008. During these visits, Carey & Co. photographed and recorded architectural features of each property. Carey & Co. also conducted extensive archival research on the history of each property using a wide range of historic resources, including:

- Sanborn fire insurance maps
- Historic and recent topographic maps
- Assessor's maps
- Land surveys
- Subdivision maps
- Archival photographs
- Census records
- California voter registries
- California death indexes
- City directories
- World War I and II draft registration cards
- Local histories
- Vertical files
- Oral interviews with local historians and building owners
- County court records
- Newspaper articles

To provide a historic context for each property, Carey & Co. also conducted archival research concerning the general area and consulted numerous architectural histories, field guides, and previous architectural surveys. In completing the DPR forms, Carey & Co. identified properties that appeared eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Properties and evaluated all other properties for their significance within the local historic context.

⁶ While 50 properties were initially selected by the PRHC, one property was later removed from the list due to insufficient historic integrity, and thus only 49 properties were included in the intensive survey.

In conducting this research, Carey and Co. consulted several local and regional repositories and persons, including:

- San Leandro History Room, San Leandro Public Library
- Livermore Heritage Guild
- Lucille Lorge, Castro Valley historian
- Hayward Area Historical Society
- City of Pleasanton Department of Planning and Community Development
- History Room, Oakland Public Library
- Court Records, County of Alameda
- San Francisco History Center, San Francisco Public Library
- Federal Lands Records, Bureau of Land Management, General Land Office
- Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley
- Earth Sciences and Map Library, University of California, Berkeley
- Environmental Design Library, University of California, Berkeley
- Historic Topographic Map Collection, Meriam Library, California State University, Chico

Historic Preservation Ordinance

Carey & Co. began preparation of the Historic Preservation Ordinance (see Appendix D) in May 2007 by reviewing several such ordinances from other jurisdictions, including Sacramento, Santa Cruz, Fremont and Santa Clara County, and reviewing the ordinance that the PRHC had drafted in 2003. Specifically, Carey & Co. extensively updated the text and structure of the 2003 draft ordinance (1) in light of the general guidelines set forth in the Office of Historic Preservation Bulletin “Drafting Effective Historic Preservation Ordinances;”⁷ (2) in light of the approaches taken in other preservation ordinances around the state; and (3) in response to the specific concerns that had been raised by the PRHC and the County regarding certain aspects of the ordinance. At the County’s direction, Carey & Co. submitted the draft ordinance to attorney Carolyn Douthat during the summer of 2007, and revised the ordinance in response to her comments. The ordinance was submitted to the County and PRHC in June 2007, and further revised in light of PRHC feedback at their July 2007 and August 2007 meetings. Key decisions made at these two meetings are summarized in Appendix E.

The Alameda County Register of Historic Resources (see Appendix F), which is established by the ordinance, identifies all Landmarks and Structures of Merit within unincorporated Alameda County. The composition of the draft register, which includes both Landmarks and Structures of Merit, was decided at the PRHC’s July 2007 and August 2007 meetings. Landmarks include (1) the 49 properties for which the PRHC requested Carey & Co. complete DPR 523 forms; and (2) 91 additional properties given the highest level of significance in previous surveys (properties rated “Y” in the Ashland & Cherryland survey, “1” in the San Lorenzo survey and “K” in the East Alameda survey) that Carey & Co. verified merited continued listing. Structures of Merit include 94 additional properties that were specifically recommended by the PRHC in October 2007 for historical consideration but not for DPR treatment.

⁷ California Office of Historic Preservation. *Drafting Effective Historic Preservation Ordinances*, Technical Assistance Series 14. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Parks and Recreation, June 2005.

PRHC Meeting Attendance

Throughout the duration of the project, Carey & Co. met regularly with County staff and the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission (PRHC) to provide updates on project progress and receive feedback on all work products. Recent meetings with the PRHC include:

- PRHC Meeting, July 5th, 2007
Senior Planner Bill Sugaya and Preservation Planner Matthew Davis, both of Carey & Co., met with the PRHC to review the draft preservation ordinance (submitted June 2007) and discuss major outstanding decision points related to the finalization of the draft ordinance.
- PRHC Meeting, August 2nd, 2007
Matthew Davis met with the PRHC to address remaining decision points regarding the draft preservation ordinance.
- PRHC Public Hearings, December 6th, 2007 and February 7th, 2008
On both dates, Matthew Davis gave a public presentation summarizing the survey process and outlining the main provisions of the draft preservation ordinance. Mr. Davis also responded to questions from the County and the public following his presentation.

II. HISTORIC CONTEXT

Native Inhabitants⁸

Indigenous Californians once accounted for the densest and most linguistically and culturally diverse populations in all of the territory that now makes up the continental United States. Approximately 300,000 people who spoke between sixty-four and eighty languages lived within the boundaries of modern-day California. Before the European settlement of the San Francisco Bay Area, the region was occupied by Native Americans known as the Ohlone (a relatively recent identifier coined by indigenous groups), whom the Spanish referred to as *Costanoans*. The territory of this tribe extended along the coast from the mouth of San Francisco Bay in the north to Carmel in the south, and as far as sixty miles inland. The Ohlone are believed to have inhabited the area since 500 AD or earlier.⁹

Like most California tribes, the Ohlone were a hunter-gatherer and “basket-maker” society that did not develop a written language or build permanent architecture. They lived in conical-shaped huts made with poles, woven reeds, and grass thatch and depended on acorns and seafood for sustenance. Traveling in *balsas*, a type of canoe made of tule reeds, the Ohlone fished the bay for their main food source: fish, mussels, oysters, and seals. Their diet also included seeds, berries, roots, land mammals, waterfowl, reptiles, and insects. The Ohlone are known to have used bows and arrows, cordage, bone tools, and twined basketry to procure and process their foodstuffs. Though not an agricultural society, the Ohlone managed the production of various plants

⁸ Much of this context statement has been adapted closely from three previous surveys: (1) Jody R. Stock and Michael Corbett, “Unincorporated San Lorenzo Historic Building Survey, Alameda County, California,” November 2000. (2) Michael Corbett, “Historical and Cultural Resources East Alameda County,” June 2005. (3) Siegle & Strain, “Preliminary Cultural Resources Survey, Ashland and Cherryland Districts, San Lorenzo, Alameda County, California,” 30 April 1998.

⁹ Richard Levy, “Costanoan,” in *California*, ed. R. F. Heizer, Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 8., general ed. W. C. Sturtevant (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), 485-495.

through controlled burning (a practice that was later halted by the Spanish to the detriment of the local environment).¹⁰

The Ohlone inhabited a natural environment of grasslands and oak forests, filled with natural springs and creeks, lush vegetation, and abundant game. They settled in communities that the Spanish later termed *rancherías*, which were small villages of unrelated family groups that collaborated in hunting, harvesting, and religious practices. In the subject area, they tended to gather around water courses such as San Lorenzo Creek, San Leandro Creek, Dry Creek and Sulphur Creek and in the sheltered canyon lands like those around Castro Valley. The Ashland and Cherryland districts of San Lorenzo are located within the territory of the Chochenyo tribelet of the Ohlone. Their settlement was located south of San Lorenzo Creek, possibly within the study area. The exact location is not known, but it may be linked to CA-Ala-6, a Native American village site known to be within the study area along San Lorenzo Creek near the Southern Pacific Railroad (formerly Central Pacific Railroad) tracks. The San Leandro Indian Adobe Rancheria, an adobe house dating to 1837, was located “on top of the small hill 200 feet west of Foothill Boulevard between 155th and 159th Streets, within the study area, where the Fairmount Hospital stands today. Although no visible evidence of either site remains the probability of below ground archeological resources is high. Archaeologists believe that a population of approximately 150 native settled near a hot mineral spring formerly located in the area.”¹¹

Indigenous Californians and their ways of life survived virtually intact for nearly two hundred years after Christopher Columbus happened upon the West Indies in 1492 and European powers established Colonial empires in North and South America. With a vast desert in the southeast, formidable mountain ranges along lengthy stretches of the eastern and western borders, and difficult tides and winds to navigate, California’s natural landscape deterred Spain, the closest colonial power, to invest much time or energy in this region. The few disastrous explorations of California that Europeans made during the sixteenth and early seventeenth century – to find a northwest water passage through the continent, to find gold, or to find a safe harbor – simply reinforced conclusions that settling California presented far more difficulties than it was worth. As historians James Rawls and Walter Bean wrote, California presented little more than “a barren and dangerous coast that a ship sailed past once a year.”¹²

Spanish Period

In 1765, Visitor-General José de Gálvez exploited the Spanish crown’s desire to expand its wealth in New Spain as well as the crown’s fears of the incursion into its lands of other European powers, including England, the Netherlands, and Russia, to embark on his own mission to settle California. He convinced the crown to fund an expedition that would lead to the establishment of missions, a well-established colonial institution that ostensibly served to convert the natives to Christianity and divest them of their indigenous ways, thereby rendering a region more amenable to imperial rule. Missions also included a military unit, or *presidio*, and essentially functioned as towns, or *pueblos*. In 1769 Captain Gaspar de Portolá led three ships and two land contingents on this “Sacred Expedition.” A Franciscan priest named Junípero Serra served as the religious leader. A year later, after many disasters small and large, the Spaniards built a *presidio* and mission at Monterey Bay, establishing the crown’s sovereignty over Alta California.¹³

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ John S. Sandoval, *The Rancho of Don Guillermo: A History of Hayward, Castro Valley and San Lorenzo* (Hayward, CA: Mt. Eden Historical Publishers, 1991), 4.

¹² James J. Rawls and Walton Bean, *California: An Interpretive History*, 7th ed. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1998), 20-26.

¹³ Ibid., 26-35.

Civilian settlement of the area came several years later. In 1776, the De Anza Expedition arrived in Monterey. The settlers, lead by Juan Bautista de Anza, consisted of men, women, and children who had traveled from Arizona to populate the new Spanish territory in *Alta* (Upper) California. The majority was peasant-class Spanish citizens, and many were of mixed Spanish, Mexican, and indigenous heritage. Pedro Fages led a Spanish expedition in 1772 that likely crossed the San Lorenzo area, and the Juan Bautista de Anza expedition in 1775-76 certainly traversed the region.

Seven Spanish missions were founded in Ohlone territory between 1777 and 1797, and Alameda County fell under the jurisdiction of Mission San Jose, in present-day Fremont. Established in 1797 by Reverend Fermin Francisco de Lasuen, Mission San Jose consisted of a small complex of adobe structures located in the southwestern portion of the county. Its lands, as claimed by the Catholic Church, encompassed the entirety of the subject areas, including the distant reaches of East County. A rancho was established as an outpost of the mission on the banks of San Lorenzo Creek. Known as the San Leandro Indian Adobe Rancheria, it was constructed in 1837 by Jose de Jesus Vallejo, the mission administrator. As mentioned earlier, the house was located near a spring on the present-day site of Fairmont Hospital and the former site of an Ohlone settlement. El Camino Real del Norte, the major north-south road of the Mission Period, followed roughly de Anza's trail, very nearly the same route as today's East 14th Street/Mission Boulevard, and Mission-owned cattle ranged the vast expanses of land surrounding these tiny settlements.¹⁴

The mission system transformed Indian life all along California's coast. Mission leaders tried to convert local natives to Catholicism and a European style of farming, labor, and gender systems. Diverse tribes from the surrounding regions, including those from the Esselen, Yokut, Miwok, and Patwin, commingled within the mission, which fostered the beginnings of a pan-Indian identity (which eventually resulted in adopting the Ohlone name). California's indigenous population also suffered devastating losses under the mission system. Scholars estimate that disease, harsh living conditions, and low birth rates reduced the region's the Native American population alone from around 10,000 in 1770 to fewer than 2,000 by 1832.¹⁵

Mexican California

The Mexican Period officially started in 1821, when Mexico declared its independence from Spain; however, the effects of this revolution took a number of years to reach colonial California. Over the next dozen years the Mexican government created laws that secured the transfer of power. The Mexican Colonization Law of 1824 and the Reglamento of 1828, for instance, encouraged civilian settlement in California by creating guidelines for the establishment of land grants.¹⁶ As demonstrated by the history of the land that now makes up Alameda County, the Mexican system of land grants and ranchos differed dramatically from laws that governed Spanish rule over the land. The true shift in power from Spanish to Mexican rule occurred in 1833 with the Secularization Act. This act officially wrested control of mission lands from the Catholic Church and made them available for the private ownership of Mexican citizens. Private parties secured Mission San Jose in 1845.

While missions continued to operate, they did so under a far more secular organization involving salaried managers. The Indian neophytes were free to leave and often went elsewhere to establish small independent settlements, but primarily continued their European mode of life. They had

¹⁴ Siegle & Strain, "Preliminary Cultural Resources Survey, Ashland and Cherryland Districts, San Lorenzo, Alameda County, California" (30 April 1998), 4-5.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Dorothy Krell, *The California Missions* (Menlo Park, CA: Lane Publishing Company, 1989), 172.

learned European ways, and many had never known anything but mission life. Many went to work as wage laborers on the ranchos and mines, and others found domestic positions. Some groups returned at least in part to aboriginal religious practices and subsistence strategies – Native Americans continued to reside along San Lorenzo Creek, where an Indian hut was located on the land now used as the San Lorenzo Cemetery, and along the marshes as late as 1859 – but, for the most part, Ohlone cultures were greatly diluted.¹⁷

The areas that now comprise San Lorenzo, San Leandro, Hayward, Castro Valley, and East County were part of large land grants given to former soldiers and others who served the Constitutional Governor of the Department of California. The land grants of Don Jose Joaquin Estudillo, Guillermo Castro, and Francisco Soto made up present-day San Leandro, San Lorenzo, Hayward, and Castro Valley. San Lorenzo Creek formed the border between two of these ranchos: Estudillo's Rancho San Leandro on the north, and the Rancho San Lorenzo of Francisco Soto on the south. Border disputes erupted between the parties. Rancho Valle de San José, Rancho San Ramon, Rancho Santa Rita, and Rancho de las Positas made up East County. The Bernal family soon acquired titleship of Rancho Valle de San José, and Robert Livermore controlled Rancho de las Positas.

Jose Joaquin Estudillo first settled in the subject area in 1836. Born in California, he served as Comisionado of Mission Dolores (Mission San Francisco de Asis) from 1834 to 1835, and Alcade of San Francisco in 1836. The following year he petitioned for a land grant from the Mexican government (though it was not officially recorded until 1842) and built a house on the banks of San Leandro Creek near the town of San Leandro. Only a relatively small portion of Estudillo's rancho was located within the subject area, covering the Hillcrest Knolls, Fairmont, and Ashland neighborhoods; however, the Hillcrest Knolls and Fairmont portion were pivotal elements, considering the conflict they would create between Estudillo and his neighbor, Guillermo Castro. Of note in the area of Hillcrest Knolls is the Mount Calvary Cemetery, located at the north end of Van Avenue. Here, Jose Joaquin Estudillo's wife was buried in 1879, underscoring its importance as the burial ground for the Rancho San Leandro. One boundary of the rancho ran through the center of the cemetery, near the present location of Fairmont Hospital. The water source on this land made it particularly desirable and led to ownership disputes between Castro and Estudillo, but Estudillo gained possession of that parcel.¹⁸

Guillermo Castro owned the largest rancho in the area, Rancho San Lorenzo. The Mexican government granted it to him in two portions – a "home lot" in 1841 in the vicinity of today's downtown Hayward and a ranch 1843. Castro's land ultimately totaled 28,000 acres and covered the subject areas of Castro Valley, the Castro Valley canyon lands, El Portal Ridge and Fairview, in addition to much of Hayward. Born and raised in Mexican California, Guillermo Castro was a member of a prominent Californio family. As a young man he served as lieutenant in the Mexican army. He later became a surveyor of land and worked for the Pueblo of San Jose to determine boundaries of public and private lands. He first settled in the survey area in 1839, when he built an adobe house in the center of present-day Hayward. Castro did not have legal title to this unclaimed land, but was a friend and political ally of California's Governor Alvarado. The land was also lay close proximity to a large and well-established land grant owned by his wife's family, the Peraltas.¹⁹ Castro established a ranch around his adobe and initially ran approximately 600 head of cattle on the land.²⁰

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Sandoval, *The Rancho of Don Guillermo*, 34, 77-80, 87-88.

¹⁹ The Peralta's Rancho San Antonio had been granted by the Spanish government in 1820 and was located north of Estudillo's rancho, with a small segment of shared border at the northwest of Castro's rancho. Beth Bagwell, *Oakland: The Story of a City* (Oakland, 1982), 10-13.

²⁰ Sandoval, *The Rancho of Don Guillermo*, 25.

In 1840 Castro made an official application for ownership of the land on which he was living. As a part of the new Rancho San Lorenzo, his initial homestead came to be called San Lorenzo Alto. Castro enlarged his adobe house at this time and built a chapel nearby. He also constructed a plaza and rodeo grounds, and planted gardens, orchards and vineyards. Small “herder’s camps” located throughout the rancho lands provided shelter and camping sites for the vaqueros who worked Castro’s herds. This cattle ranching activity primarily resulted in the production of hides and tallow.²¹ Guillermo Castro was a well-respected citizen in the area and served as the judge of the Contra Costa District, where he settled disputes over ownership of land, cattle, water rights and other community conflicts. He also took it upon himself to bring Indian cattle rustlers to justice and so kept good order on his Rancho.²²

Francisco Soto established a third rancho referred to as both Rancho San Lorenzo Baja and San Lorenzito (Little San Lorenzo), located just southwest of Castro’s land (south of Estudillo’s). It covered the subject area of Hayward Acres, Mt. Eden, Tennyson, San Lorenzo, and Hayward west of the Western Pacific Railroad tracks. A former infantry sergeant in the Mexican army, Soto spent the 1830s serving as the police commissioner in the Pueblo of Monterey (then California’s capital) and Lieutenant of the Monterey Presidial Company. He also presided over the secularization of the mission at Santa Cruz before settling San Lorenzo Baja. The Soto and Castro families were close friends, and Soto married Guillermo Castro’s sister in 1832. He obtained the land grant for his rancho in 1842. It measure about one quarter the area of Castro’s land, consisting of only 6,688 acres of primarily flat land.²³ Soto constructed an adobe house only a quarter mile from the Castro family home. The cattle from the two ranchos grazed together and events such as rodeos and slaughterings were conducted for both ranchos at once.²⁴

Rancho Valle de San José, Rancho San Ramon, Rancho Santa Rita, and Rancho de las Positas were established in the eastern portion of present-day Alameda County. The first of these, Rancho Valle de San Jose, was established in 1839 by the Bernal family, a large and prominent Californio family. Robert Livermore, a native of England who became a naturalized Mexican citizen and was instrumental in the settlement of the Livermore Valley, which bears his name, settled Rancho de las Positas. Livermore was the first settler to plant vineyards, fruit orchards and olive groves in the area, though this had little effect on local farming practices at the time.²⁵

Mexican rancheros prospered. All of the ranches, like virtually all of Mexican-era California, were vast, unfenced areas where large herds of cattle grazed on wild oats and other native grasses. These cattle were raised for their hides and tallow and very little for meat. The tallow for soap, and the hides for leather, were virtually the only export product of the period, and were shipped primarily to the eastern United States and Europe. As noted, Robert Livermore experimented with growing crops that would come to define California agriculture beginning in the late nineteenth century. Other early settlers cultivated grains, particularly wheat for flour, oats for hay, and barley for livestock feed, as well as corn and watermelon. Alameda County supplied plentiful game as well, including bears and deer, as well as geese, ducks, and a variety of other wildlife in the marshlands. Rancheros, meanwhile, spent money liberally. They constructed ever-larger haciendas and furnished homes and families with the latest fashions. Guillermo Castro was particularly well known for his extravagances and penchant for gambling, which would contribute to his eventual downfall.

²¹ William Self Associates, “Historical Resources Evaluation Report-580/Castro Valley Interchange Improvement Project,” CALTRANS District (4 April 2005).

²² Sandoval, *The Rancho of Don Guillermo*, 25.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Corbett, “Historical and Cultural Resources East Alameda County,” 1.

The rancheros enjoyed relative peace and isolation too. Few roads marked the landscape, except for two long trails that connected the ranchos to the mission in the south, which allowed for communication and commerce. Indians raided ranches for horses and cattle, but posed no significant threat to the rancheros. As early as 1827, American fur trapper and explorer, Jedediah Smith, led a brigade of men into the area encompassed by Mission San Jose. Other small groups of Americans passed through the county and some conflicts between those parties and the Mexican government did arise. For the most part, however, Americans established no permanent presence on the land.²⁶

Just twenty-five years after securing its sovereignty from Spain, Mexico found itself battling to save its territory. War erupted between the United States and Mexico in 1846, largely over the independence of Texas and its border. The United States overran Mexico with troops and won in a decided fashion. The war officially ended on February 2, 1848, with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ceded California (and other territories) to the United States and guaranteed that Mexicans residing in the territory at the time of the treaty could continue to reside there and would retain all rights to their property. Even rights to land that belonged to Mexican proprietors who did not reside on it would be “inviolably respected” as long as a contract for that land could be produced.²⁷ The signers of the treaty did not know, however, that gold had been discovered along the American River nine days earlier.

American Period

United States possession of California territory coincided with the discovery of vast quantities of gold in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada mountains. On January 24, 1848, John Marshall, an employee of a ranch and mill owner named John Sutter, discovered gold on the American River. News of Marshall’s discovery spread like wildfire and soon, as the saying goes, the world rushed in. Half of California’s population descended upon the region between San Francisco and the Sierra foothills, with the former’s population alone growing from fewer than 1,000 people at the opening of 1848 to more than 26,000 by year’s end. Huge waves of migrants from the East Coast and immigrants from Europe, Central and South America, and Asia commenced the following year. These settlers regularly squatted on already claimed land. By 1850, California’s population was sufficiently large that the territory could apply for statehood.

Americanization significantly impacted all of the ranches and rancheros in Alameda County. Early in 1853, Alameda County was separated from Contra Costa County, one of the original counties of California. It comprised all of the project area. San Lorenzo, San Leandro, Castro Valley, and Fairview, were located in Eden Township, while the East County subject area made up Murray Township, named after an early settler, Michael Murray. Under such organization, the Mexican rancho system was essentially overwritten and rancheros lost much of their political clout on their own land.

Despite the terms of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Mexican landowners quickly lost their property rights after the Gold Rush. The earliest settlers were ignorant – or disdainful – of the treaty and its protection of Mexican property rights, forcing rightful owners to undertake strenuous and ultimately futile legal battles to prove their claims. The Land Act of 1851 attempted to solve conflicts of land ownership, but it did not enforce the treaty and placed the burden of proof on land owners. Mexicans kept paper records, including written contracts and

²⁶ Stock and Corbett, “Unincorporated San Lorenzo Historic Building Survey,” 7.

²⁷ Rawls and Bean, *California*, 85-89; *Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo*, February 2, 1848, Article VIII (<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon>, accessed August 1, 2007).

maps of land grants, but the system was not as rationalized as the American parcel system, which divided land systematically into surveyed grids and kept a paper trail of titles. Mexicans relied on natural features as boundaries, and their title records were usually incomplete. These obstacles, combined with language barriers, usually resulted in losses by the Mexicans. Most disputes also took decades to resolve; those Mexicans who did win their legal battles often had to sell the property to pay for the legal fees.

All of the rancheros in the survey area successfully claimed their patents. The United States government confirmed Robert Livermore's Rancho Las Positas in 1854 and 1872; Bernal's claims to Rancho Valle de San Jose in 1856 and 1865; Estudillo's land grant in 1863; Castro's in 1865; and Soto's in 1875. By the time these lawsuits were settled, however, the ranchos had diminished. Legal fees and increased settlement during the 1850s in the Livermore Valley, for example, led rancheros to subdivide and sell their lands in Murray Township.²⁸

In 1851 a group of Anglos squatted along the fertile banks of San Lorenzo Creek. The settlement, named "Squattersville," developed on the northern side of the creek in the Four Corners. The squatters had been attracted to the fertile lands and abundant game along San Lorenzo Creek, and believed that the border disputes between Estudillo, Soto, and Castro such undermined ownership claims. Conflicts between the squatters and the rancheros were frequent, as the squatters attempted to enforce their claims by vandalizing rancho property, killing livestock, and erecting fences to keep grazing animals away from the creek that was their water source. Nonetheless, settlers began growing crops and as early as 1853 they shipped grain, fruit, and vegetables from Robert's Landing at the mouth of San Lorenzo Creek to markets in San Francisco. The San Lorenzo Post Office opened in the Four Corners area in 1854 on what is today Lewelling Boulevard. Estudillo, meanwhile, had begun litigation against squatters in 1852. While his wife claimed rent from the squatters during the litigation process, most of the land was parceled off to incoming settlers and Rancho San Leandro had all but disappeared by the time patents were settled. Following the death of Francisco Soto, his wife faced monumental financial difficulties and sold off her half of the rancho in 1853.¹

Guillermo Castro laid claim to the largest rancho in the survey area and the most spectacular downfall. In 1851 he encountered a squatter named William Hayward who had settled at the mouth of Palomares Canyon on the mistaken information that it was government land. There he hunted deer, until Castro requested that Hayward move farther down the valley and sold him a parcel of land at the present-day intersection of A and Main Streets. Hayward's eventual settlement in that location led to the founding of the town that eventually bore his name, and he was responsible for erecting the first building in what would become the town of Hayward.²⁹ Soon a store, lodging house, post office, stage stop and dairy products depot followed. As one of Castro's last acts as the Don of a prestigious Mexican rancho, he magnanimously assisted Hayward by plotting a town site around the community and named it San Lorenzo after his rancho, though it was commonly known as Hayward's Place or simply Hayward's.³⁰ First he sold parcels of his land around Hayward's property to settlers, thus enabling the town to grow and delaying his own economic demise slightly. Mounting legal fees and gambling debts forced

²⁸ Corbett, "Historical and Cultural Resources East Alameda County," 2.

²⁹ Ibid., 436.

³⁰ In 1860, when a post office was established, it and the town were named Haywood, due to a clerical error, but in 1876, the town was incorporated as the Town of Haywards, commonly called Haywards until 1894, when it became simply Hayward. City of Hayward, "About Hayward – History" <http://www.hayward-ca.gov/about/history.shtm> (accessed February 28, 2007.)

Castro to sell the remainder of his land holdings. In 1864, a year after confirming his land patent, Castro the remaining northern portion of the rancho to Faxon Dean Atherton for \$30,000, then relocated to Chile.³¹ Atherton later sold portions of the rancho to a number of individuals, though an 1878 map shows Atherton as the holder of many large tracts of land, mostly in the vicinity of the eastern side of Castro Valley, the canyons and Fairview.³²

Early Infrastructure

The American era introduced unprecedented development of roads, water resources, and communication lines. As the area grew, trails that connected the ranchos were expanded into roads capable of carrying freight wagons, carriages, and horse and buggy traffic. This period saw the construction of new roads as well. In 1853, the county built a wagon road through Niles Canyon (Ananian 1993: 8). By 1857, primitive roads linked the sites of future towns in the valleys. They also lead westward through Hayward Pass and Mission Pass to the flatlands along the bay, northward to the San Ramon Valley and Contra Costa County, and eastward through Livermore Pass, Patterson Pass, and Corral Hollow Pass to the Central Valley (Higley 1857). Many of these roads connected the existing mission roads to new towns and landings where produce was shipped to markets in San Francisco. The network of roads was erratic and anything but gridlike. Similarly, property lines for farmsteads in East County were formed by former rancho boundaries, roads, and natural features. The East County roads and borders were highly irregular in contrast to those in towns like San Leandro, San Lorenzo, and Hayward, which were platted with orthogonal lots and streets.³³

By 1878, the few dirt roads that existed in the Castro Valley and Hayward areas included what are present-day Mission Boulevard, Castro Valley Boulevard, Redwood Road, Crow Canyon, and "A" Street. Redwood Road was originally a logging road used to transport lumber from the forests north of Castro Valley to the bay, where it was then shipped to San Francisco and cities throughout the Bay Area. Wood planks "paved" portions of the road to make travel easier for the horse and oxen-drawn logging wagons.³⁴

A road through part of Guillermo Castro's former ranch in Castro Valley established the path for a main regional thoroughfare that continues to this day. William Maddox and Father Zachariah Hughes, a Methodist preacher, purchased 400 acres of Castro's land in 1853, which included the rights to a seven mile long toll road running through the area. The road ran from the El Camino Real (present-day East 14th Street, Hayward) to Dublin Canyon, where it connected to the Dublin Road (now East Castro Valley Boulevard). Established by the Dougherty family, the road led to their property at Dougherty Station in East County.³⁵ The toll road probably followed the path of present-day Castro Valley Boulevard, which at one time was known as Mattox Road (a small portion of the road, now located in Hayward, is still called Mattox Road),³⁶ and later

³¹ Sandoval, *The Rancho of Don Guillermo*, 130.

³² Thompson and West, *Historical Atlas of Alameda County*, 1878.

³³ Corbett, "Historical and Cultural Resources East Alameda County," 3.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ A 1880s map shows the distinct line of Castro Valley Boulevard, and Lucille Lorge notes that it was called Mattox Road. The author assumes the road to have been named for William Maddox, though the spellings are different. The author also assumes this to be the same road as the toll road mentioned by Sandoval, since the course from Castro Valley to Dublin runs approximately along that line and the association with Maddox is strong evidence of the connection. See Lucille Lorge, Robert Phelps, and Devon Weston, *Castro Valley* (Charleston: Arcadia Publishing, 2005); Daniel P. Faigin, "California Highways" (<http://www.cahighways.org>, accessed February 25, 2008).

became the property of the County and was named County Route 248. Dublin Road later became Highway 50 and was integrated into the route of the Lincoln Highway in 1911, going to Livermore and points east. Interstate 580 now follows the general path of these roads, though not exactly, leaving portions of the old roads as existing surface streets.

According to Michael Corbett:

East County has been a crossroads of major infrastructure developments of the industrial era. Because of its location and geography. Located between San Francisco on the west, and sources of water and power on the eastern side of California, as well as markets in the eastern United States, Murray Township has been crossed by several important linear systems because of favorable passes through the mountains that isolate the area around San Francisco Bay. Those systems have been significant not only to Murray Township but also to California. Some have been significant to the United States. In addition to the first transcontinental railroad and highway, the first transcontinental telegraph line was built across the township (in association with the railroad). Later, aqueducts, hydroelectric power lines and telephone lines have been built, many of them in the same alignments as the railroad and highways.

In 1877, a wooden aqueduct was built to carry water for San Francisco. The Spring Valley Water Company, which owns substantial amounts of land in the Sunol area, built an improved system, symbolized by its Sunol Water Temple, in 1910.

The development of water resources is a particularly important aspect of the general development of this area. Water has never been abundant, and until the mid-twentieth century has come largely from wells drilled by individual property holders. On farms and in towns, a characteristic feature of the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century landscape has been the tank house. By the 1930s, municipal water systems in small towns operated by the same principal, with larger tanks. When the Veterans Administration Hospital was established in the 1920s near Livermore, it secured its water supply by the old method — from a private supply. With the arrival of reservoir water from public supplies, in recent years, most of these private systems have ceased to operate.

In the early 1920s, early electric power lines were built across the valley and in the 1930s the main line of the Hetch Hetchy system bringing power to San Francisco was built. In the 1950s, the Delta-Mendota Canal was built as part of the Central Valley Project. In the 1960s, the California Aqueduct was built.³⁷

Lake Chabot, built between 1874 and 1875, was the most monumental water project completed in Alameda County during the late nineteenth century. William Pearce sold the land, formerly known as Hobler Ranch, to Anthony Chabot in 1873. Chabot was a pioneer in water resources development throughout Northern California. He began his career by engineering canals and ditches to supply water to mining operations in the Sierra during the Gold Rush, and he helped invent the hydraulic mining cannon in 1852.³⁸ He later developed reservoirs and distribution systems in Vallejo, Oakland, and San Jose. Lake Chabot served as a reservoir for another Chabot venture: the Contra Costa Water Company. Chabot engineered the construction of an earthen dam and combined his hydraulic mining cannon, Chinese labor, and horses to build it. Wild

³⁷ Corbett, "Historical and Cultural Resources East Alameda County," 4-5.

³⁸ Lucille Lorge, Robert Phelps, and Devon Weston, *Images of America: Castro Valley* (Charleston: Arcadia Publishing, 2005), 73.

horses ran across the project each day to pack down the earth. For a long time, the 315 acre lake served as the primary water supply for much of the East Bay.³⁹

Railroads and Town Growth

Urban (or town) and economic growth depends in part on the efficient circulation of people, goods, and information. The late nineteenth century saw the rise of the railroad and concomitant growth of towns and commerce in the subject area. By 1865 the “San Francisco, Alameda, and Haywards Railroad” ran through the Meek orchards near Hayward. Within the next few years, the Central Pacific Railroad, the first transcontinental route, completed in 1869, absorbed this railroad with San Lorenzo Station, located just north of the Pioneer Cemetery. Livermore and what became Pleasanton (originally Alisal) grew directly out of the development of the Central Pacific Railroad. Before terminating in Oakland, the Central Pacific also stopped at Niles, Hayward, and San Leandro. In 1879, the main line of the railroad was moved to a new route across the Carquinez Strait, but southern route remained an important branch, and the principal connection of the area to markets for its products. In 1909, a parallel line, the Western Pacific Railroad, joined the route of the Central Pacific Railroad (by this time known as the Southern Pacific Railroad). Castro Valley’s story diverged from these, as the Central Pacific Railroad provided the closest line – along the east shore with a stop at Hayward.

These railroads provided a lifeline between the rural towns and their even more rural hinterlands. By the time Thompson & West published its atlas in 1878, for example, Murray Township had been surveyed in the U.S. grid system of townships and ranges. In the hills, the typical parcel ranged from a quarter section (160 acres) to a section (640 acres) of land, with several over 1,000 acres. In the valleys, the typical farm was 80 to 160 acres, with many larger holdings as well, ranging up to several thousand acres held by Joseph F. Black, J.W. Dougherty, and Abijah Baker. While the majority of valley farms were shown with buildings, few of the hill parcels had been improved. The small nineteenth-century towns of Livermore and Pleasanton served the agricultural areas around them, and the farms and ranches of Murray Township depended on the towns for supplies.

Economic growth followed the growth of the railroad. Beginning in 1885 refrigerated railroad cars moved perishable fruit grown in the area to markets across the country, fueling a boom in local fruit production that continued for decades. According to the 1898 publication, *Alameda County, Its Cities, Towns, and Environments*, more fruit was shipped out of the San Lorenzo Railroad Station than any other station in the state. Stockyards, packinghouses, and the Trojan Powder Factory shipped their products via rail as well.

The railroad moved people as well. In March of 1878, nine years after the Central Pacific began to carry passengers across the continent, the Alameda and Santa Clara Railroad began service from Santa Cruz to the Oakland waterfront, passing through Mt. Eden and San Lorenzo on the way. It merged with the Southern Pacific eight years later. Southern Pacific lines ran fifteen passenger trains a day.⁴⁰ Railroads provided easy access to recreational destinations as well. Murray Township began to develop a recreation industry as early as 1870s when rail stops in Niles Canyon were used by picnickers. In the 1880s, wealthy visitors were brought in highly publicized trips to local wineries. Later, others came to places like “The Pines” and “The Buckeye Club” for hunting and fishing. Wagons took visitors directly from the railroad depot in Livermore to Mendenhall Springs on Mines Road in the latter 19th century.⁴¹

³⁹ Sandoval, *The Rancho of Don Guillermo*, 329-330; Lorge, *Images of America*, 71-73.

⁴⁰ Sandoval, *The Rancho of Don Guillermo*, 153.

⁴¹ Corbett, “Historical and Cultural Resources East Alameda County,” 5.

The advent of interurban railroad fueled suburban development during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Construction of the “Oakland, San Leandro, and Hayward Electric Railway” began in 1891. By 1892, 14.3 miles of track ran along the County Road (today’s East 14th Street/Mission Boulevard) between Hayward and Oakland. Cars ran every half hour from 5 a.m. until midnight daily. Side-feeder lines ran from Ashland Junction (near 150th Street and Mission Boulevard) along Telegraph (today’s Hesperian Boulevard) and along Ashland Avenue to Lewelling Boulevard. By 1895 sixty to seventy miles of interurban rail lines connected Oakland, Alameda, and Hayward. As transportation networks grew, farmlands and orchards were subdivided into town lots of about one acre each. Streetcar suburbs, including Ashland, Haywards Park Homestead, and Meek Orchards, developed along the line. Developers of the Meek estate emphasized the area’s proximity to the electric rail lines as a primary asset. An advertisement published in 1923, for example, offered various real estate options including:

- 1) “Orchard Home Sites - right on the car line ... or one block off the car line....”;
- 2) “Pear Orchard Pieces - For suburban homes, with full grown trees right in their prime. (The best paying orchard in the Meek Estate)....”; or
- 3) “Poultry Farm Pieces - with city water, sewers and new turnpike gravel roads within 10 minutes of the car line....”; and
- 4) “Poultry, Squab and Pigeon Farms - With city water and sewers. Big enough for 1000 hens or 4000 pigeons....”. “All of the above properties have city water and city sewers Street Cars all close by. Wonderful water level for wells.”

Electric rail owners created amenities to draw prospective home builders and buyers too: San Lorenzo Grove, an eight acre natural park, entered on 2nd Street (today’s Tracy Street) in the Four Corners area, became a popular destination. The park featured a dance pavilion, picnic grounds, playing fields, concession area, and an outdoor bandstand. It operated until 1917 when it was converted to an apricot orchard.⁴²

Automobiles and Highways

The twentieth century ushered in the era of the automobile. The first automobiles appeared in the Bay Area in the late 1890s, and became common after 1910. East 14th Street/Mission Boulevard (then called County Road) was the major north-south road in the East Bay. Running east-west, the route created by Foothill Boulevard, Castro Valley Boulevard, and Dublin Road connected with Hopyard Road, then Portola Avenue in Pleasanton to First Street in Livermore.⁴³ Collectively, these roads became part of the Lincoln Highway, which was the first transcontinental highway and opened in 1913. More than previous automobile developments, Lincoln Highway signaled the demise of the importance of the railroad in the region. Running from New York to San Francisco, Lincoln Highway followed the general path of today’s Interstate 580 through Alameda County, linking East County with the Castro Valley/Hayward area. Lincoln Highway in the Dublin area was described as a narrow path with weedy shoulders, while redwood curbs lined the segment from Dublin into Oakland. Some portions of the Highway were paved and others were not. Either graded dirt and crushed rock or sand sprayed with oil and rolled to create a viscous but compacted surface coated the segments through Alameda County were.⁴⁴ A 1923 gasoline tax provided for the construction and maintenance of

⁴² Siegle & Strain, “Preliminary Cultural Resources Survey,” 6.

⁴³ Chris Lewis, “Lincoln Highway’s Ghosts Echo from Many Roads, Highways” (*Oakland Tribune*, October 19, 1997), 17.

⁴⁴ Chris Lewis, “America’s Main Street” (*Oakland Tribune*, 19 October 1997).

more roads throughout the county around that time.⁴⁵ This led to a construction of a northern route for Lincoln Highway – one that roughly follows I-80 from Sacramento to Oakland – which opened in 1927. Although the Dublin Road/Castro Valley/Foothill Boulevard route now became the secondary transcontinental passage, it remained a major thoroughfare through Alameda County. Lincoln Highway through this area was incorporated into the U.S. Highway system as U.S. Highway 50. In 1928, it was also designated State Highway 84. By 1953, U.S. Highway 50 had become a divided four-lane road; I-680 was completed in 1967. By 1973, U.S. Highway 50 had become I-580.⁴⁶

Agriculture

By the late nineteenth century, unincorporated Alameda County's towns all functioned more or less self-sufficiently, with blacksmith shops, grocers, hardware stores, schools, and churches all established during the nineteenth century. Agriculture and agriculture-related industries, however, dominated the landscape and economy of the survey area before World War II. Excellent soil conditions, weather, and minimal frost meant crops could be grown year round. Situated near the bay with easy water access to California's largest city, San Francisco, and therefore linked to international markets, Alameda was ideally situated to lead regional agricultural production during the nineteenth century. The American settlers first raised potatoes, barley, wheat, and cattle, but like farmers throughout the state, they realized the lucrative potential for growing luxury crops, especially fruit trees, by the 1880s. Three industries eventually defined Alameda County's agricultural landscape more than any others: vineyards, orchards, and poultry farms. Although the large farmsteads had been subdivided to some extent before World War II, the population boom and housing shortage that coincided with that major event signaled the end of the agricultural era.

Grain production, particularly wheat production, dominated some parts of Alameda County, just as it did throughout California from the 1850s to the 1880s. Flour milling was one of the few large-scale manufacturing industries that succeeded in California and introduced the state into the world of international trade. During the 1840s, California had but a few small flour mills. The most famous of these was John Sutter's mill on the American River, not far from present-day Sacramento. Sutter never completed this mill, however, and never produced much flour. In January 1848, one of Sutter's employees, a man by the name of John Marshall, discovered gold. The rapid influx of people during the gold rush quickly strained California's agricultural production and exposed its inability to provide enough food – particularly breadstuffs – to the miners and other settlers. Despite the potential of California's rich soil to feed the masses, the territory and young state depended heavily on imports. It received most of its flour from Chile.⁴⁷

These circumstances rendered flour a valued commodity and led to high rates of inflation. In San Francisco, the price per barrel of flour in 1850 was \$15. Two years later that number rose to \$42 per barrel. Settlers in more remote locations suffered under much higher prices. In Columbia, a mining town in the Sierra foothills, for example, a barrel of flour cost as much as \$80. Tensions flared under these circumstances and caused miners and other residents of Mariposa to organize a meeting in 1852 to protest against the foreign-controlled flour monopoly.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Siegle & Strain, "Preliminary Cultural Resources Survey," 6.

⁴⁶ Faigin, "California Highways" (<http://www.cahighways.org>, accessed February 25, 2008).

⁴⁷ Paul N. Woolf, "A Historical Appraisal of the Flour Milling Industry in California" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1939), chapter 1, 1-4.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 4-5.

Ever opportunistic settlers sought to remedy California's dependence on imported flour. A number of small mills cropped up throughout northern California during the early 1850s; however, San Francisco established its position as the leader in flour production and retained this position for decades. Alameda County, with its close proximity to the city and vast stretches of arable land, provided the grain. Murray Township contributed significantly to this period of development. In 1860 several landowners in the Livermore area experimented with growing wheat. By 1862, expanding wheat crops were fenced and the period of free-roaming cattle came to an end. By 1865-1870, several farmers cultivated wheat crops of over 1,000 acres each, some with portions of their crop on more than one parcel. (Corbett) The Sacramento Valley proved a decent competitor to San Francisco and Alameda County, but production in other regions remained relatively small until the 1880s. More important to Californians than the region that produced the most flour was the fact that by 1853 the state had relinquished its dependence on imported flour. Prices fell accordingly.⁴⁹

Roberts Landing, a shipping facility established at the mouth of San Lorenzo Creek in 1853, facilitated early growth of farming economies and communities in the western area of the county. Captain William Roberts, a forty-niner who failed to find his fortune in the gold mines, was first drawn to the area while on a hunting expedition in 1850. He discovered that the abundant game could bring a fair price in the San Francisco market, so he moved to the area and built a landing consisting of a wharf and several warehouses at the mouth of San Lorenzo Creek. By 1853 a freight and passenger schooner offered regular service between the landing and San Francisco.⁵⁰ With easy access to the regional market, this part of Alameda County became central to agricultural production. Roberts Landing thrived until the 1870s, by which time railroads surpassed shipping as the primary means for transporting goods.

Although grain crops still dominated local agriculture during the 1880s, a shift toward luxury crops like fruits and vegetables had begun. The shift occurred for several reasons: California producers flooded the foreign market with flour, which led to price deflation. Just as the transcontinental railroad opened California's opportunity to trade in American markets beyond the Sierra, so too could other states introduce their products to the California market. Midwestern and Plains states took advantage of this opportunity, especially Minnesota and Kansas. In addition, overproduction of the wheat fields depleted the soil and rendered the crops both more difficult to grow and less satisfactory in quality. Instead, California agriculture focused on more diversified crops that required less overhead capital and yielded higher profits. Improvements in refrigerating technology, including refrigerated rail cars, for example, also made the preservation and marketing of fruit over long distances feasible and encouraged fruit production.⁵¹ Eden Township led the transition to such luxury crops. Already in 1883, the *History of Alameda County, California* boasted of the township: "It should be said, that in this vicinity there is the finest soil in the whole valley, as the magnificent orchards, splendid gardens, and ripe grain-fields indicate. It is truly a garden spot!"

By the late nineteenth century, fruit production defined much of Alameda County's agriculture. Like wheat production, meat production became part of a large national system based in the Midwest and regional production, such as that here, declined, and the growth of population in

⁴⁹ Ibid., 7-12; chapter 2, p. 11.

⁵⁰ Stock and Corbett, "Unincorporated San Lorenzo Historic Building Survey," 7.

⁵¹ Woolf, "Flour Milling Industry," chapter 8; Marguerite Hunt and Harry Lawrence Gunn, *History of Solano County and Napa County: From their Earliest Settlement to the Present Time* (Chicago, 1926), 101-106; Corbett, "Historical and Cultural Resources East Alameda County."

the Bay Area increased the demand for local vegetables, poultry, and dairy products. (Corbett) Eden Township had the most orchards in the area. William Meek and E. Lewelling had the greatest land holdings in San Lorenzo. They introduced some of the first fruit trees to the area and established large nurseries and orchards, which flourished and made the men very wealthy. Both built large residences around 1870, Meek on the south side of San Lorenzo Creek and Lewelling on the north. The Meek mansion still stands on Hampton Road. Other farmers and ranchers in the area pioneered the local production of such crops as cotton, cherries, apricots, potatoes, corn, and sugar beets. Pears, plums, were also popular, and chew trees were particularly abundant.⁵²

Around this time, parts of Murray Township, especially in the Livermore Valley, turned to large-scale grape and wine production. Previously, wine had been produced by the missions and by Robert Livermore on Rancho las Positas in small quantities. Illustrations in Thompson and West (1878) depict farm houses surrounded by vines and fruit trees by the mid 1870s. Only during the 1880s, however, were grapes and wine production promoted and winemaking developed as an important industry. Many farmers planted vineyards for the production of raisins, table grapes, and wine grapes. In 1887 Alameda County counted 90 vineyards, most measuring 20 to 25 acres. Just six years later, 156 vineyards covered Alameda County's landscape and a few wineries had been established as well. Due both to the quality of its products and the efforts of local boosters, Livermore Valley wine was widely recognized as an important vine growing region. In the late 1890s, phylloxera killed many vines and reduced production. In Prohibition ended virtually all wine production between 1920 and 1933. The Repeal of Prohibition in 1933 revived production, which continues to thrive today.

Transportation and technology altered the nature of Alameda County farming economy. The railroad both increased access to markets outside the Bay Area and brought settlers to the region, which increased the demand for agricultural products. Farms grew. The introduction of automobiles and the construction of numerous roads made truck farming (small farms) possible. No longer dependent upon easy access to rail lines, farmers could grow crops anywhere. Just as the railroad increased access to otherwise remote markets, so did the network of roads that emerged in the automobile age connect small farms to markets. The southern area of Murray Township developed during the twenties and thirties as small farmsteads surrounding the community of Russell City. During this period, fruit orchards and vegetable farms predominated, and poultry farms were common. By using new pickling, canning, and refrigerated transportation methods, produce was also sent to New York and Boston markets.

Poultry⁵³

"The first chicken hatcheries relied on primitive incubators, capable of hatching ten eggs at a time. A Petaluma factory for the manufacture of incubators produced "simple gas-burning apparatuses in which the eggs had to be turned three times a day by hand to simulate the hen's turning of her eggs with her beak, but they were soon in great demand. They won prize after prize when pitted against rival incubators and were soon being shipped to the East Indies, to Alaska, and to Germany," as well as throughout California (Smith & Daniel 1975: 235). Based on this early technology, six hatcheries were established in Petaluma in the 1890s. Hatchery chicks were at first sold only to chicken ranchers in the local area, but because newborn chicks are naturally hardy and do not need food or water for about forty-eight hours after they are born,

⁵² Siegle & Strain, "Preliminary Cultural Resources Survey," 5.

⁵³ Much of this section has been adapted from Michael Corbett's report "Historical and Cultural Resources East Alameda County."

hatchery chicks were soon transported by rail within a two-day radius of chicken hatcheries, and then as far as three or four hundred miles by rail express (Ibid.: 236).

“A parallel development that encouraged commercial chicken hatcheries was the specialized breeding of champion egg-laying chickens, with the white Leghorn emerging as the most successful egg-laying breed in California (Ibid.: 236). Whereas in earlier periods, production of eggs and chicken meat had been part of a diversified farm production, now it was possible to make a living raising nothing but chickens. ‘It was soon clear that this was a far more efficient method of production. Feed was cheap. Little land was needed (an acre or two would take care of a thousand chickens) and hardly any capital was required to set up business; a man handy with tools could readily build a simple chicken house. In California, the chickens stayed out of doors in all but the most inclement weather. Moreover, once the hen house was established, there was much less work to do than on the average farm.’(Ibid.: 237).

“Rising feed prices and falling prices for eggs persuaded some poultry farmers to turn from egg production to the production of baby chicks. The hatchery business was considered more reliable than other phases of the poultry business because the price of chicks was much less subject to fluctuations of the market than was the price of eggs. Hatchery customers included not only those ranchers just starting out in business but also established ranchers who relied on hatcheries as a convenience. The largest hatchery in Petaluma in the 1910s was 160 feet long and produced a hatch of more than 150,000 birds every three weeks (Ibid.: 246). Newborn chicks were placed under “brooders” to keep warm and to dry. When dry, they were placed in boxes holding a hundred chicks.

“The new science of poultry management that emerged by the 1910s laid the foundation for sweeping changes in chicken raising and ultimately to enormous growth in the production of chickens and eggs. While Petaluma was the self-proclaimed “Egg Basket of the World”, other California counties, including Santa Cruz, Sacramento, Alameda, Los Angeles, Stanislaus and Riverside counties were important producers as well, and egg production was carried on just as intensively in the eastern United States (Ibid.: 241).”

The poultry industry in Alameda County had its beginnings before 1870. In 1880, the periodical *Poultry News* was published in San Leandro. Several factors allowed small farmers successfully raised chickens and other poultry in the area. The mild climate, access to markets, availability of cheap land and cheap labor, and plentiful supplies of grain for feed were all conducive to poultry raising. While the primary poultry area in Alameda County was Eden Township, Murray Township was also a poultry area. One writer described “A California General Purpose Poultry Ranch” as a common type of small operation where fruit, poultry, and bees could be efficiently raised together (Swaysgood 1915: 20).

Between 1910 and 1940 Castro Valley emerged as the second most prominent chicken and egg producer in the state, after Petaluma. Arthur Bailey and A.J. Geandrat established the first commercial poultry farm in Castro Valley in 1906 by. Others soon followed. A cooperative called the Hayward Poultry Producers Association was formed to promote the interests of poultry farmers in the area. At its peak there were twelve hatcheries and hundreds of chicken farms, most between five to twenty acres in size. During the 1920s Castro Valley still had a population of about 2,000 people, but 800,000 hens.⁵⁴ A typical chicken farm during the mid-1930s and 1940s had from 200 to 500 chickens and could provide a good living for farm families. For example, a small chicken farm with a flock of 1,000 chickens could produce a profit of \$4,000⁵⁵

⁵⁴ William Self Associates, “Historical Resources Evaluation Report: I-580/Castro Valley Interchange Improvement Project.”

⁵⁵ Corbett, “Historical and Cultural Resources East Alameda County, June 2005,” 19.

in the 1940s and early 1950s, about 20% higher than the U.S. average in 1950.⁵⁶ The poultry farms typically consisted of a group of buildings; a bungalow facing the road, a principle farm building or buildings (hatchery, egg laying house, etc.) near the front of the lot, a tank house, chicken houses and fenced-in yards.

Advances in poultry management were brought to local farmers by the Agricultural Extension Service of the University of California (est. 1914), and by the Alameda County Farm Bureau.

During the 1930s the chicken industry experienced another technological revolution: the introduction of artificial light around the clock to stimulate egg production (Smith and Daniel 1975: 264-69). Since successful poultry production depended on achieving the highest possible ratio of eggs to chicken feed, poultry farmers were usually quick to adapt to technical innovations, including vaccinations of chicks, in hopes of reducing costs per bird. By 1938, Alameda County produced 45 million eggs from 375,000 hens, worth \$5,000,000.

The small chicken farm remained a viable option for those seeking economic independence throughout the 1940s and during the post-war period (Ibid.: 273). A new chicken rancher could rely on help from a county agricultural agent, and a favorable climate for bank loans as well as an array of eager suppliers of feed and equipment. In the immediate post-war period, a flock of a thousand chickens could be counted on to produce, in a good year, four thousand dollars in profits — a comfortable income in the late 1940s and early 1950s (Ibid.: 274). At that time, “California was producing less eggs than it consumed” (Biddle 1989: 370).

This happy state of affairs did not last. Harwood Hall narrates a number of reasons why poultry farming died out in Castro Valley during the 1950s and 1960s.⁵⁷ Mechanization, vertical integration, and economies of scale made it harder for individual poultry farmers to compete. Small producers, who required a 25-cents-per-bird profit, couldn’t compete with larger operations that could turn a profit with ¼ cent per bird. In 1950, an operation was considered large with 1,000 fryers per week, by 1960, 100,000 was considered common. But large flocks increased the incidence of disease while new suburban residents objected to the flies and noise. With post war population growth, the poultry farms became more valuable as homes sites than as farms. Many were subdivided and sold for residential development.

Society

The latter half of the nineteenth century saw more settlers coming into Alameda County. Whereas Americans had represented the initial wave of settlement in the Hayward/Castro Valley areas, other ethnic groups followed. A large number of Portuguese immigrants settled in Eden Township and established vegetable and poultry farms. Additionally, Danish immigrants settled in the Mt. Eden area around 1860. The latter a settlement came to be known as “Little Copenhagen.”⁵⁸ Census records show that by 1900 Japanese immigrants were living in the area and working on farms as laborers too. A largely immigrant population is represented in the burials present in the San Lorenzo Pioneer Cemetery.⁵⁹ A table of prominent landowners in the 1878 Thompson & West atlas showed the majority to have been born in other states of the United States, but natives of Germany, Denmark, and Ireland were also significantly represented. In addition, native Californians, Mexicans, Chinese, and others who did not own land but were hired as labor occupied the land. A majority of the residents of the area, including immigrants, lived in family groups. In situations where single men lived together in a boarding

⁵⁶ Fifties Web. “Prices in 1950” (www.fiftiesweb.com/pop/prices-1950.htm).

⁵⁷ Harwood Hall, *Eden Township: Its Agriculture* (Hayward Area Historical Society, 1997) 211,214,215.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 8.

⁵⁹ Siegle & Strain, “Preliminary Cultural Resources Survey,” 5.

house, most were from the same ethnic group. Although ethnicities were mixed throughout the area, they often chose to settle near their countrymen.

One immigrant group deserves particular attention: the Portuguese. According to a recent study by Donald Warrin (p. 94)

Portuguese immigration to the United States has traditionally concentrated in three geographic regions: New England, California, and Hawaii. Initial immigration by Portuguese to each of these areas was the result of their participation in the American whaling industry of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. During this period the Portuguese Atlantic islands — the western Azores in particular — were a favorite stopping point for American whalers to replenish supplies and fill out their crews . . . These islanders were able to move early to California, especially after 1848, as whaling crews headed for the Gold Rush.

Portuguese participated heavily in the early placer mining in the Sierra Nevada and Siskiyou ranges, and later many continued north and east inland in search of precious metals. Industrious and parsimonious in the extreme, they were often able to leave the mines with nest eggs, which they then invested in other enterprises, such as stores, farms, or livestock.

Others, arriving after the surface minerals had been substantially worked out, had to find another source for capital accumulation.

As towns and cities in Alameda County grew dramatically in the early twentieth century and continued to attract, among other groups, Portuguese immigrants. Census records for 1910 show that many of the Portuguese in the area were the children of Azoreans (Portuguese), who had settled in the country in the 1880s and 1890s; thus, early twentieth-century arrivals joined established and flourishing Portuguese communities. Indeed, the 1911 United States Senate's *Report of the US. Immigration Commission* (Vol. 24, Part 11, *Immigrant Farmers in the Western States*, Chapter XIV) indicates that nearly two-thirds of the 2,600 residents of San Leandro were of Portuguese descent. In the twentieth century the Portuguese have been best known for their work in the dairy and tuna fishing industries. In addition, they were involved with "another industry of major importance to the economy of California and to the island immigrants from Portugal — the production of sheep." The traditional way of raising sheep was largely obsolete by the twentieth century, especially in the more densely settled regions, such as Alameda County (p. 100):

Sheepmen in the West came to practice what is known as "transhumance," a system, popular on the Iberian Peninsula, in which the sheep are driven into the mountains in the summer and returned to the warmer valleys with the approach of winter. Thus, sheep were almost always migratory, spending little time in one locale (no more than two days was a rule of thumb) unless they were being fed at the home ranch. As California became more settled and fences began to go up in the late nineteenth century, the life of the sheepman became more complex.

Portuguese in California cities, especially in the East Bay formed religious, fraternal, community organizations beginning in the 1860s. Social and protective societies like the Portuguese Union

of the State of California based in San Leandro and Holy Ghost societies offered members social gatherings, picnics, parades, and life insurance.

Infrastructure Improvement in the 1930s

Castro Valley and Murray Township saw the most important infrastructure improvements during the 1920s. Two bond measures in the 1930s helped spur residential development in Castro Valley. Water service from the East Bay Municipal Utility District came in 1930 and a sewer system was created with the formation of the Castro Valley Sanitary District in 1939. Municipal water systems established during the 1930s finally addressed the constant need for water to irrigate vast expanses of farmland in East County as well. These systems included miles of simple irrigation ditches, which conveyed water from local rivers into the surrounding fields, and were managed and maintained by organized municipal water districts. The Hetch Hetchy Aqueduct of the San Francisco Water System also crossed the East County area in the 1920s and 1930s.

Though this system did not provide water to any part of Alameda County, it was a major feat of engineering that crossed the landscape. Other public improvements included the establishment of the Veterans Administration Hospital and the Del Valle Sanitarium, south of Livermore, and continued improvements to Fairmont Hospital in San Leandro, and general road improvements.

World War II and After

With the shift to orchard, poultry, and vegetable farming in the late nineteenth century, farmers and landowners throughout Alameda County sold off parcels. Some of these parcels simply became smaller farms, but others were subject to suburban development. Hermann Mohr, the son of a prominent farmer who settled in Mt. Eden during the 1850s, subdivided his land early in the twentieth century. During the 1920s large portions of William Meek's vast transformed into the Meek Orchards residential subdivision, and James Willison built the first planned development in Cherryland, complete with standardized homes, curbed sidewalks, a paved road, and garages for every homeowner's car. Castro Valley's distance from the railroad and interurban rails protected it from much development, but with the rising popularity of the automobile during the 1910s and opening of Lincoln Highway, which ran straight through Castro Valley, suburban middle-class homes and roadside hotels began to crop up alongside the poultry farms. Despite changes like these, the character of unincorporated Alameda County remained basically rural and its economy remained almost wholly agricultural or related to agricultural service and processing. World War II, however, accelerated the trends towards suburbanization on an unprecedented scale and signaled the beginning of an entirely new era.

A variety of factors fell into place allowing for suburban development in previously unsuitable areas and on a scale that few could imagine before the late 1930s. Automobiles first released suburban developers from limiting their projects to sites near railroads and interurban rail lines. Before the 1930s, most developers limited their activities to platting streets and grading them, installing sewers systems and other infrastructure details like phone lines and electricity. Few developers built more than ten homes a year, leaving that task to home owners and resulting in a landscape of individualized homes (though most people adopted popular styles and many followed pattern book plans). In 1934 the federal government established the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and introduced new policies that transformed this pattern of residential development. It encouraged banks to offer long-term, low-interest loans mortgages (twenty or thirty years instead of five or ten) by guaranteeing federal funds to the bank should the borrower default. Increasingly standardized housing and new building techniques also sped up the rate of construction and made it cheaper.⁶⁰ The "California system," perfected by David E. Bohannon (discussed below), epitomized these changes.

⁶⁰ Gwendolyn Wright, *Building the American Dream: A Social History of Housing in America* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981), 240-261.

Demand for housing achieved a new urgency too. Wartime industries brought hundreds of thousands of migrants to California and introduced new landscapes in Alameda County. In East County, for example, the U.S. Naval Auxiliary Air Field was established northwest of Livermore and Parks Air Force Base was located near Pleasanton. (Corbett) The rest of the survey area did not see military bases or large shipbuilding yards and aeronautics facilities, but it did welcome a huge influx of people, many of whom worked at the shipyards throughout the Bay Area and all of whom needed things like housing, schools, recreational and entertainment sites, shops, and medical facilities. The G.I. Bill provided generous postwar benefits to military veterans, including subsidies for homeownership, which further encouraged subdivision of farmlands and widespread residential development, and a postwar baby boom increased the demand for housing again. According to historian Gwendolyn Wright, “the most conservative reports from the government’s National Housing Agency estimated that the country needed at least 5 million new units immediately and a total of 12.5 million over the next decade.”⁶¹

While all of the survey area saw tremendous population growth and suburbanization during World War II and after, San Lorenzo Village, a postwar housing development planned by David D. Bohannon, stands out as the most important example of the mid-century transformation of the agricultural landscape. Between 1939 and 1944, David D. Bohannon had perfected the “California method” of home building, or using pre-cut wood and an assembly line process to build large-scale developments of similarly styled and planned, modest single family homes. After building developments of 300 houses in nine months in San José, followed by 500 houses in Napa, and 700 houses in four months in Richmond, Bohannon set his sights on the undeveloped farmlands of San Lorenzo. He purchased 350 acres in 1944 and built 1500 homes within a year. Eventually, San Lorenzo Village comprised 4500 houses as well as shopping centers, entertainment and recreational facilities, community centers and schools. San Lorenzo Village typified rapid postwar developments that anticipated and responded to the huge population growths that came with World War II migrations to California, followed by the baby boom.⁶²

Postwar developments also reflect the dominance of the car in the late twentieth century. Large tracts of small lots were clustered together, while access to work, commercial development, and other services generally required an automobile. The construction of the Eastshore or Nimitz Freeway, now Interstate 880, built between Emeryville and San Jose from 1946 to 1960, contributed to the increased ease of transportation in the Castro Valley/Hayward area. Its construction subsequently stimulated the growth of commercial development along major surface streets such as East 14th Street/Mission Boulevard, Lewelling Boulevard, Foothill Boulevard, and Meekland Avenue.⁶³ Route 238 freeway was run through the middle of the study area north of Lewelling Boulevard in the 1960s. This had the greatest effect on the Ashland neighborhood. I-680 through Dublin, Pleasanton, and San Ramon, was completed in 1967. By 1973, U.S. 50 had become I-580, and the old Naval Auxiliary Air Field and old farms, especially around the cities of Livermore and Pleasanton were redeveloped as housing subdivisions. (Corbett)

Common Architectural Styles

The housing stock of unincorporated Alameda County generally mirrors the evolution of prevailing architectural styles throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. Consistent with the region’s relatively slow development up to World War II, relatively few structures date to earlier

⁶¹ Ibid., 242.

⁶² Andrew Hope, “Evaluating the Significance of San Lorenzo Village, A Mid-20th Century Suburban Community” *CRM Journal*, 2 (Summer 2005), <http://crmjournal.cr.nps.gov>, accessed February 20, 2008; Doris Marciel and the Hayward Area Historical Society, *Images of America: San Lorenzo* (San Francisco: Arcadia Publishing, 2006).

⁶³ Siegle & Strain, “Preliminary Cultural Resources Survey,” 6-7.

than the mid-Twentieth Century. The majority of the housing stock exhibits the styles popular during the World War II era and after. Most houses are modest in size, indicating a largely middle- and working-class population, which was probably further influenced by the relatively rural nature of unincorporated Alameda County. The following discusses general architectural trends by decade and the prevalence of those styles in unincorporated Alameda County:

Pre-1900s

Most Victorian-era houses in the area probably date to the late nineteenth century and were built as farm houses when agricultural industries still dominated the local economy and landscape. The houses of this era that do survive are primarily found singly and at a distance from one another, reflecting the rural aspect of the area at that time and the organization of a single farm house located on large tracts of farmland. Many of the remaining houses of such age are well known as having belonged to prominent pioneer families, such as the Strobridge House, Stanton House, Mohr House, and Meek House. They range in style from Queen Anne Victorian, to Gothic Revival, to Italianate. They also exhibit a broad range in size, from large houses like those named above, to more modest Victorian cottages or small Folk Victorian houses. No matter the size however, Victorian era architecture typically demonstrated ornate and abundant detailing. These Victorian era styles often lap over the turn of the century and continued to be used during the early years of the 1900s.

Beginning with some of the earliest homesteads through the 1940s, the owners of agricultural properties satisfied a need for a dependable water supply by constructing water towers or tank houses. Several of these tank houses remain in the survey area. Most of these are associated with houses dating from the turn of the twentieth century through the 1920s. Domestic water towers were first developed in California about 1865, following the example of the many elevated water tanks built by the railroads. They typically take the form of a tall, square building with walls that taper toward the top and were usually built using heavy timber and brace-frame construction in order to carry the weight of the water in the tank at the top. Many now lack the round barrel-like tank that once sat on top of the structure, but the remaining bases are still recognizable. Some have been converted to other uses.⁶⁴ Tank houses are typically located behind and in close proximity to a residence in order to supply water conveniently. Tank houses functioned by raising the water supply off the ground to create a gravity fed method of delivering water for domestic plumbing and garden irrigation.

Barns dating to the nineteenth century are prevalent in unincorporated Alameda County too. According to Michael Corbett, they “were in three parts, either enclosed by a large gable roof in one plane on each slope, or by a gable roof over the central bay with shed roofs of the same or different slopes over the side bays. Most of these barns were hay and livestock barns with hay storage in the central bay and animal stalls in the side bays. Before baling became common, loose hay was raised from wagons outside the barn on a hoisting beam, brought inside by pulleys, and stored in a loft. The earliest type of barn was of braced-frame construction with notched and mortised members specifically designed for particular positions in the structure. Later types were of nailed timber-frame construction and stud-wall construction. All types were generally clad in vertical plank siding, sometimes with battens.” (Corbett)

⁶⁴ Corbett, “Historical and Cultural Resources East Alameda County, June 2005,” 15.

1910s

Beginning in the 1900s and particularly popular during the 1910s and early 1920s, bungalow style homes began to be constructed. Initially, bungalows often had simple and utilitarian styles; they were known as simple bungalows. Later, and commonly when the owners were more prosperous, bungalows adopted architectural features that referenced the Craftsman style that was so popular in the 1910s and 1920s. "Bungalow style" denotes both the architectural style and the modest size of the house. All bungalows typically take the form of one or one-and-a-half-story structures with informal floor plans and prominent porches on the front facades. They are often constructed of wood, or at least use natural, inexpensive, and readily obtainable materials. Following the contemporary trend toward simplicity, bungalows were less visually complex and cheaper to build than preceding Victorian styles. Bungalows remained popular for several decades, often reflecting the stylistic motifs of their time.

By this time, the poultry industry had become common in unincorporated Alameda County, and remnants of this economy still stand. Chicken houses vary according to things like the size of the farm or specific function of a building, but among the most common type of chicken house is a long, shed roofed structure that stands about eight feet at the top. It faces south with large window openings to warm the chickens and dry out the interior, and is divided by a partition every few feet to keep individual colonies of chickens together. Open doorways allow the chickens to run outside into fenced ranges. Each interior section includes roosts, nests and egg-collecting equipment. The same structure can be outfitted in part for brooding chicks with other types of equipment. (Pasarello 1964: 72). (Easson 1923: opposite pages 33, 97, 128 and 160).

Hatcheries were even more common. Most hatcheries were rectangular stud-frame buildings with gable roofs carried on trusses to keep the ground floor space free of columns. The poultry literature suggested using the spaces between studs as parts of the ventilation system. Ventilating flues and monitors on the ridgeline are typically visible on the roof. Whereas other poultry buildings were usually open to light and air by doors, windows, and screens (they may have also had simple ventilation systems), hatcheries were closed, relatively dark buildings with tight interior siding on walls and ceilings for insulation. Because hatchery owners were small businesspeople who not only produced chicks, but had to sell them, hatchery buildings were commonly used as part of a public relations or marketing effort, with ridgeline signs or false fronts suitable for signs or other decoration. Of all the poultry industry buildings of the 1910s-1920s, hatcheries were the most expensive.

1920s

Though the bungalow style remained popular through the 1920s, revival styles gained popularity as well. These styles looked back to the architectural traditions of the past, and usually those of European derivation. In unincorporated Alameda, these revival styles most commonly take the form of Colonial Revival, Mission or Spanish Colonial Revival, Pueblo Revival, and Tudor Revival or English Cottage style. In most cases these houses are made of wood frame construction, but use cladding and veneering techniques that make them appear to be of brick, stone, or adobe construction, thus referencing traditional aesthetics while using modern and affordable construction methods.

The 1920s also saw significant commercial development, particularly along Castro Valley Boulevard. Commercial buildings of the era took substantial, block-like forms. They often had flat roofs with stepped parapets or followed the conventions of traditional Western False Front buildings. Unlike residential structures the use of poured concrete as the structural building material was typical, while masonry and stucco was still commonly used as exterior cladding.

1930s

The Great Depression nearly halted building construction throughout the country for much of the 1930s. Buildings that date to this period were generally small and simple in form and style, continuing the preceding bungalow trend in residential architecture, but also serving as a precursor to the more modern, clean line styles of the World War II and postwar era. Many buildings constructed during the 1930s are what can be termed Minimal Traditional style. They employ traditional forms and proportions, and feature minimal decoration and detailing.

1940s

World War II created a building materials shortage that kept construction at a minimum. Many small, inexpensive houses were built in the 1940s following the guidelines of the Federal Housing Authority, whose goal was to encourage affordable houses with modern features. These small houses are often referred to as World War II-Era Cottages and Transitional Ranches. The latter appeared mostly during the late 1940s, when the war-era cottage began to evolve into the elongated plan characteristic of the 1950s ranch house. Houses of the 1940s occasionally referenced the revival styles as well, particularly those with strong California influence, such as the Spanish Colonial style.⁶⁵

1950s

The vast majority of houses in unincorporated Alameda County date from the postwar years, when a building boom occurred. The most prevalent postwar style in the area is the ranch house; a one-story building with a long, low form. The geometry and decorative elements on the typical ranch house have a horizontal emphasis. Rustic details are also common. Scalloped eave brackets and trim, shutters with decorative cut outs, board and batten siding, and other quaint decorative elements lend the most elaborate ranch houses a “country” motif.

1960s

Although the 1960s do not lie within the current historic period, it is pertinent to mention a large architect-designed neighborhood on Greenridge Road in Castro Valley. Noted developer Joseph Eichler designed a tract of around 200 homes in Crow Canyon in 1963. These 3- and 4-bedroom homes are designed with a flowing one-story plan that references the outdoors through the use of large continuous expanses of windows and atriums. This Eichler development is similar to other Eichler neighborhoods built throughout California between 1949 and 1974. Two Eichler developments (constructed in 1950 and 1954-55) in Palo Alto are now listed on the National Register of Historic Places, suggesting the potential historic significance of these Castro Valley Eichler houses. Jones & Emmons and Claude Oakland & Associates contributed designs for the Greenridge development.⁶⁶ According to Arnold Anderson, the homes in Greenridge were more expensive than was typical for Castro Valley real estate in the postwar period.⁶⁷

The large number of structures built during the post-war period sets the dominant architectural setting of the unincorporated areas of Alameda County. While some neighborhoods are dominated by extensive developments of tract houses, it is also common to see streets (particularly those laid out early in the area’s developmental history) where houses dating from various decades and exhibiting a wide range of styles sit side by side.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Arbunich, Mary; Eichler Network Director. Communications with Richard Brandi. 17 May 2006.

⁶⁷ Arnold Anderson.

⁶⁸ Fred Wasserman, “Historic Architectural Survey for Proposed Improvements to Interstate 580 Castro Valley and Hayward, California” (California Department of Transportation, 1981).

III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Together, the reconnaissance survey conducted by Carey & Co. and the three previous surveys identified 2,628 properties in unincorporated Alameda County constructed before 1960. Carey & Co. surveyed a total of 1,688 properties during the reconnaissance survey. The following chart shows the number of properties identified by the each survey and the number of properties identified in the top two ranks. Resource with a “1” ranking appear to be eligible for listing in the Alameda County Register of Historic Resources, the California Register of Historical Resources, or the National Register of Historic Places, while those ranked “2” are potentially significant pending further research.

Survey Name	Total Number of Properties Identified	Number of Properties Ranked 1	Number of Properties Ranked 2
Ashland/Cherryland	285	38	59
San Lorenzo	247	19	35
East County	408	35	148
Present Survey	1,688	51	299
TOTAL	2,628	143	541

Of the total 2,628 properties identified, 684 properties were ranked 1 or 2 and were included on the initial list of properties submitted to the County and the PRHC in May 2007. One hundred of these properties were subsequently selected for the short list, which was submitted to the County and the PRHC in August 2007. The 49 properties selected by the PRHC for intensive survey and documentation on 523 DPR forms are listed below. A survey matrix of these properties is located in Appendix A, DPR 523 forms for these properties are located in Appendix B, and photographs of these properties are located in Appendix C.

Properties Selected for the Intensive Survey

- Livermore Veterans Administration Hospital, 4951 Arroyo Road, East County
- House, 728 Bockman Road, San Lorenzo
- Henry Bockman House, 782 Bockman Road, San Lorenzo
- Castro Valley Lumber Company, 2495 Castro Valley Boulevard, Castro Valley
- California State Hatchery, 2520 Castro Valley Boulevard, Castro Valley
- Crowe’s Feed Shop, 2544 Castro Valley Boulevard, Castro Valley
- Chabot Theater, 2845-61 Castro Valley Boulevard, Castro Valley
- House, 22047 Center Street, Castro Valley
- Red barn, Cull’s Ranch, 14563 Cull Canyon Road, Castro Valley
- House, 16874 Cull Canyon Road, Castro Valley
- Mt. Eden Cemetery, 2440 Depot Road, Hayward
- “Sea Breeze,” Herman Mohr House, 2595 Depot Road, Hayward/ Eden Area
- King Ranch, 22380 Eden Canyon Road, Castro Valley
- Farm house, 10366 S. Flynn Road, East County
- Alameda County Infirmary, Fairmont Hospital, 15400 Foothill Boulevard, Fairmont
- Superintendent’s house, 15400 Foothill Boulevard, Fairmont
- Heide House, 1048 Grant Avenue, San Lorenzo
- Grove Way Bridge, Grove Way at Mission, Cherryland
- Cornelius Mohr House and Farm, 24985 Hesperian Boulevard, Hayward

- Mai House, Hollis Canyon off Eden Canyon, Castro Valley
- Jensen farmhouse, 5922 Jensen Road, Castro Valley
- Barn, 16331 Kent Avenue, Ashland
- Holy Ghost Hall, 16490 Kent Avenue, Ashland
- St. John's Catholic Church, 264 E. Lewelling Boulevard, San Lorenzo
- Captain William Robert's House, Lewelling Boulevard at Embers Way, San Lorenzo
- Adobe brick building, 22319 Meekland Avenue, Cherryland
- House, 2033 Miramonte Avenue, Fairmont
- PG&E substation, Station O, 20095 Mission Boulevard, Hayward
- Francisco Alviso Adobe, 3461 Old Foothill Road, East County
- Bonnie Doone Ranch, 24829 Palomares Road, Castro Valley
- Chouinard Winery and vineyards, 33853 Palomares Road, Castro Valley
- "Spark Stoves" barn, 6446 Paloverde Road, Castro Valley
- Borloz Farm, 5196 Proctor Road, Castro Valley
- Houses, 911-960 St James Court, Cherryland
- Houses, 20050, 20110 and 20176 San Miguel Avenue, Castro Valley
- House, 4327 Seven Hills Road, Castro Valley
- House, 15645 Tracy Street, San Lorenzo
- First Southern Baptist Church, 15507 Usher Street, San Lorenzo
- House, 15525 Usher Street, San Lorenzo
- Mount Calvary Cemetery, North end of Van Avenue, San Leandro

As described in the DPR forms, Carey and Co. determined that 25 of these 49 properties appeared to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register or Historic Places. The DPRs for the remaining 24 properties summarize their significance within the local historic context.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Having written the historic context, completed the reconnaissance and intensive surveys, and prepared the historic preservation ordinance, Carey & Co. offers the following recommendations regarding significant resource types and particular residential developments. In addition, Carey & Co. provides recommendations regarding the finalization of the historic preservation ordinance.

Historic Neighborhoods

Though the reconnaissance survey identified few neighborhoods with a high concentration of intact historic residential resources, neighborhoods may exist which merit consideration for recognition as historic districts at the local level. GIS data, along with information contained in this report, should be consulted to identify areas with significant concentrations of resources that have a common age, architectural style, or historic association with a significant person or event. Further assessment and research may be able to support the recognition of small neighborhoods or clusters of resources. Once the period of significance and historic association of these neighborhoods are identified, planning procedures should be conducted with attention to the preservation of the integrity of each neighborhood as a whole, both through the appropriate treatment of its individual resources and through the preservation of the neighborhood's overall setting and character.

Greenridge Eichler Development

Constructed in 1963, the Eichler development of single-family homes located on Greenridge Road in Crow Canyon is not yet fifty years old, and therefore, was not included in the present survey. However, two earlier housing developments designed by Eichler in Palo Alto, California, have recently been listed on the National Register of Historic Places.⁶⁹ Due to its association with Joseph Eichler and with mid-century trends in residential design and development, the Greenridge tract may become historically significant once it becomes fifty years old and could be eligible for historic designation at that time. Until then, these houses should be given particular attention in planning procedures and design review with the intent that in 2013 they may be reassessed for historic designation. At that time, a more detailed survey of the tract is recommended, and the options for historic recognition and designation should be explored.

Agricultural Properties

As agriculture was an important aspect of the County's history and development, extant farmsteads and barns should be regarded as particularly important resources. The majority of these properties are located in the Castro Valley canyons, though some exist within the other sub-areas. Often comprised of a house and one or more agricultural outbuildings (including tank houses), these properties should be given due attention in planning procedures, design review and preservation efforts. These resources are particularly threatened, not only by active demolition and development, but by deferred maintenance.

Historic Preservation Ordinance

The County faces several key issues regarding finalization of the historic preservation ordinance, four of which we summarize below.

First, the County needs to decide whether they have sufficient information on the proposed Structures of Merit to support their proposed formal designation. The County has little information on many of these buildings and several may have been tagged historic from a previous windshield survey. It is possible that some of these properties should not actually be designated Structures of Merit due to alterations or other disqualifying factors that were not immediately recognized as such in the field. Similarly, the County needs to decide whether they have sufficient information to designate the proposed Landmarks for which a DPR 523 form has not been completed. In those cases, the County is deferring to the prior historic resource surveys, which were reconnaissance survey, so evaluation adequacy issues similar to those that concern the Structures of Merit may arise. One possibility would be to remove the currently proposed Structures of Merit from the Register and re-designate as Structures of Merit the proposed Landmarks for which DPR 523 forms have not been completed.

The County also needs to decide whether to incorporate some measure of owner consent into the listing process. If decision is made to retain a Structures of Merit list, one option would be to require owner consent for Structure of Merit designation, but not for Landmark designation. Finally, the County needs to decide whether or not to make the de-listing process simpler for Structures of Merit than for Landmarks, in light of public appeals to more precisely match the amount of information being requested to remove a Structure of Merit from the register with the amount of information that has been used to list it in the first place.

⁶⁹ The Eichler developments Green Gables, consisting of 63 building, and Greenmeadow, consisting of 246 buildings, were listed on the National Register of Historic Places on July 28, 2005. Both developments are located in Palo Alto, California.

V. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Annmarie. "Modernism and Medicine: The Hospitals of Stevens and Lee, 1916-1932." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58 (March 1999): 42-61.
- Arbunich, Marty; Eichler Network Director. Communications with Richard Brandi. 17 May 2006.
- "Arroyo Del Valle Draft Land Use Plan," East Bay Regional Park District, Planning/Stewardship Department, 1998, Document on file Pleasanton Library, Local History Files, Park Documents.
- Baer, Morley, Augusta Fink, and Amelie Elkinton. *Adobes in the Sun: Portraits of a Tranquil Era*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1980.
- Backhurst, Paul, ed. *Backpacking in California: Over 30 Years of Outdoor Experience*. Berkeley, CA: Wilderness Press, 2001.
- Baker, Suzanne, and William Kostura. "Cultural Resource Study: 2033 Miramonte Avenue, San Leandro, California." May 2002.
- Black, Benjamin W. *Annual Report Alameda County Hospital*. San Leandro, CA: Fairmont Community Press, 1934.
- California Death Index. <http://www.vitalsearch.com> (accessed February 20, 2008).
- California Register of Voters (1900-1968). <http://www.ancestry.com> (accessed February 20, 2008).
- California Department of Transportation. *Historic Highway Bridges of California*. United States: California Department of Transportation, 1990.
- Carrère, John M. "City Improvement from the Artist Standpoint." *Western Architect* 15 (April 1910): 40-44.
- "Castro Valley 1930 Old Town." Hayward, CA: Hayward Area Historical Society, n. d.
- Castro Valley Municipal Advisory. Council Minutes for July 28, 2003. http://www.acgov.org/cda/meetings/documents/mac_mn072803.pdf (accessed January 29, 2008).
- Chouinard Winery. "History." <http://www.chouinard.com> (accessed February 29, 2008).
- City and County of the San Francisco, Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). *San Francisco Water and Power: A History of the Municipal Water Department and Hetch Hetchy System*. San Francisco: Public Utilities Commission, Communications and Public Outreach, 2005.
- City of Hayward. "About Hayward – History." <http://www.hayward-ca.gov/about/history.shtm> (accessed February 28, 2007.)

- Corbett, Michael. "Historical and Cultural Resources East Alameda County." June 2005.
- DeMersman, Jim, and Lucille Lorge. "History of the Chabot Theater." Courtesy of Lucille Lorge.
- Drueckhammer, Robert. "It All Began With a Road." *Castro Valley Forum*, 9 March 1992, 1.
- Drummond, G. B. *A Guide to Architectural Styles in the Livermore-Amador Valley*. Union City: Mill Creek Press, 1978.
- Faigin, Daniel P. "California Highways." <http://www.cahighways.org> (accessed February 25, 2008).
- Faragher, John Mack. "Bungalow and Ranch House: The Architectural Backwash of California." *Western Historical Quarterly* 32, no. 2 (Summer 2001): 149-173.
- Fenton, Banning. *Hayward: The Heart of the Bay*. Carlsbad, CA: Heritage Media Group, 2002.
- Fifties Web. "Prices in 1950." <http://www.fiftiesweb.com/pop/prices-1950.htm> (accessed February 28, 2008).
- Hampson, R. Paul, Charlene Duval, and Roberta S. Greenwood. "Cultural Resource Investigation at Alviso Adobe Community Park." January 2000. Unpublished report on file at the City of Pleasanton, CA.
- Gasparini, D. A. "Contributions of C. A. P. Turner to Development of Reinforced Concrete FlatSlabs, 1905-1909." *Journal of Structural Engineering* 128, no. 10 (October 2002):1243-1252.
- Geib, Margaret M. *The Old Barn Book: A Field Guide to North American Barns and Other Farm Structures*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1995.
- Gelernter, Mark. *A History of American Architecture: Buildings in Their Cultural and Technological Context*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1999.
- Giffen, Helen S. *Cases and Courtyards, Historic Adobe Houses of California*. Oakland: Biobooks, 1955.
- Gottfried, Herbert, and Jan Jennings. *American Vernacular Design, 1870-1940: An Illustrated Glossary*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1985.
- Goulart, Tony P., ed. *The Holy Ghost Festas: A Historic Perspective of the Portuguese in California*. San Jose, CA: Portuguese Heritage Publications of California, 2003.
- Kovacs, Sallyann. "Chabot Theater Tot its Start in 1949." *Castro Valley Forum*, 9 March 1992, 3.
- Hall, Harwood. *Eden Township: Its Agriculture*. Hayward, CA: Hayward Area Historical Society, 1997.

- Hannaford, Donald R., and Revel Edwards. *Spanish Colonial or Adobe Architecture of California, 1800-1850*. New York: Architectural Book Publishing Company, Inc., 1931.
- Hermann, Laura "A Guided Tour Through Old Town Castro Valley." *Castro Valley Forum* 8-21 March 1993, 10-11.
- Homan, Anne Marshall. *Historic Livermore, California: Illustrated A-Z*. Walnut Creek: Hardscratch Press, 2007.
- Hope, Andrew. "Evaluating the Significance of San Lorenzo Village, A Mid-20th Century Suburban Community." *CRM Journal*, 2 (Summer 2005), <http://crmjournal.cr.nps.gov> (accessed February 20, 2008).
- Hunt, Marguerite and Harry Lawrence Gunn. *History of Solano County and Napa County: From their Earliest Settlement to the Present Time*. Chicago: S. J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1926.
- Vertical Files, Livermore Heritage Guild, Livermore, California.
- Jackson, Kenneth T. *Silent Cities*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1989.
- Klein, Dan, Nancy A. McClelland, and Malcom Haslam. *In the Deco Style*. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 1987.
- Kostoura, William. "Auguste Borloz Farm: California Register Evaluation." October 2002.
- Krell, Dorothy, ed. *The California Missions*. Menlo Park, CA: Lane Publishing Company, 1989.
- Land Patent Database for Alameda County, Bureau of Land Management.
<http://www.glorecords.blm.gov/PatentSearch> (accessed February 2008).
- Lane, Bob and Pat. *The Amador-Livermore Valley: A Pictorial History*. Norfolk, VA: Donning Co., 1988.
- Levy, Richard. "Costanoan." In *California*. ed. R. F. Heizer. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 8. general ed. W. C. Sturtevant. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1978.
- Lincoln Highway Association. <http://www.lincolnhighwayassoc.org> (accessed January 31, 2008).
- Livermore Heritage Guild. *Images of America: Early Livermore*. San Francisco: Arcadia Publishing, 2006.
- Longstreth, Richard. *On the Edge of the World: Four Architects in San Francisco at the Turn of the Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Lorge, Lucille, Robert Phelps, and Devon Weston. *Images of America: Castro Valley*. Charleston: Arcadia Publishing, 2005.

- Lumpkins, William. "A Distinguished Architect Writes on Adobes." *El Palacio* 77, no. 4. Reprint, *Adobes Past and Present*. Santa Fe, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1974.
- "Map of the Meek Estate Orchards, Hayward Eden TP, Alameda Co. Cal." 1922. Map on File at the Earth Science Library, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California.
- Marciel, Doris, and the Hayward Area Historical Society. *Images of America: San Lorenzo*. San Francisco: Arcadia Publishing, 2006.
- McAlester, Virginia and Lee. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005.
- Mohr, Nancy. *The Barn: Classic Barns of North America*. Philadelphia: Running Press Book Publishers, 2001.
- Mohr-Fry Ranches. <http://www.mohrfry.com/history.html> (accessed February 14, 2008).
- Munro-Fraser, J. P., et al. *History of Alameda County, California*. Oakland: M. W. Wood, Publisher, 1883. Reprint, Oakland, CA: Holmes Book Co., 1969.
- Noble, Allen G., and Richard K. Cleek. *The Old Barn Book: A Field Guide to North American Barns and Other Farm Structures*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1995.
- Pamphlet Files. Hayward Area Historical Society. Hayward, California.
- Pattillo & Garrett Associates. "Alviso Adobe Community Par, Pleasanton, CA: Draft Master Plan Report." May 31, 2000. Unpublished report on file at the City of Pleasanton, CA.
- Powell, Jane, and Linda Svendsen. *Bungalow Details: Interiors*. Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith, 2006.
- Rawls, James J. and Walton Bean. *California: An Interpretive History*, 7th ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 1998.
- Rawson, Richard. *Old Barn Plans*. New York: Mayflower Books, 1979.
- San Leandro Historical Society. "Enriching Our Future by Preserving Our Past." <http://www.sanleandrohistoricalsociety.org/Our%20History%205-28-07.html> (accessed January 2, 2008).
- Sanborn Maps, Hayward, California. June 1888, March 1893, December 1896, May 1903, November 1907, May 1923, 1932-50.
- Sanborn Maps, San Leandro, California. April 1917, 1928-1950.
- Sanchez, Laura, and Alex Sanchez. *Adobe Houses for Today*. Santa Fe: Sunstone Press, 2001.
- Sandoval, John S. *The Rancho of Don Guillermo: A History of Hayward, Castro Valley and San Lorenzo*. Hayward, CA: Mt. Eden Historical Publishers, 1991.

- Siegel & Strain. "Preliminary Cultural Resources Survey, Ashland and Cherryland Districts, San Lorenzo, Alameda County, California." 30 April 1998.
- Sloane, David Charles. "Scientific Paragon to Hospital Mall: The Evolving Design of the Hospital, 1885-1994." *Journal of Architectural Education*, 48 (November 1994): 82-98.
- State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation. *California Register of Historical Resources: The Listing Process*, Technical Assistance Series 5. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Parks and Recreation, n.d.
- State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation. *California Register and National Register: A Comparison*, Technical Assistance Series 6. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Parks and Recreation, 2001.
- State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation. *User's Guide to the California Historical Resource Status Codes & Historic Resources Inventory Directory*, Technical Assistance Bulletin 8. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Parks and Recreation, 2004.
- Stock, Jody R., and Michael Corbett. "Unincorporated San Lorenzo Historic Building Survey, Alameda County, California." November 2000.
- Thompson & West. "Map Number Three." *Official and Historical Atlas Map of Alameda County, California*. Oakland, CA: Thompson & West, 1978.
- Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo*, February 2, 1848, Article VIII, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon> (accessed August 1, 2007).
- Tyrell, Henry Grattan. "Bridges in Relation to the City Plan." *The Architect and Engineer* (August 1913): 83-93.
- United States Federal Census (1860-1930). <http://www.ancestry.com> (accessed February 14, 2008).
- United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services. *The Preservation of Historic Barns*, Preservation Brief 20. <http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/briefs/brief20.htm> (accessed February 14, 2008).
- United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. *Historic Residential Suburbs, National Register Bulletin*. <http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/suburbs/index.htm>.
- United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. Washington, DC: United States Department of the Interior, 1997.
- Vlach, Michael, ed. *Common Places: Readings in American Vernacular Architecture*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986.

- Wasserman, Fred. "Historic Architectural Survey for Proposed Improvements to Interstate 580 Castro Valley and Hayward, California." California Department of Transportation, 1981.
- William Self Associates. "Historical Resources Evaluation Report-580/Castro Valley Interchange Improvement Project." CALTRANS District, 4 April 2005.
- Woolf, Paul N. "A Historical Appraisal of the Flour Milling Industry in California." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1939.
- World War I and II draft cards. <http://www.ancestry.com> (accessed February 4, 2008).
- Wright, Gwendolyn. *Building the American Dream: A Social History of Housing in America*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.

Appendix A

Survey Matrix of Properties Selected for Intensive Survey

Unincorporated Alameda County
Historic Survey and Preservation Ordinance
Carey & Co., Inc.

**Alameda County Landmarks & Contributing Buildings
Identified in 2005-2008 Comprehensive Survey**

Carey & Co., Inc.

Address	Area	Historic Name	Description	Year Built
4951 Arroyo Road	East County	Livermore VA Hospital	Spanish Revival hospital building	1949
728 Bockman Road	San Lorenzo		Queen Anne cottage	1895
782 Bockman Road	San Lorenzo	Henry Bockman House	Folk Victorian bungalow	1904-10
2495 Castro Valley Blvd	Castro Valley	Castro Valley Lumber Co.	Industrial building	c. 1924
2520 Castro Valley Blvd	Castro Valley	California State Hatchery	Art Deco commercial building	1934
2544 Castro Valley Blvd	Castro Valley	Crowe's Feed Shop	Mission Revival store, warehouse	1924
2845-61 Castro Valley Blvd	Castro Valley	Chabot Theater	Art Deco cinema	1949
22047 Center Street	Castro Valley		Prairie Box/American Foursquare style residence	c. 1910
14563 Cull Canyon Road	Castro Valley	Red barn, Cull's Ranch	Transverse frame barn	1855-78
16874 Cull Canyon Road	Castro Valley		Farmhouse and barn	1890
2440 Depot Road	Hayward	Mt. Eden Cemetery	Cemetery	1862
2595 Depot Road	Hayward/ Eden Area	"Sea Breeze," Herman Mohr House	Modified Queen Anne	1900
22380 Eden Canyon Road	Castro Valley	King Ranch	Bank barn	c. 1905
10366 S. Flynn Road	East County		Period Revival farmstead	c. 1890
15400 Foothill Boulevard	Fairmont	Alameda County Infirmary, Fairmont Hospital	Eclectic group of medical buildings, mainly Mediterranean Revival styles	c. 1918 - c. 1960
15400 Foothill Boulevard	Fairmont	Superintendent's house	Queen Anne, White Cotton Cottage	c. 1890s
1048 Grant Avenue	San Lorenzo	Heide House	Queen Anne cottage	1901
Grove Way at Mission	Cherryland	Grove Way Bridge	Bridge	1915
24985 Hesperian Boulevard	Hayward	Cornelius Mohr House and Farm	Italianate Farmhouse, Barn, and Tank House, and ancillary Buildings	1876
Hollis Canyon off Eden Canyon	Castro Valley	Mai House	Craftsman bungalow, known as "Eastwood House"	1915-16
5922 Jensen Road	Castro Valley	Jensen farmhouse	Farmhouse and associated structures	1872
16331 Kent Avenue	Ashland		Barn	c. 1890
16490 Kent Avenue	Ashland	Holy Ghost Hall	Portuguese social hall and chapel	1903
264 E. Lewelling Boulevard	San Lorenzo	St. John's Catholic Church	Spanish Eclectic church	1925-72
Lewelling Blvd @ Embers Way	San Lorenzo	Captain William Robert's House	Italianate house	1869

**Alameda County Landmarks & Contributing Buildings
Identified in 2005-2008 Comprehensive Survey**

Carey & Co., Inc.

Address	Area	Historic Name	Description	Year Built
22319 Meekland Avenue	Cherryland		Adobe residence	late 1930s
2033 Miramonte Avenue	Fairmont		Spanish Revival "estate"	c. 1922-24
20095 Mission Boulevard	Hayward	PG&E substation, Station O	Mediterranean Revival PG&E substation	1926
3461 Old Foothill Road	East County	Francisco Alviso Adobe	Adobe residence/ranch	1854
24829 Palomares Road	Castro Valley	Bonnie Doone Ranch	Folk Victorian farmhouse	c. 1860
33853 Palomares Road	Castro Valley	Chouinard Winery and vineyards	Ranch-style house	1942
6446 Paloverde Road	Castro Valley	"Spark Stoves" barn	Transverse frame barn	c. 1915
5196 Proctor Road	Castro Valley	Borloz Farm	Poultry farming complex	c. 1920
911 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
912 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
926 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
927 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
943 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
944 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
959 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
960 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
20050 San Miguel Avenue	Castro Valley		Minimal Traditional residence	1936
20110 San Miguel Avenue	Castro Valley		Minimal Traditional residence	1935
20176 San Miguel Avenue	Castro Valley		Minimal Traditional residence	1939
4327 Seven Hills Road	Castro Valley		Craftsman Bungalow	1924
15645 Tracy Street	San Lorenzo		Shingle style residence	c. 1900
15507 Usher Street	San Lorenzo	First Southern Baptist Church	Gothic Revival church	1875
15525 Usher Street	San Lorenzo		Queen Anne cottage	c. 1895
North end of Van Avenue	San Leandro	Mount Calvary Cemetery	Cemetery	1872

Appendix B

DPR Primary Record (523A), and
Building, Structure and Object Record (523B) Forms

[Draft DPR 523 forms are currently being reviewed by the PRHC]

Unincorporated Alameda County
Historic Survey and Preservation Ordinance
Carey & Co., Inc.

Appendix C

Photographs of Intensively Surveyed Properties

[Submitted to the County on March 7, 2008 on four CDs]

Unincorporated Alameda County
Historic Survey and Preservation Ordinance
Carey & Co., Inc.

Appendix D

Historic Preservation Ordinance

Unincorporated Alameda County
Historic Survey and Preservation Ordinance
Carey & Co., Inc.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE
For the County of Alameda
*****Draft, 12/06/07*****

ARTICLE I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Findings
2. Purpose
3. Definitions

ARTICLE II. PARKS, RECREATION AND HISTORICAL COMMISSION

1. Commission—Recognition
2. Commissioners—Terms, Appointment, Qualifications
3. Board—Term of Office, Vacancies
4. County Historian
5. Commission Staff and Operating Requirements
6. Prohibition Against Direct Interest In Projects
7. Organization—Meeting Place—Attendance—Rules And Regulations
8. Commission—Duties and Powers
9. Planning Department—Duties and Powers

ARTICLE III. CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEYS

ARTICLE IV. THE ALAMEDA COUNTY REGISTER, THE CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR PLACEMENT ON, OR DELETION FROM, THE ALAMEDA COUNTY REGISTER, AND NOMINATION AND HEARING PROCESS

1. Alameda County Register
2. Criteria And Requirements for Placement on, and Deletion from, the Alameda County Register
3. Procedures for Nomination of Resources for Placement on Alameda County Register and for Requests for Deletion of Resources from the Alameda County Register
4. Nominated Resources Protections Pending Final Decision
5. Process for Evaluating Nominations for Placement on the Alameda County Register and Proposals for Deletion from the Alameda County Register.
6. Hearing by the Commission: Notice and Form of Notice
7. Proposed Designations for Inclusion on, and Proposed Deletions from, the Alameda County Register
8. Action by Board Of Supervisors
9. Frequency of Nominations
10. Proposed Demolition or Relocation of Buildings or Structures that are At Least Fifty Years Old: Review for Nomination for Placement on Alameda County Register

ARTICLE V. HISTORIC PRESERVATION DISTRICTS

ARTICLE VI. DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AND DEMOLITION REVIEW

1. General: Review Required for Development Projects Involving Landmarks, Contributing Resources and Non-Contributing Resources, and for Demolition of Landmarks and Contributing Resources
2. Certificates of Appropriateness
3. Applications
4. Review of Development Projects Involving Non-Contributing Resources In Historic Preservation Districts
5. Review of Development Projects Involving Nominated Resources and Requests for Demolition of Nominated Resources
6. Notice and Hearing
7. Standards
8. Decision and Findings
9. Appeal
10. Expiration of Approval
11. County Projects

ARTICLE VII. DANGEROUS BUILDINGS AND IMMEDIATELY DANGEROUS BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES OR RESOURCES

1. Notice to Planning Department
2. Reports to Commission
3. Demolition of Landmarks and Resources within Historic Preservation Districts
4. Lawful Demolition, Removal, or Disturbing of Listed Historic Resource—Deletion—Restrictions

ARTICLE VIII. APPEALS

1. Finality of Commission and Planning Department Decisions
2. Appeal of Planning Department Actions
3. Appeal of Commission Actions

ARTICLE IX. INCENTIVE PROGRAMS

1. Incentive Programs
2. California State Historical Building Code
3. Mills Act Contracts
4. Other Government-Sponsored Incentive Programs

ARTICLE X. MINIMUM MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

ARTICLE XI. ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

1. Application of Chapter and Enforcement Powers
2. Prohibitions
3. Additional Penalties

ARTICLE XII. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Judicial Review
2. Fees
3. County Code References
4. Severability

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE

For County of Alameda

*****Draft, 12/06/07*****

ARTICLE I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Findings

The Board of Supervisors finds and declares that:

- A. The County of Alameda has a rich history. Significant aspects of that history need to be recognized and preserved.
- B. The county's historic structures, sites and other resources are irreplaceable and need to be protected from deterioration, inappropriate alterations, demolition and archeological site damage.
- C. Preservation of county's historic resources enhances the county's economic, cultural, and aesthetic standing, its identity, and its livability, marketability and urban character.
- D. Well-preserved and retained historic resources are essential to maintain and revitalize the county and its neighborhoods and stimulate economic activity, and, further, the preservation and continued use of historic resources are effective tools to sustain and revitalize neighborhoods and business districts within the county.
- E. Preservation of historic resources is important to promote the public health and safety and the economic and general welfare of the people of the county.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this chapter shall be to:

- A. Identify, protect, and encourage the preservation of significant architectural, historic, prehistoric and cultural structures, sites, resources and properties in the county;
- B. Ensure the preservation, protection, enhancement and perpetuation of historic structures, sites and other resources to the fullest extent feasible;
- C. Encourage, through both public or private action, the maintenance or rehabilitation of historic structures, sites and other resources;
- D. Safeguard the county's historic resources, both public and private projects;
- E. Encourage development that sensitively incorporates the retention, preservation and re-use of historic structures, sites and other resources;

F. Foster civic pride in the character and quality of the county's historic resources and in the accomplishments of its people through history;

G. Provide a mechanism, through surveys, nominations and other available means, to compile, update and maintain a register of historic resources within the county;

H. Protect and enhance the county's attraction to tourists and visitors;

I. Provide for consistency with state and federal preservation standards, criteria and practices;

J. Encourage new development that will be aesthetically compatible with historic resources.

3. Definitions

"Alameda County Register" means the register created by Article IV of this chapter.

"Board of Supervisors" or "Board" means the Board of Supervisors of the County of Alameda.

"Building official" means the building official designated in Chapter 15.04 of Title 15 of this code, and his or her designee(s).

"California Environmental Quality Act" means the California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. as it may be amended. The California Environmental Quality Act may also be referred to in this chapter as "CEQA." "California Register" means the California Register of Historical Resources as defined in California Public Resources Code Section 5020.1 as it may be amended from time to time.

"California Register resource" means any resource designated on the California Register as it may be amended from time to time.

"Certificate of Appropriateness" shall mean the certificate required pursuant to Article VI herein prior to undertaking any of the following work or improvements on a landmark, contributing resource or non-contributing resource, or pursuant to **Section 15.124.190**, on a nominated resource:

I can't find (<http://municipalcodes.lexisnexis.com/codes/alamedagen/>) several sections referenced in the 2003 Draft Ordinance:

- Section 8.96.110 ("dangerous building" defined)
- Section 15.124.180
- Section 15.124.190
- Section 15.124.200
- Section 15.124.280
- Section 15.124.300
- Section 15.124.320
- Section 15.124.330
- Section 15.124.410

- Section 32.04.402

These may have been intended as internal references to the Ordinance itself. I've marked references to all such sections in [yellow].

1. Installation or replacement of exterior windows or doors;
2. Construction of new fencing or walls, or alteration of existing fencing or walls;
3. Replacement or alteration of exterior paint or other exterior architectural coating or treatment on a landmark, where the exterior paint or other exterior architectural coating or treatment has been identified as a significant feature or characteristic of a landmark.

“Certified local government” (CLG) means a local government that has been certified by the National Park Service to carry out the purposes of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. Sec. 470 et seq.) as amended, pursuant to Section 101(c) of that Act and the regulations adopted under the Act, which are set forth in Part 61 (commencing with Section 61.1) of Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

“Commission” means the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission as designated in Article II of this chapter.

“Comprehensive Survey of Historic Sites” means the survey of historic resources throughout unincorporated Alameda County and adopted by the County in <month 2007>.

“Contributing resource” means a resource designated as a contributing resource by the Board of Supervisors in accordance with Article IV of this chapter.

“Conservation area” means an area designated as a conservation area by the Board of Supervisors in accordance with Article IV of this chapter.

“County” means the unincorporated areas of the County of Alameda.

“Cultural Resources Surveys” means the Cultural Resources Surveys done for the county, including the Preliminary Cultural Resources Surveys for the Ashland & Cherryland Districts, the San Lorenzo Area, and the East Valley Area; the Comprehensive Survey of Historic Sites in unincorporated Alameda County that was conducted in conjunction with the creation of this Ordinance; and any other surveys as they may be completed.

“Dangerous building” means a dangerous building as that term is defined in Section 8.96.110 of this code.

“Development project” means and includes the following:

1. The alteration, modification or rehabilitation of the exteriors of landmarks, contributing resources and non-contributing resources;
2. The alteration, modification or rehabilitation of interiors of landmarks and contributory resources where the interiors constitute “features or characteristics” as defined herein; or
3. New construction within a historic preservation district.

“Feature or characteristic” means fixtures, components or appurtenances attached to, contiguous with or otherwise related to a structure or property including landscaping, setbacks, distinguishing aspects, roof attributes, overlays, moldings, sculptures, fountains, light fixtures, windows and monuments. “Feature or characteristic” may include historically and/or architecturally significant interior areas that are accessible to or made available to the public, including, without limitation, areas commonly used as public spaces such as lobbies, meeting rooms, gathering rooms, public hallways, great halls, bank lobbies or other similar spaces. Interior areas that generally are not accessible to or made available to the public, but which occasionally may be visited by business invitees or members of the public, including those on a tour of a facility, do not constitute a “feature or characteristic” for purposes of this chapter.

“Historic preservation district” means a geographic area designated as a historic preservation district by the Board of Supervisors in accordance with Article IV of this chapter.

“Historic preservation district plan” means a plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to Article IV of this chapter or the prior versions of this chapter.

“Historic resource” and “cultural resource” mean, for the purposes of environmental reviews related to CEQA and the county’s compliance with CEQA, those landmarks, contributing resources and historic preservation districts listed in the Alameda County Register as defined herein. “Historic resource” and “cultural resource” shall also include those properties specified as a historic resource or cultural resource by CEQA, by the CEQA guidelines, or by any other provision of California law.

“Immediately dangerous building or structure” means an immediately dangerous building or structure as defined in **Section 8.96.120** of this code.

“Inventory of Potential Historic Resources” means the repository of information retained by the Planning Department regarding buildings that have been evaluated for historic significance through an official study. The Inventory includes the resources specified in the Alameda County Register of Historic Resources, but also includes surveyed structures not yet found to be historic resources.

“Landmark” means any historic resources designated as a landmark by the Board of Supervisors in accordance with Article IV of this chapter.

“Listed historic resource” means any resource listed in the Alameda County Register in accordance with this chapter. “Listed historic resource” includes any resource designated by the Board of Supervisors as a landmark, contributing resource, structure of merit or contributor to a conservation area. “Listed historic resource” does not include a non-contributing resource in a historic preservation district.

“Mills Act” means California Government Sections 50280 et seq., as it may be amended from time to time.

“National Environmental Protection Act” means 42 U.S.C. Secs.4321 et seq., as it may be amended from time to time. The National Environmental Protection Act may be referred to in this chapter as NEPA.

“National Historic Preservation Act” means 16 U.S. Secs. 470 et seq., as it may be amended from time to time.

“National Register of Historic Places” means the official inventory of districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology and culture which is maintained by the Secretary of the Interior under the authority of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq., 36 C.F.R. Sections 60, 63).

“National Register resource” means any resource listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

“Nominated resource” means a resource nominated for placement on the Alameda County Register as provided for in Article IV of this chapter.

“Nomination” means a nomination for placement of a resource on the Alameda County Register pursuant to Article IV of this chapter.

“Non-contributing resources” means all resources within a historic preservation district that are not identified as contributing resources.

“Planning Department” means the Planning Department of the County of Alameda’s Community Development Agency.

“Planning Commission” means the Planning Commission of Alameda County. The Planning Commission is always referred to in this ordinance as “the Planning Commission,” never as “the Commission,” which is reserved for the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission.

“Resource” means any building, structure, site, area, place, feature, characteristic, appurtenance, landscape, landscape plan or improvement.

“Register” means the Alameda County Register of Historic Resources.

“Secretary of the Interior Standards” means the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties found at 36 C.F.R. 68.3, as it may be amended from time to time.

“Significant feature or characteristic” means a feature or characteristic identified by the Board of Supervisors as significant from a historical standpoint pursuant to Article IV of this chapter.

“State Historical Building Code” means the State Historical Building Code as contained in Part 8 of Title 24 (California Building Standards Code) of the California Code of Regulations, as it may be amended from time to time.

“Structure” means a resource created principally to shelter or support human activity.

“Structure of merit” means a resource designated as a structure of merit by the Board of Supervisors in accordance with Article IV of this chapter.

“Supportive structures” means those structures identified as “supportive structures” within preservation areas under county ordinance No. 85-076.

“Survey” means a process by which resources are documented for landmark, structure of merit, historic preservation district or conservation area consideration.

“Zoning code” shall mean Title 17 of the county code, as it may be amended from time to time.

ARTICLE II. PARKS, RECREATION AND HISTORICAL COMMISSION

1. Commission—Recognition

There is in the county a “Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission”, hereafter in this chapter referred to as the Commission. (Prior admin. Code section 5-37.01)

2. Commissioners—Terms, Appointment, Qualifications

A. The Commission shall consist of fifteen (15) members appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

B. The members of the Commission shall be residents of the county.

C. Each supervisor shall nominate three Commissioners, one of whom shall be a person with substantial interest in history and/or historical preservation and one with a substantial interest in park and recreation matters.

D. Each member of the Commission shall have demonstrated interest in, competence in or knowledge of historic preservation and, in particular, the historical and cultural resources of the county.

E. Commission members are encouraged to be appointed from among professionals in the disciplines of history, architecture, architectural history, planning, pre-historic and historic archeology, folklore, cultural anthropology, curation, conservation, and landscape architecture or related disciplines, such as urban planning, American studies, American civilization, or cultural geography. To the extent that such professionals are available in the community and interested in serving on the Commission, such members would include:

1. A member who is a landscape architect;
2. A member who is a licensed architect;
3. A member who is a registered structural engineer;
4. A member who has training or experience in real estate development, real estate brokerage, real estate financing, real estate law, or real estate property management;
5. A member who has training or experience in Alameda County area regional history, Alameda County area ethnic history, or Alameda County area cultural development history, and who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s professional standards for historians;
6. A member who has training or experience in urban design or planning;

7. A member who has training or experience in architectural history, with a particular emphasis on North American architectural history and development, and who meets the Secretary of the Interior's professional standards for architectural historians.
8. A member who has previously served on a historic resource review body.
9. A member with training or experience as a professional archeologist.

3. Board—Term of Office, Vacancies

The members of the Commission shall serve at the pleasure of the Board of Supervisors and shall have terms of four years. Their terms shall be staggered so that no more than four terms expire in any one year, and so that no supervisor makes more than one appointment in one year, except to fill an unexpired vacancy. No one member shall serve more than three successive four-year terms. Any vacancy on the Commission shall be filled by the board of supervisors; persons appointed to fill vacancies shall serve for the unexpired term of the persons they succeed. (Prior admin. Code section 5-37.02)

4. County Historian

The post of county historian is currently empty, but may be filled in the future. Once filled, the county historian shall act as a nonvoting, unpaid member of the Commission to provide advice or historical matters to the Commission. The positions shall not fall within the term stipulation or attendance stipulation of appointed members. Mileage stipend of appointed Commissioners for meeting attendance shall be paid to the county historian for Commission meetings. (Prior admin. Code section 5-37.03)

5. Commission Staff and Operating Requirements

The Board of Supervisors shall furnish the Commission with necessary quarters, personnel, equipment and supplies, together with usual and necessary operating expenses in accordance with the reestablished public policy of budget and personnel. (Prior admin. Code section 5-37.05).

6. Organization—Meeting Place—Attendance—Rules and Regulations

A. The Commission shall annually select one of its members to serve as the chair and one of its members to serve as the vice chair and shall appoint a secretary. The secretary shall be a member of the Commission or a county employee. In the event that the chair falls vacant for any reason, the vice chair shall automatically succeed to the chair, and the vice chair shall be filled by election at the next meeting.

B. A quorum shall be required for the Commission to take any action. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the members appointed to the Commission who have not been required to abstain due to a conflict of interest. The Commission shall act by a majority vote of the quorum.

C. The Commission shall conduct regular meetings as specified in its adopted rules and regulations for the conduct of Commission business. Special meetings may be called at any time by the chair or by a quorum of the Commission.

D. The appointments of any members who have been absent from three successive regular or special meetings or who have not attended at least two-thirds of the regular or special meetings in a twelve-month period without the approval of said Commission shall be automatically terminated, and the Board of Supervisors shall appoint their successors. Members whose appointments have been terminated due to nonattendance shall not be reappointed to the Commission.

E. The Commission shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business not consistent herewith, and any such rules and regulations shall be published and made available to the public. (Prior admin. Code section 5-37.04) The Commission shall be subject to, and shall comply with, the requirements of the Brown Act.

7. Commission—Duties and Powers

Unless otherwise specified herein the powers and duties of the Commission shall be as follows:

A. Encourage and foster public participation regarding the historic preservation program, participation in the surveying of historic resources, developing preservation components in neighborhood plans and in other planning documents, the preparation or development of landmark project review standards guidelines and historic preservation district plans, landmark and historic preservation district nominations, and other activities that encourage the preservation of the county's historic resources.

B. Ensure that all historical resources in the County are recognized as such by: completing and updating Historic Surveys and Inventories; making recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for the inclusion or deletion of landmarks, structures of merit, historic preservation districts and conservation areas in the Alameda County Register using the criteria stated in Article IV of this chapter; and making recommendations to the State Office of Historic Preservation regarding nominations of property located within the county to the State Points of Interest, National Register of Historic Places, or California Register of Historical Resources.

C. Coordinate with, and make recommendations to, other governmental agencies regarding historic preservation matters.

D. Recommend appropriate additions to and deletions from the Register, and initiate other implementation measures it finds appropriate.

E. Actively attempt to secure funding from all local, state, federal, and private sources to further historical preservation in the county, and shall work with county historical societies as a coordinating body, particularly in regard to funding historical projects. The Commission shall make recommendations on requests for funding from the Alameda County Board of Supervisors.

- F. Review all requests for historical zoning and advise the Board of Supervisors as to the historical significance of the property in question. On request, it shall advise other public agencies and private groups as to the historical significance of properties in the county.
- G. Publicize historical preservation efforts in the county and ensure that information concerning the location of historical facilities is made available to all residents of the county.
- H. Review all legislation relative to historical resources and report its recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. The Commission also may take its own stand supporting or opposing legislation.
- I. Review and advise the Board of Supervisors, or other appropriate agency, regarding all requests for county funds for historical facilities or programs. The Commission shall advise the Board of Supervisors on distribution of other funds which are available to the county, including bond act funds. The Commission also shall assist the coordination of applications for funding from others sources, such as the land and water conservation fund, between the various local, regional and county agencies, and shall advise the Board of Supervisors as to interest of the county affected by the dispersal of any such funds.
- J. Make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding the historic element of the county's general plan.
- K. Hear appeals of Planning Department actions as provided for in this chapter.
- L. Approve, approve with conditions and/or mitigation measures, or disapprove applications for development projects.
- M. Certify and/or ratify applicable environmental documents, or when acting in an advisory capacity, recommend certification or ratification of environmental documents, in accordance with CEQA or NEPA.
- N. Make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, county departments, or any other entity, for purposes of providing historic preservation incentives, including, without limitation, procedural, economic and tax incentives, acquisition of property, development rights, preservation easements, conservation easements, land use, zoning, development restrictions, penalties and sanctions, fee adjustments, and negotiated settlements.
- O. Make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding the periodic update of the county's preservation program, standards, procedures, and criteria, including revisions to this chapter.
- P. Recommend standards for review of development projects in addition to those standards set forth herein and forward the recommended standards to the Board of Supervisors for the Board of Supervisors' consideration and adoption.
- Q. Evaluate and comment upon proposals and environmental reviews pending before other public agencies affecting the physical development, historic preservation and urban design in the county.

R. Make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for enforcement and penalties concerning matters covered in this chapter.

S. Make recommendations to the building or planning department(s) concerning repairs, stabilization, weatherization or demolition or partial demolition of listed historic resources;

T. Assume duties assigned to the Commission by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the certified local government provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, or duties that may be assigned to the Commission through any agreement(s) approved by the Board of Supervisors. This shall include undertaking review and comment upon those projects on which the county, as a certified local government, has an obligation or opportunity to provide review and comment under the National Historic Preservation Act, including but not limited to private and public projects undertaken within Alameda County involving one or more landmarks or historic preservation districts.

U. Consider, in accordance with the nomination process provided in Article IV of this chapter, nominations for addition(s) or deletion(s) to the Alameda County Register, designation of landmarks, structures of merit and historic preservation districts, expansion or alteration of the boundaries of any historic preservation district or conservation area, and the identification of contributing resources and non-contributing resources in historic preservation districts and conservation areas;

V. Carry out any other duties dealing with historical resources, recreation and parks in the county which the Board of Supervisors may from time to time assign to it. (Prior admin. Code section 5-37.07)

9. Planning Department—Duties and Powers

The Planning Department of Alameda County's Community Development Agency is responsible for implementing the county's historic preservation program and assisting the Commission in the performance of its historic preservation duties pursuant to this chapter. The Planning Department shall have the authority to:

A. Advise the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission, and other county offices and staff on historic preservation issues;

B. Conduct surveys and updates of surveys, throughout the county, as may be required by California law, or more often at the Planning Department's choosing, and maintain a list of resources eligible for landmark, contributing resource and historic preservation district consideration;

C. Consult with county departments regarding rehabilitation standards and historic resources surveys performed in conjunction with development projects;

D. Consult with county departments regarding potential protections, mitigations, thresholds of significance and standards suitable for historic resources involved in a development project, or other discretionary actions;

E. Make recommendations to the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors regarding development projects.;

F. Implement the county's historic preservation program;

G. Take such steps, including training, as are necessary for the county to become and remain a certified local government. This shall include undertaking review and comment upon those projects on which the county has an obligation, as a certified local government, to provide review and comment under the National Historic Preservation Act;

H. Make preliminary determinations regarding nominations for inclusion on the Alameda County Register and proposals for deletion from the Alameda County Register;

I. Take appropriate steps to ensure that the Alameda County Register is properly maintained and regularly updated and made available for public review and use. The Planning Department shall also take appropriate steps to maintain and regularly update a list or compilation of resources within the county that are on the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places, and to make the list or compilation available for public review and use;

J. Perform such other functions as are provided for in this chapter or any other applicable law.

ARTICLE III. CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEYS

A. The survey is the accepted method of systematically studying historic resources. It includes a physical description and a photograph of each historic resource, legal information from title or assessment records, statements of significance according to the criteria in this ordinance, and a statement of any threat to the integrity or continued existence of the resource. There are two levels of survey: a Cultural Resource Survey and an Intensive Survey. A Cultural Resource Survey is an overview survey to identify properties that qualify for an Intensive Survey. An Intensive Survey identifies whether a property meets the criteria for placement on the Alameda County Register as specified in Article IV. The County will maintain a list of all adopted surveys and will use the survey information to identify and protect potentially historic resources as outlined in this Ordinance. All surveys set forth in this section, shall be prepared by or under supervision of an architectural historian satisfying the professional qualification standards for architectural historians specified in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation.

B. Three Cultural Resource Surveys of portions of Alameda County were conducted prior to creation of this Ordinance:

1. Preliminary Cultural Resources Survey, Ashland & Cherryland Districts, San Lorenzo, Alameda County (April 1998)
2. Unincorporated San Lorenzo Historic Building Survey, Alameda County (November 2000)
3. Historical and Cultural Resource Survey, East Alameda County (June 2005)

C. A Comprehensive Survey of Historic Sites in unincorporated Alameda County was conducted in conjunction with the creation of this Ordinance. This survey verified and incorporated the findings of the previous three surveys and evaluated potential historic resources throughout the remainder of unincorporated Alameda County. The landmarks, contributing buildings and historic preservation districts identified in this survey provided the basis for the Alameda County Register.

D. Inventory of Potential Historic Resources. All properties evaluated in the above surveys, regardless of the conclusions as to their historic significance, will go into an Inventory of Potential Historic Resources. This Inventory shall also include the results of any future historic resource surveys, including historic resource evaluations done in conjunction with completion of any Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) in the County.

ARTICLE IV. THE ALAMEDA COUNTY REGISTER, THE CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR PLACEMENT ON, OR DELETION FROM, THE ALAMEDA COUNTY REGISTER, AND NOMINATION AND HEARING PROCESS

1. Alameda County Register

A. The ordinances adopting designations and deletions of landmarks, contributing resources, historic preservation districts, structures of merit, and conservation areas shall be known, collectively, as the Alameda County Register.

B. The original Alameda County Register and any subsequent amendments, inclusions, or deletions thereto shall be on file with the county clerk. The county clerk shall deliver a copy of the Alameda County Register, as it is amended, to the director of the Planning Department, the building official, the county office of environmental affairs, the code enforcement manager, the neighborhood area directors, the head of the county's geographic information systems, the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission, and the manager of the Alameda County central library.

C. Initially, the Alameda County Register shall include:

1. Properties deemed likely significant in previous surveys (properties rated "Y" in the Ashland & Cherryland survey, "1" in the San Lorenzo survey and "K" in the East Alameda survey) that, as part of the Comprehensive Survey of Historic Sites in unincorporated Alameda County, were verified to merit continued listing;
2. All landmarks, contributing buildings and historic preservation districts identified in the Comprehensive Survey that were not identified in any of the three previous surveys;
3. Properties identified by the Commission that meet the structure of merit criteria set forth below in Section IV.2.D.
4. Areas identified by the Commission that meet the conservation area criteria set forth below in Section IV.2.E.

D. The Planning Department shall take appropriate steps to ensure that the Alameda County Register is properly maintained and regularly updated. The Planning Department shall also take appropriate steps to maintain and regularly update a list or compilation of resources within the county that are on the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places, and to make the list or compilation available for public review and use.

2. Criteria and Requirements for Placement on, and Deletion from, the Alameda County Register

The criteria and requirements for placement on, or deletion from, the Alameda County Register as a landmark, contributing resource, historic preservation district, structure of merit or conservation area are as follows:

A. Addition to the Alameda County Register—Landmarks. Landmarks are intended to be properties in unincorporated Alameda County (or county-owned buildings in an incorporated area of Alameda County) of exceptional historical or architectural value that are clearly eligible individually for the California Register of Historical Resources, including those that are especially fine examples of an important style, type, or convention, or which are intimately associated with a person, organization, event, or historical pattern of major importance at the local level or of moderate importance at the state or national level. A nominated resource shall be added to the Alameda County Register as a landmark if the Board of Supervisors finds, after holding the hearing(s) required by this chapter, that all of the requirements set forth below are satisfied:

1. Requirements.

- a. The nominated resource meets one or more of the following criteria:
 - i. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the history of the county, the region, the state or the nation;
 - ii. It is associated with the lives of persons significant in the county's past;
 - iii. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction;
 - iv. It represents the work of an important creative individual or master;
 - v. It possesses high artistic values; or
 - vi. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in the prehistory or history of the county, the region, the state or the nation.
- b. The nominated resource has integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. Integrity shall be judged with reference to the particular criterion or criteria specified in "a" above;
- c. The nominated resource has significance historically or architecturally, and its designation as a landmark is reasonable, appropriate and necessary to promote, protect and further the goals and purposes of this chapter.

2. Factors to be Considered. In determining whether to place a nominated resource on the Alameda County Register as a landmark, the following factors shall be considered:

- a. A structure removed from its original location is eligible if it is significant primarily for its architectural value or it is the most important surviving structure associated with a historic person or event.
- b. A birthplace or grave is eligible if it is that of a historical figure of outstanding importance and there is no other appropriate site or structure directly associated with his or her productive life.
- c. A reconstructed building is eligible if the reconstruction is historically accurate, if the structure is presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan; and if no other, original structure survives that has the same association.
- d. Properties that are primarily commemorative in intent are eligible if design, age, tradition or symbolic value invest such properties with their own historical significance.
- e. Properties achieving significance within the past fifty (50) years are eligible if such properties are of exceptional importance.

B. Addition to the Alameda County Register—Contributing Resources. Contributing Resources are intended to be properties of secondary importance to Landmarks. Properties generally appropriate to be Contributing Resources include those having sufficient historical or visual/architectural value to warrant limited recognition but which do not appear individually eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources, including (1) properties that are superior or visually important examples of a particular style, type or convention, (2) most buildings which were constructed prior to 1906, and (3) properties that are not individually distinctive but which are typical or representative examples of an important style, type, convention or historical patterns. A nominated resource shall be added to the Alameda County Register as a contributing resource if the Board of Supervisors finds, after holding the hearing(s) required by this chapter, that all of the following requirements are satisfied:

1. The nominated resource is within a historic preservation district;
2. The nominated resource either embodies the significant features and characteristics of the historic preservation district or adds to the historical associations, historical architectural qualities or archaeological values identified for the historic preservation district;
3. The nominated resource was present during the period of historical significance of the historic preservation district and relates to the documented historical significance of the historic preservation district;
4. The nominated resource either possesses historic integrity or is capable of yielding important information about the period of historical significance of the historic preservation district; and

5. The nominated resource has important historic or architectural worth, and its designation as a contributing resource is reasonable, appropriate and necessary to protect, promote and further the goals and purposes of this chapter.

C. Addition to the Alameda County Register—Historic Preservation Districts. A geographic area nominated as a historic preservation district shall be added to the Alameda County Register as a historic preservation district if the Board of Supervisors finds, after holding the hearing(s) required by this chapter, that all of the requirements set forth below are satisfied:

1. Requirements.

- a. The area is a geographically definable area;
- b. The area possesses either:
 - i. A significant concentration or continuity of buildings unified by: a) past events; or b) aesthetically by plan or physical development; or
 - ii. The area is associated with an event, person, or period significant or important to county history
- c. The designation of the geographic area as a historic preservation district is reasonable, appropriate and necessary to protect, promote and further the goals and purposes of this chapter and is not inconsistent with other goals and policies of the county.

2. Factors to be Considered. In determining whether to place a geographic area on the Alameda County Register as a historic preservation district, the following factors shall be considered:

- a. A historic preservation district shall have integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.
- b. The collective historic value of the buildings and structures in a historic preservation district taken together may be greater than the historic value of each individual building or structure.

D. Addition to the Alameda County Register—Structures of Merit. A nominated resource shall be added to the Alameda County Register as a structure of merit if the Board of Supervisors finds, after holding the hearing(s) required by this chapter, that it satisfies one or more of the following criteria:

- 1. It represents in its location an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community or County; or
- 2. It materially benefits the historic, architectural or aesthetic character of the neighborhood or area; or
- 3. It is an example of a type of building that once was common but is now rare in its neighborhood, community or area; or

4. It is connected with a business or use which was once common but is now rare; or
5. It contributes to an understanding of the contextual significance of a neighborhood, community or area.

E. Addition to the Alameda County Register—Conservation Areas. A geographic area nominated as a conservation area shall be added to the Alameda County Register as a conservation area if the Board of Supervisors finds, after holding the hearing(s) required by this chapter, that the nominated area is a geographically definable area that has a distinctive character that conveys (1) its history and (2) a sense of cohesiveness through its design, architecture, setting, materials or natural features.

The conservation area designation shall be reserved for areas that do not satisfy the historic preservation district criteria specified above (see IV.2.C), but nevertheless are culturally, historically or visually significant.

Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit adoption of design guidelines or other specialized zoning regulations applicable to one or more designated conservation areas.

F. Deletions from the Alameda County Register. An application to delete a listed historic resource from the Alameda County Register may be approved if the Board of Supervisors finds, after holding the hearings required by this chapter, that the listed historic resource no longer meets the requirements set forth above; provided that where a landmark, contributing resource or structure of merit is proposed for deletion due to a loss of integrity, the loss of integrity was not the result of any illegal act or willful neglect by the owner or agent of the owner.

3. Procedures for Nomination of Resources for Placement on Alameda County Register and for Requests for Deletion of Resources from the Alameda County Register.

A. Process for Nominating Resource for Placement on Alameda County Register. The Board of Supervisors and the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission shall have the authority to nominate resources for placement on the Alameda County Register as landmarks, historic preservation districts, contributing resources, structures of merit, or conservation areas subject to compliance with the requirements of this section.

1. The Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission shall initiate landmark, contributing resource, historic preservation district, structure of merit and conservation area nominations by adopting a resolution of intent to consider a nomination either on its own motion, or at the request of the Planning Department or members of the public. The Board of Supervisors may nominate landmarks, contributing resources, historic preservation districts, structures of merit and conservation areas by adopting a resolution identifying the nominated resource and transmitting its resolution to the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission. The Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission shall adopt a resolution of intent to consider nominations for resources nominated by the county Board of Supervisors.

- a. Notice of Hearings. Written notice shall be given by first class, prepaid mail not less than ten (10) days prior to the hearing before the Commission on whether to

adopt a resolution of intent to nominate a resource for placement on the Alameda County Register to the following individuals: The owner(s) of the resource(s) proposed for nomination, as shown on the latest tax roll. In the case of a nomination regarding a historic preservation district, the notice shall be provided to all property owners within the proposed district, as shown on the latest tax roll.

b. Form and Content of Notice. Notice shall include:

- i. Common address and assessors parcel number, if any, of the resource proposed for nomination.
- ii. A general explanation of the requirements, benefits and restrictions associated with a nomination.
- iii. The date and place of the public hearing or hearings before the Commission.

2. The owner(s) of properties nominated as landmarks, contributing resources or structures of merit and the owner(s) of properties within the geographic area nominated as a historic preservation district or conservation area shall be notified in writing within a reasonable period of time, not to exceed twenty (20) days, of the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission's adoption of a resolution of intent. Notice shall be given by first class, prepaid mail sent to owners at the addresses shown on the latest tax rolls.

Notice given pursuant to this provision shall include at least the following:

- a. Notification that the resource has been nominated for placement on the Alameda County Register as a landmark, contributing resource or structure of merit, as appropriate. In the case of a nomination of a historic preservation district or conservation area, the notice shall include a description of the proposed boundaries of the district, and whether the owner(s)' property is proposed to be added as a contributing or non-contributing resource;
- b. A general explanation of the nomination process and the effect of being nominated, and the opportunity for appeal of the preliminary determination of the Planning Department;
- c. A general explanation of the effect of being a nominated resource, including the restrictions on alteration and demolition;
- d. A general explanation of the hearing process for determining whether the nominated resource qualifies as a landmark, contributing resource or structure of merit, or in the case of a proposed historic preservation district or conservation area, the hearing process for determining whether the geographic area qualifies as a historic preservation district or conservation area; and
- e. A general explanation of the effect of placement on the Alameda County Register, including the restrictions on alteration and demolition, as well as the general benefits from placement on the register.

3. Pursuant to **Section 15.124.190**, resources nominated as landmarks or contributing resources, or resources within a historic preservation district shall be considered to be landmarks, contributing resources, or resources within a historic preservation district for purposes of Article VI, and shall be subject to the restrictions of Article VI following adoption of the resolution of intent, for the time period specified in **Section 15.124.190**.

Note: as currently written, the provisions of Article VI have not been extended to structures of merit or conservation areas.

B. Process for Proposing Deletion from Alameda County Register. The procedure for proposing deletion of a listed resource from the Alameda County Register shall be as follows:

1. Application by Owners of Landmarks, Contributing Resources and Structures of Merit:

a. Application for Deletion—Landmarks, Contributing Resources and Structures of Merit. The owner(s) of a landmark, contributing resource or structure of merit may propose deletion of the listed historic resource from the Alameda County Register.

b. All applications to delete a listed resource from the Alameda County Register shall be submitted to the Planning Department. The Planning Department shall determine if an application is or is not complete, and the date that the application nomination is or is not complete.

c. Notice of Application for Deletion. Where an application is filed for deletion of a listed resource from the Alameda County Register, notice shall be given to the following persons within a reasonable period of time following receipt of the application:

- i. All property owners, as shown on the latest tax roll, within five hundred (500) feet of the nominated resource(s). In the case of a nomination regarding a historic preservation district, the nomination notice shall be provided to all property owners within the proposed district and within five hundred (500) feet of the boundary of the proposed district.
- ii. Anyone who has in writing to the Commission secretary requested notice of the nomination.

d. Preliminary Determination of Planning Department. Within such time that is reasonable and practicable after the Planning Department has determined that an application for deletion is complete, the Planning Department shall make a preliminary determination on whether the listed historic resource is eligible for consideration for deletion from the Alameda County Register. The Planning Department shall find that the listed historic resource is eligible for consideration for deletion from the Alameda County Register if the Planning Department finds that there is a reasonable likelihood that the listed resource will be deleted from the Alameda County Register, following completion of the notice and hearing requirements of this chapter, for its failure to meet the criteria specified in **Section 32.04.402** above. The Planning Department shall submit to the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission a written summary of its preliminary determination as

to whether the listed resource is eligible for consideration for deletion from the Alameda County Register. The Commission will review the Planning Department's preliminary determination and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors regarding the listed resource's eligibility for deletion from the Alameda County Register. The Board of Supervisors will then determine whether or not the listed resource is eligible for deletion from the Register.

e. Prior to the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission recommending to the Board of Supervisors approval of deletion of a listed resource from the Alameda County Register, and prior to the Board of Supervisors endorsing the recommendation, each shall find:

- i. That the listed resource no longer has significant aesthetic, cultural, architectural, or engineering interest or value of an historical nature; and
- ii. That approval or modified approval of the application to delete a listed resource from the Alameda County Register is consistent with the purposes and criteria of the County's historic preservation policies set forth herein.

f. Notice of Preliminary Determination. Written notice of the determination of the Board of Supervisors shall be given to the owner(s) and others who received notice of the application for deletion pursuant to c. above.

g. Appeal. The owner(s) who apply to delete a listed historic resource from the Alameda County Register shall have the right to appeal to the Board of Supervisors a determination that a listed resource is not eligible for consideration for deletion, in accordance with the provisions of Article VIII herein. The Board of Supervisors may refer the matter to the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission for a recommendation.

h. If the Board of Supervisors finds the listed historic resource to be eligible for deletions from the Alameda County Register, the general public shall be notified through publication in a local daily newspaper.

2. Deletions of Historic Preservation Districts or Conservation Areas Proposed by Planning Department, Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission and Board of Supervisors. The Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission may initiate a proceeding to delete a historic preservation district or conservation area by adopting a resolution of intent to delete a historic preservation district or a conservation area, either on its own motion or at the request of the Planning Department or the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors may adopt a resolution identifying the historic preservation district or conservation area proposed for deletion, and transmitting its resolution to the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission. No other person may propose deletion of a historic preservation district.

Persons who own at least fifty-one percent of the parcels of land included in a conservation area may propose may propose deletion of that conservation area.

3. Periodic Deletion of Structures No Longer Eligible for the Alameda County Register. The Planning Department shall periodically propose and process for deletion from the Alameda County Register those listed historic resources which have been lawfully removed, demolished or disturbed to such an extent that, in the Planning Department's opinion, they no longer qualify for placement on the register. Such proposals shall be made to the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission and approved by the Commission before deletions are processed.

4. Nominated Resource Protections Pending Final Decision

A. Subject to the time limits set forth in Subsection B below, any nominated resource proposed for consideration as a landmark or contributing resource shall be considered to be a landmark or contributing resource for purposes of Article VI herein, and it shall be subject to the restrictions and protections of Article VI as if it were a landmark or contributing resource. Any geographic area proposed for consideration as a historic preservation district shall be considered to be a historic preservation district for purposes of Article VI herein, and the resources located within the proposed historic preservation district shall be subject to the restrictions and protections of Article VI as if they were located within a historic preservation district.

B. The restrictions of Subsection A above shall apply for a period of one hundred eighty (180) days from the date of adoption by the Commission of a resolution of intent to consider a nomination of a property as a landmark, a contributing resource or a property within a historic preservation district. After one hundred eighty (180) days have elapsed from the date of the resolution of intent, if the Board of Supervisors has not adopted an ordinance designating the nominated resource as a landmark, contributing resource or historic preservation district, the restrictions and protections established by Subsection A above shall no longer apply unless the Board of Supervisors has adopted an ordinance to extend the one hundred eighty (180) day limit to consider the nomination. The Board of Supervisors may extend the time period an additional one hundred eighty (180) days.

C. Listed historic resources proposed for deletion from the Alameda County Register shall be subject to the restrictions and protections of Article VI unless and until a final decision is made by the Board of Supervisors to delete the listed historic resources from the Alameda County Register.

5. Process for Evaluating Nominations for Placement on the Alameda County Register and Proposals for Deletion from the Alameda County Register

The Board of Supervisors shall hear and decide nominations for placement on the Alameda County Register and proposals for deletion of listed historic resources from the Alameda County Register. Prior to the Board of Supervisors hearing a nomination for placement on the Alameda County Register or proposal for deletion from the Alameda County Register, the Commission shall hold a hearing and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for inclusion on, or deletion from, the Alameda County Register.

6. Hearing by the Commission: Notice and Form of Notice

The Commission shall conduct a public hearing or hearings on nominations for placement on the Alameda County Register and proposals for deletion from the Alameda County Register. At the conclusion of the hearing(s), the Commission shall make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on the nomination or proposal.

A. Notice of Hearing. Notice of the hearing before the Commission shall be provided as follows:

1. Written notice shall be given not less than twenty (20) days prior to the hearing to the following individuals:

a. The owner(s) of the nominated resource(s) or the owner(s) of the listed resource proposed for deletion, as shown on the latest tax roll. In the case of a nomination or proposal for deletion regarding a historic preservation district, the notice shall be provided to all property owners within the proposed district or the district proposed for deletion, as shown on the latest tax roll.

b. Where the resource is proposed for inclusion on, or deletion from the register as a landmark, all property owners within five hundred (500) feet of the resource, as shown on the latest tax roll. In the case of a nomination regarding a historic preservation district, the nomination notice shall be provided to all property owners within the proposed district and to all property owners whose property abuts property proposed for inclusion in the historic preservation district.

c. Anyone who has in writing to the Commission secretary requested notice of the nomination.

2. In the event of a nomination or proposed deletion of a historic preservation district, the Planning Department shall also send a copy of the notice to the secretary of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission may review the proposed designations and boundaries of the historic preservation district, or the proposed deletion, and may forward its recommendations to Commission for the Commission's consideration. Failure of the Planning Commission to provide comments shall not prevent the Commission from acting on the nomination or proposed deletion.

3. In the case of a nomination or application for deletion of a resource other than a historic preservation district, the Commission secretary shall also post the notice on the nominated resource or resource proposed for deletion, or in a location in the public right-of-way in a location adjacent to the resource.

B. Form and Contents of Notice.

1. Common address and assessors parcel number, if any, of the nominated resource or the resource proposed for deletion;

2. A general explanation of the proposed designation or proposed deletion, and in the case of a nomination, the requirements and/or benefits thereof;

3. For nominations, the reasons for the proposed designation, in terms of the historic, architectural, and cultural significance of the nominated resource(s), including a description of the proposed significant features and characteristics of the proposed historic resource. The identification of significant features and characteristics in the notice shall not be considered binding on the Commission or Board of Supervisors, and nothing shall prevent or preclude the Commission or Board of Supervisors from identifying different, additional or fewer significant features and characteristics;
4. The date and place of the public hearing or hearings before the Commission.

7. Proposed Designations for Inclusion on, and Proposed Deletions from, the Alameda County Register

A. If the Commission determines that the resource under consideration is eligible for inclusion on, or deletion from, the Alameda County Register based upon the criteria, considerations and assessment of integrity and significance outlined in this chapter, the Commission shall then make its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors as to whether the resource should be included as a landmark, contributing resource, structure of merit, historic preservation district or conservation area on the Alameda County Register, or be deleted from the Alameda County Register. In its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, the Commission shall specify the significant features or characteristics of the nominated resource.

B. In the case of historic preservation district recommendations, the Commission shall identify as “contributing resource(s)” all properties, structures, features or other resources within the proposed historic preservation district that it determines contribute to the district’s designation as a historic preservation district. Properties, structures, features or other resources that happen to be located within the recommended historic preservation district boundaries, but which have no relevance to the area’s identified significance, significant physical features or identifying characteristics shall be deemed non-contributing resources.

8. Action by Board of Supervisors

A. The Commission secretary shall transmit to the county clerk for review by the Board of Supervisors the Commission’s recommendations on inclusion(s) or deletion(s) to or from the Alameda County Register.

B. Upon receipt of the recommendations of the Commission, the Board of Supervisors shall hold a public hearing thereon and may adopt, modify or reject the action(s) recommended by the Commission. In the alternative, the Board of Supervisors may refer the proposed action(s) to the Commission for further hearings, consideration or study. Adoption of any inclusion on or deletion from the Alameda County Register shall be made by uncoded ordinance which shall contain findings of fact in support of each designation. The uncoded ordinance shall identify significant feature(s) or characteristic(s) of resources added to the Alameda County Register, and shall identify contributing resources and non-contributing resources in a historic preservation district.

C. Notice of the Board of Supervisors hearing pursuant to this section shall be mailed to the owner of the affected nominated resource(s), and the person nominating the nominated resource(s), not less than twenty (20) days prior to the date of the hearing. In addition, notice shall be published once not less than twenty (20) days before the hearing in an official newspaper of the county.

9. Frequency of Nominations

When a nomination for placement of a resource on the register has been denied, no new nomination for placement of the same or substantially the same resource may be filed or submitted for a period of three years from the effective date of the final denial of the nomination, except that an owner of a resource may file a new nomination following the passage of one year from the date of final denial. Where a nomination for deletion of a listed historic resource from the register has been denied, no new application to delete the same listed historic resource may be filed or submitted for a period of one year from the effective date of the final denial.

10. Proposed Demolition or Relocation of Buildings or Structures that are At Least Fifty Years Old: Review for Nomination for Placement on Alameda County Register

A. If a permit is sought to demolish or relocate a building or structure that was constructed at least fifty (50) years prior to the date of application for demolition or relocation, and that building or structure is not currently on the official register, is not the subject of a pending nomination, has not been nominated for placement on the official register or reviewed pursuant to this section within the past three years, the permit application shall be referred to the Planning Department to allow the Department to make a preliminary determination whether the structure should be nominated for placement on the official register. For purposes of this section, a building or structure for which a building permit issued and construction commenced not less than fifty (50) years prior to the date of application for a demolition or relocation permit shall be considered to have been constructed not less than fifty (50) years ago, regardless of when the construction was completed, and regardless of whether the building or structure was thereafter expanded, modified or otherwise altered. Absent sufficient evidence to the contrary, the date of issuance of the building permit shall be considered to be the date on which construction commenced.

1. Exceptions: To the extent that surveys have been prepared, and the Board of Supervisors has approved and adopted these surveys, the Board of Supervisors may provide, by resolution or ordinance, that this section shall apply only to those buildings or structures that the survey has identified as potential landmarks or contributing resources.

B. Upon receipt of an application to demolish or relocate a structure pursuant to Paragraph A above, the Planning Department shall make a preliminary determination on whether the structure is eligible for consideration by the Commission and Board of Supervisors for placement on the Alameda County Register, and shall provide notice to the property owner(s) of the preliminary determination. Notice shall be provided by first-class, prepaid mail. The Planning Department shall make the preliminary determination within forty-five (45) days of the date that the application for the permit to demolish or relocate a building or structure is filed and determined or deemed to be complete. Failure of the Planning Department to act within the forty-five (45)

day period determination shall be considered to be a determination that the structure is not eligible for placement on the register. For purposes of this section, the decision shall be considered to have been made on or before the date of mailing of the notice.

C. In making this preliminary determination, the Planning Department shall apply the eligibility criteria and factors specified above. The Planning Department shall find that the nominated resource is eligible for consideration for placement on the Alameda County Register if the Department finds that there is a reasonable likelihood that the nominated resource will be placed on the Alameda County Register following completion of the notice and hearing requirements of this chapter.

D. The preliminary determination of the Planning Department may be appealed by the owner or applicant pursuant to the Commission, and thereafter to the Board of Supervisors, pursuant to the provisions of Article VIII.

E. If an appeal of the preliminary determination of the Planning Department is filed by the owner or applicant, the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission shall hear and decide that appeal within thirty (30) days of the date of filing of the appeal. Notice of the appeal shall be given in the manner specified in Article VIII. Failure of the Commission to act within this time period may be treated by the owner or applicant for the permit to demolish or relocate as a denial of the appeal of the preliminary determination that the building is eligible for consideration for placement on the official register, and that decision shall be subject to appeal to the Board of Supervisors by the owner or applicant for the permit at any time thereafter, up to the date that the Commission in fact issues a decision on the appeal. If the owner or applicant for the permit has not filed an appeal to the Board of Supervisors, the issuance by the Commission of a decision on the appeal more than thirty (30) days after the date of the filing of the appeal shall be subject to appeal to the Board of Supervisors in the manner specified in Article VIII.

F. Pending a final decision on the preliminary determination of whether the building or structure is eligible for nomination for placement on the Alameda County Register, and for a period of forty-five (45) days after a final decision that the building or structure is eligible, the building or structure shall be treated as a nominated resource and shall be subject to the provisions of **Section 15.124.190**. The forty-five (45) day time period shall commence on the date that the preliminary determination, including any appeals, is considered final. During the forty-five day (45) period, the Commission shall consider whether to initiate nomination proceedings; and if the Commission adopts a resolution of intent pursuant to **Section 15.124.180**, the provisions of **Section 15.124.190** shall apply from the date of adoption of the resolution of intent.

ARTICLE V. HISTORIC PRESERVATION DISTRICTS (Prior Chapter 17.20)

A. (Prior 17.20.010) **Purpose.** Historical preservation districts, hereinafter designated as HP districts, are established to further preservation of historical resources in the county by encouraging development within the district which makes their preservation economically and physically viable and by restricting development inconsistent with or detrimental to their historical nature. Regulation of uses within the district is intended to be compatible with the historical nature of the resource and with the district. Regulation may extend to structural or other alteration, including painting, of structures within the district to maintain compatibility with historical values, and any other regulations which may be necessary to properly preserve the

historical resource. (Prior gen.code section 8-35.0) Establishment of any HP district, and regulations adopted therein, shall be consistent with this purpose. (Ord.93-15 Section 1:prior gen.code section 8-35.3)

B. (Prior 17.20.020) Permitted uses. All such uses permitted by the regulations of any of the districts of this title and authorized by the land use and development plan adopted for each HP district established are permitted in the HP district. (Prior gen.code section 8-35.1)

C. (Prior 17.20.030) Establishment. An HP district shall be established by the adoption of an ordinance by the Board of Supervisors reclassifying the described property to an HP district and adopting a land use and development plan constituting the regulations for the use, improvement, and maintenance of the property within the boundaries of the district. (Prior gen.code section 8-35.2)

D. (Prior 17.20.040) Requirements. In order to be classified in the HP district, at least part of the property or one of the structures on the property must be:

1. Listed on the Alameda County Register, or otherwise specifically recognized by the Alameda County general plan; or
2. Designated a Point of Historic Interest or State Historical Landmark, or be eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, or some state or federal inventory of historical resources; or
3. Of special importance due to its historical association, basic architectural merit, its embodiment of a style or special type of construction, or other special character, interest, or value.

E. (Prior 17.20.50) Initiation. Any amendment to establish this district may be initiated in conformance with Section 17.54.730 of this title. The boundaries of the district may include any or all of the areas which relate to the specific historical resource. The proposed amendment shall be in the form of a land use and development plan which specifies the uses of land and other regulations that are to apply in the district. (Prior gen. Code section 8-35.4)

F. (Prior 17.20.060) Procedure—Referral to Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission. The petition or the land use and development plan proposed by the planning commission in the case of a planning commission initiated reclassification, shall be referred to the county Parks, Recreation, and Historical Commission for recommendation. The recommendation shall include a determination as to whether or not the property meets the requirements of item 4 above (Prior Section 17.20.040), whether or not reclassification to an HP district is an appropriate means of preserving the property, and whether or not the proposed uses and any proposed alterations to the property are detrimental to its historical value. The Parks, Recreation, and Historical Commission may also make recommendations to the planning commission as to appropriate modifications in the proposal, including the boundaries of the district. The Parks, Recreation, and Historical Commission review shall be completed and transmitted to the planning commission within forty-five days of receipt, or such longer time as may be agreed to by the planning commission, or the above determination shall be made by the planning commission. (Prior gen. Code section 8-35.5)

ARTICLE VI. DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AND DEMOLITION REVIEW

1. General: Review Required for Development Projects Involving Landmarks, Contributing Resources and Non-Contributing Resources, and for Demolition of Landmarks and Contributing Resources

A. Planning Department Determination. The Planning Department shall review and determine whether a development project application involving a landmark or contributing resource is subject to review by the Commission or by the Department. The determination of the Planning Department on this issue shall be final and shall not be subject to appeal. The decision of the Commission or Planning Department on the development project application shall be subject to appeal pursuant to Article VIII.

B. Commission Review. The Commission shall review and act on the following development projects and requests for demolition and relocation involving landmarks and contributing resources:

1. Any development project involving a landmark or contributing resource where the Planning Department determines that the development project involves work on significant features or characteristics or involves work that could affect the eligibility of the listed historic resource for the Alameda County Register.

Except as specified herein, this includes any of the following work or improvements undertaken on either: a) a landmark, contributing resource or non-contributing resource; or b) pursuant to **Sections 15.124.200 and 15.124.320**, a nominated resource:

- a. Installation or replacement of exterior features including but not limited to windows, doors, and siding;
 - b. Construction of new exterior features, fencing or walls, or alteration of existing features, fencing or walls;
 - c. Replacement or alteration of exterior paint or other exterior architectural coating or treatment on a landmark or contributing resource, where the exterior paint or other exterior architectural coating or treatment has been identified as a significant feature or characteristic;
 - d. Alteration of character-defining interior features of public buildings.
2. Except as provided below, all applications for demolition or relocation of landmarks and contributing resources;

C. Planning Department Review. The Planning Department shall review and act on all development projects involving landmarks and contributing resources not subject to review by the Commission pursuant to Subsection A above. In particular, the Planning Department shall have authority to review and act upon applications for demolition or relocation of accessory

buildings and structures that are not identified as significant features or characteristics of the landmark or contributing resource.

D. Exceptions. Notwithstanding Subsection A above, review by the Commission or Planning Department pursuant to this chapter shall not be required for the following:

1. Demolition or relocation of a non-contributing resource;
2. Demolition of an immediately dangerous building, provided the provisions of **Section 15.124.410** of this chapter shall be satisfied prior to demolition;
3. The following minor projects, provided the work is determined by the Planning Department to be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's standards:
 - a. Demolition or removal of insignificant features of a historic resource, including noncontributory additions, garages or accessory structures, replacement windows and later siding material;
 - b. Any undertaking requiring a permit that does not change the exterior character-defining features of a historic resource, including, but not limited to, re-roofing if the re-roofing material has a similar appearance to the existing or original roofing material and the existing roofing material is infeasible to repair, replacement of windows and doors if the replacements match the existing or original windows and doors and it is infeasible to repair the existing doors or windows.
 - c. Any addition of less than two hundred (200) square feet on side or rear elevations that are not visible from the public right-of-way;
 - d. Any undertaking required by or related to health and safety needs that does not materially alter significant features of a historic resource or have an adverse effect on the significance of a historic resource;
 - e. Any other undertaking determined by the Planning Department to be minor that does not materially alter significant features of a historic resource or have an adverse effect on the significance of a historic resource.
 - f. Projects proposed for consideration as minor projects pursuant to this subsection shall be reviewed by the Planning Department prior to issuance of a building permit to determine if the work meets all of the requirements to be treated as a minor project as defined above. No hearing shall be required, and the decision of the Planning Department shall be final and not subject to appeal. If the Planning Department determines that the project does not constitute a minor project as defined above, the project shall be subject to formal review by the Commission or Planning Department pursuant to Subsection A above and **Section 15.124.300**.
4. Work and repairs required as a matter of law.

E. Review Required. It shall be unlawful and a violation of this chapter for any person to commence or continue work on a development project involving a landmark or contributing resource, or a non-contributing resource in a historic preservation district unless review and approval pursuant to this chapter has occurred; provided that development projects lawfully commenced prior to <date>, either with or without review under the previous version of this chapter, shall not be subject to any further review under this chapter or title.

2. Certificates of Appropriateness

A certificate of appropriateness approved by the Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission shall be required to undertake any of the work specified in Section 15.124.280. This requirement shall be in addition to any other permit or requirement required by this code. The Commission shall, in the manner specified in Section 15.124.330, notice and hold a hearing on the application to undertake work specified in Section 15.124.280.

In reviewing a Certificate of Appropriateness, the Commission must conclude its review by making a finding that the proposal does or does not result in a significant impact upon, or is potentially detrimental to, any resource (including historic districts) listed in the Alameda County Register. If the Commission finds that the proposal would not have a significant impact on, or is not potentially detrimental to, any resource (including historic districts) listed in the Alameda County Register, a Certificate of Appropriateness is issued. Appeals of Commission actions related to Certificates of Appropriateness may be made to the Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Article VIII herein.

3. Applications

The building official shall forward to the Planning Department all applications for permits or other entitlements in which all or part of the work to be performed thereunder is subject to the review of the Commission or Planning Department.

4. Review of Development Projects Involving Non-Contributing Resources in Historic Preservation Districts.

The Commission shall act on development project applications involving new construction on vacant parcels within historic preservation districts. The Planning Department shall act on all other development project applications involving non-contributing resources in historic preservation districts.

5. Review of Development Projects Involving Nominated Resources and Requests for Demolition of Nominated Resources

A. Resources Nominated as Landmarks and Contributing Resources. For purposes of this chapter, resources nominated as potential landmarks and contributing resources shall be treated as if they are landmarks and contributing resources on the Alameda County Register, and

development projects and requests for demolition or relocation involving these resources shall be subject to review by the Commission or Planning Department pursuant to **Section 15.124.300**.

B. Other Resources within Nominated Historic Preservation Districts. Resources within geographic areas nominated for consideration as historic preservation districts which are not nominated or identified as potential contributing resources shall be treated as non-contributing resources, and development projects and requests for demolition or relocation involving these resources shall be subject to review by the Commission or Planning Department pursuant to **Section 15.124.300**.

6. Notice and Hearing

At least one public hearing shall be held by the Commission or Planning Department, as appropriate, on development project applications and other matters for which Commission or Planning Department review is required pursuant to this chapter. Notice of the hearing shall be given as follows:

A. Notice.

1. **Written Notice.** Written notice of the hearing before the Planning Department or the Commission shall be given not less than ten (10) days prior to the hearing to the following: **<Although it doesn't quite make sense to have the Planning Department hold hearings, we need to figure out ways the Planning Department can take some of these responsibilities off the shoulders of the PRHC.>**

- a. The project applicant;
- b. All owners of property located within five hundred (500) feet of the property which is the subject of the hearing, using for notification purposes the names and mailing addresses as shown on the latest tax roll in existence on the date the application is filed.

2. **Posting.** Notice of the hearing shall also be posted on the property which is the subject of the hearing in a conspicuous place for at least seven days prior to the date of the hearing.

B. Form of Notice. The notice shall provide a general description of the development project or proposal, and the date and place of the public hearing(s) before the Planning Department or Commission.

7. Standards

The Commission or Planning Department, as appropriate, shall apply and consider the following when reviewing a development project or other matter pursuant to this chapter:

A. The Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings;

- B. When the project involves a resource located within a historic preservation district, the applicable provisions of the historic preservation district plan, if any;
- C. The goals and policies of this chapter;
- D. The goals and policies of the general plan and any applicable specific or community plan; and
- E. The California State Historical Building Code.

In applying and considering these guidelines, the Commission or Planning Department, as appropriate, shall focus development review on potential impacts to the publicly visible portions of identified historic resources.

8. Decision and Findings

A. Projects not involving the Demolition or Relocation of a Landmark or Contributing Resource. For projects not involving the demolition or relocation of a landmark or contributing resource, the Commission or Planning Department shall not approve the application unless the Commission or Department makes one or more of the following findings concerning the project, as it may have been conditioned or modified:

1. The proposed work will neither adversely affect the exterior architectural features of any landmark nor adversely affect the character or historical, architectural, or aesthetic interest or value of any such resource and its site. With regard to any property located within a historic district, the proposed work conforms to the prescriptive standards for the district adopted by the Commission and does not adversely affect the character of the district.
2. The project is consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards and the goals and policies of this chapter;
3. The project is not fully consistent with the Secretary of Interior standards, due to economic hardship or economic infeasibility, but the project is generally consistent with, and supportive of, the goals and policies of this chapter. The applicant shall have the burden of proving economic hardship or economic infeasibility;
4. The project is not fully consistent with the Secretary of Interior standards, but is consistent with and supportive of identified goals and policies of the general plan or applicable community or specific plan(s); and the project is either generally consistent with, and supportive of, the goals and policies of this chapter, or if not, the benefits of the project and furthering the identified goals and policies of the general plan or applicable community plan outweigh any impacts on achieving the goals and policies of this chapter.

B. Projects Involving Demolition or Relocation of a Landmark or Contributing Resource. For projects involving the demolition or relocation of a landmark or contributing resource, the Commission or Planning Department shall not approve the application unless the Commission or

Department makes one or more of the following findings concerning the project, as it may have been conditioned or modified:

1. Based upon sufficient evidence, including evidence provided by the applicant, the property retains no reasonable economic use, taking into account the condition of the structure, its location, the current market value, the costs of rehabilitation to meet the requirements of the building code or other county, state or federal law;
2. That the demolition or relocation of the landmark or contributing resource is necessary to proceed with a project consistent with and supportive of identified goals and policies of the general plan or applicable community or specific plan(s), and the demolition of the building or structure will not have a significant effect on the achievement of the purposes of this chapter or the potential effect is outweighed by the benefits of the new project;
3. In the case of an application for a permit to relocate, that the building may be moved without destroying its historic or architectural integrity and importance;
4. That the demolition or relocation of the landmark or contributing resource is necessary to protect or to promote the health, safety or welfare of the citizens of the county, including the need to eliminate or avoid blight or nuisance, and the benefits of demolition or relocation outweigh the potential effect on the achievement of the goals and policies of this chapter.

C. Demolition or Relocation. For purposes of this section, demolition or relocation shall mean the complete demolition or relocation of the entirety of the landmark or contributing resource; or the partial demolition or relocation of a portion of a landmark or contributing resource, including where partial demolition or relocation that is part of a development project to remodel or alter the landmark or contributing resource, where the demolition or relocation affects or may affect a significant feature or characteristic, or where the demolition or relocation is other than minor, inconsequential or insignificant and has the potential to affect the historical value of the landmark or contributing resource.

D. Stays of Demolition. The Commission shall have the power, as part of its decision-making process, to delay a demolition decision for up to 180 days to allow for negotiations and exploration of other preservation opportunities, including documentation and relocation. If no satisfactory progress has been made at the end of that set time period, the Board of Supervisors shall have the power to extend the stay of demolition for an additional 180 days to further explore preservation opportunities.

E. Sample Mitigation Measures.

Projects having a substantial adverse impact on historic resources shall, prior to project approval, incorporate one or more measures to mitigate that impact. Such mitigations may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Conformance with Secretary of Interior's Standards. For any proposed exterior alteration of, or other modification to, an identified historic resource that the County determines through the CEQA-required Initial Study review process may cause a

“substantial adverse change” to that resource, the County and applicant shall incorporate measures that would seek to improve the affected historic resource in accordance with either of the following publications:

- Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings; or
- Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.

This measure would likewise apply to any resources determined through the Initial Study review process to be potentially historically significant. Successful incorporation of these measures would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level (*CEQA Guidelines* §15126.4(b)).

2. Relocation. If preservation of the affected historic resource at the current site in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Section IV.8.D.1 above) is determined to be impossible, the building shall, if feasible, be stabilized and relocated to other nearby sites appropriate to their historic setting and general environment. A moved building or structure that is otherwise eligible may be listed in the California Register if it was moved to prevent its demolition at its former location and if the new location is compatible with the original character and use of the historical resource. After relocation, the building’s preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration, as appropriate, shall follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards to ensure that the building retains its integrity and historical significance.
3. Salvage. If the affected historic resource can neither be preserved at its current site (Section IV.8.D.1) nor moved to an alternative site (Section IV.8.D.2) and is demolished, the project applicant shall consult with the Alameda County Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission (PRHC) and local historical societies regarding salvage of materials from the affected historic resource for public information or reuse in other locations. Demolition may proceed only after any significant historic features or materials have been identified and their removal completed.
4. Commemoration. If the affected historic resource can neither be preserved at its current site (Section IV.8.D.1) nor moved to an alternative site (Section IV.8.D.2) and is demolished, the project applicant shall, with the assistance of the Alameda County Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission (PRHC) or other professionals experienced in creating historical exhibits, incorporate a display featuring historic photos of the affected resource and a description of its historical significance into the publicly accessible portion of any subsequent development on the site.
5. Contribution to a Historic Preservation Fund. If the affected historic resource can neither be preserved at its current site (Section IV.8.D.1) nor moved to an alternative site (Section IV.8.D.2) and is demolished, the project applicant may be eligible to

mitigate project-related impacts by contributing funds to the County to be applied to future historic preservation activities, including survey work, research and project evaluation. The details of such an arrangement would be worked out on a case-by-case basis. As part of any such arrangement, the project applicant shall clearly demonstrate the economic infeasibility of other mitigation measures that would mitigate impacts to historic resources, including preservation, relocation, and project modification.

6a. Documentation (short version). Documentation of the affected historic resource and its setting shall be prepared. This documentation shall include three components:

- a. Photographs: An architectural photographer with HABS/HAER experience shall photograph the affected historic resource. If large-format photography is not possible, 35mm photography is acceptable, if the negatives are processed according to HABS standards.
- b. Drawings: Full-measured drawings are preferable. Less elaborate drawings of minor aspects of the affected historic resources may be deemed acceptable.
- c. Historical Overview: Documentation shall include a historical overview of the affected resource.

This documentation shall be filed with local libraries and historical societies, as appropriate.

6b. Documentation (long version). In consultation with a Planning Department Preservation Technical Specialist, the project applicant shall have documentation of the affected historic resource and its setting prepared. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with one of three documentation levels associated with the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) or Historic American Engineering Record (HAER). The Specialist, possibly in consultation with the National Park Service Regional Office, can decide the most appropriate form of documentation, depending on the significance of the affected resource. The three documentation levels are:

Documentation Level I

1. Drawings: a full set of measured drawings depicting existing or historic conditions.
2. Photographs: photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views; photocopies with large format negatives of select existing drawings or historic views where available.
3. Written data: history and description in narrative or outline format.

Documentation Level II

1. Drawings: select existing drawings, where available, shall be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar.
2. Photographs: photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views, or historic views, where available.
3. Written data: history and description in narrative or outline format.

Documentation Level III

1. Drawings: sketch plan.
2. Photographs: photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views. (If large-format photography is not possible, 35mm photography may be deemed acceptable, if the negatives are processed according to HABS standards.)
3. Written data: one page summary.

For all levels of documentation, material standards regarding reproducibility, durability and size shall be met. The HABS/HAER standards are:

Measured Drawings:

Readily Reproducible: Ink on translucent material
Durable: Ink on archivally stable materials
Standard Sizes: Two sizes: 19" x 24" or 24" x 36"

Large Format Photographs:

Readily Reproducible: Prints shall accompany all negatives
Durable: Photography must be archivally processed and stored. Negatives are required on safety film only. Resin-coated paper is not accepted. Color photography is not acceptable.
Standard Sizes: Three sizes: 4" x 5", 5" x 7", 8" x 10"

Written History and Description:

Readily Reproducible: Clean copy for xeroxing.
Durable: Archival bond required.
Standard Sizes: 8 1/2" x 11"

Note: Photographic specifications tend to change with changing technologies. The National Park Service document *Photographic Specifications, Historic American Buildings Survey, Historic American Engineering Record* (National Park Service, 1989) provides useful guidelines for photographing historic buildings, including specifications regarding film and processing types. The National Register of Historic Places recently began accepting digital photographs as official documentation, subject to its 75-year permanence standard.

The agreed upon documentation shall be filed with the local libraries and historical societies, as directed by the Alameda County Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission (PRHC).

9. Appeal

The decision of the Planning Department shall be subject to appeal to the Commission pursuant to Article VIII herein. The decision of the Commission, including the decision of the Commission on an appeal from the Planning Department, shall be subject to appeal to the Planning Commission pursuant to Article VIII herein.

10. Expiration of approval

Whenever the Commission or Planning Department approves the issuance of a demolition permit or a building permit for demolition and rights thereunder have not been exercised for a period of one hundred eighty (180) days from the effective date of issuance, said approval shall expire and said permit is void notwithstanding any other provision of this code to the contrary. For purposes of this section, the term “exercise of rights” shall mean substantial expenditures in good faith reliance upon said permit. The burden of proof in showing substantial expenditures in good faith reliance upon said permit shall be placed upon the permit holder.

11. County projects

A. General. Except as provided below, the provisions of this chapter requiring hearing(s) before the Commission or Planning Department shall apply to development projects involving, or requests for demolition or relocation of, landmarks, contributing resources or non-contributing resources which are owned by the county, including public projects within the Alameda County national historic landmark, historic preservation district; provided that the Commission or Planning Department shall make a recommendation to the county Board of Supervisors or other county decision-making body, entity or person, rather than issuing a decision. When acting on county projects, the Board of Supervisors or other county decision-making body, entity or person shall apply the same standards, and make the same findings, required by this chapter for private projects.

B. Exception. The Board of Supervisors may, by resolution or ordinance, exempt from review by the Planning Department or Commission individual county projects or categories of county projects.

ARTICLE VII. DANGEROUS BUILDINGS AND IMMEDIATELY DANGEROUS BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES OR RESOURCES

1. Notice to Planning Department

The building official, and designees, shall notify the Planning Department upon designation of any of the following as a substandard, dangerous, or immediately dangerous building, structure or resource: any listed historical resource, any resource in a historic preservation district, any nominated resource, any California Register resource, or any National Register resource.

2. Reports to Commission

The secretary of the housing code advisory and appeals Commission and the building official shall forward to the Commission secretary all notices and orders involving any listed historic resource within ten (10) days of any such notices or orders.

3. Demolition of Landmarks and Resources within Historic Preservation Districts

The provisions of this chapter shall not be construed to regulate, restrict, limit or modify the authority of the County and the building official or his or her designee(s) as specified below, to issue demolition or other permits under the building code set forth in this title of this code for the abatement of listed historic resources determined to be immediately dangerous, pursuant to the summary procedures set forth in **Chapter 8.96 of Title 8** of the this code; provided that, prior to approval of a demolition permit for the demolition of a listed historic resource determined to be immediately dangerous, the building official or in his or her absence, the code enforcement manager, or in the code enforcement manager's absence his or her designee as specified below, shall comply with the review and consultation process specified herein.

A. The person serving as building official shall personally issue any permits authorizing the demolition of structure(s) or other resource(s) on the Alameda County Register determined to be immediately dangerous after complying with the review and consultation process specified herein; provided that if the person serving as building official is absent or otherwise unavailable, then the code enforcement manager his or her designee, shall be responsible for issuing any permits authorizing the demolition of a listed historic resource determined to be immediately dangerous after complying with the review and consultation process specified below.

B. The building official, code enforcement manager or designee specified, may issue a permit authorizing the demolition of a listed historic resource determined to be immediately dangerous; provided that prior to issuing the demolition permit, the building official or designee shall first consult with the Planning Department and the chairperson of the Commission for the purpose of discussing (i) whether the condition of the structure(s) or other resource(s) is immediately dangerous within the meaning of this code; and (ii) whether there are any feasible alternatives to demolition that will protect adequately the health and safety of the public, including but not limited to abatement of the immediate threat through repair as specified in **Chapters 8.96 and 8.100 of Title 8** of this code, securing the premises through security fencing or other measures, stabilization, and limited demolition; and provided further that if the building official or designee determines that the structure is immediately dangerous and that there is no feasible alternative to demolition to abate the immediate and present threat to life, health or safety of the public, the building official, code enforcement manager, or designee may issue a permit authorizing the demolition of the structure without complying with the consultation process, although the building official, code enforcement manager or designee, shall make all reasonable efforts to comply with the consultation process before issuing such permit.

4. Lawful Demolition, Removal, or Disturbing of Listed Historic Resource—Deletion—Restrictions

A. When an individually listed landmark on the Alameda County Register, or portion thereof, has been lawfully demolished, removed, or disturbed pursuant to any provisions of this chapter, the county clerk upon notice from the Planning Department, shall cause such landmark, or portion thereof, to be deleted from the Alameda County Register. Upon deletion, the provisions of this chapter shall not be considered to encumber any remaining property on which the landmark was located. Landmark(s) in which a majority of the significant feature(s) and characteristic(s) are destroyed by natural disaster(s), acts of God or other similar events not attributable to the willful or intentional action of the owner or owner's agent, shall be considered lawfully demolished, removed, or disturbed for the purposes of this section.

B. When a listed historic resource in a historic preservation district, or portion thereof, has been lawfully demolished, removed, or disturbed pursuant to any provisions of this chapter, the county clerk upon notice thereof, shall cause such listed historic resource, or portion thereof, to be downgraded to a non-contributing resource in the historic preservation district. Listed historic resource(s) in a historic preservation district in which a majority of the significant feature(s) and characteristic(s) are destroyed by natural disaster(s), acts of God or other similar events not attributable to the willful or intentional action of the owner or owner's agent shall be considered lawfully demolished, removed, or disturbed for the purposes of this section.

ARTICLE VIII. APPEALS

1. Finality of Commission and Planning Department Decisions

Any decision or order of the Commission or Planning Department under this chapter shall become final if no appeal is taken from such order or decision within the time limits prescribed by the applicable appeal provisions of this chapter. No permit regulated by the provisions of this chapter shall issue, nor shall any rights therein vest, until the decision of the Commission or Planning Department is final or any appeal therefrom is disposed of in the manner prescribed by this chapter.

2. Appeal of Planning Department Actions

Except as expressly provide otherwise herein, any person dissatisfied with any decision of the Planning Department under this chapter may appeal the decision to the Commission not later than ten (10) days after the issuance of the Planning Department's notice of decision and findings. Such appeal is taken by filing a notice of appeal with the Commission secretary and paying an appeal fee as established by the Board of Supervisors. Upon receipt of a timely appeal, the Commission secretary shall forthwith transmit to the Commission chairperson all papers and documents on file with the Planning Department relating to the appeal. Notice of the hearing before the Commission shall be given in the manner specified in **Section 15.124.330** provided that, to the extent that **Section 15.124.330** does not otherwise require that notice be given to the appellant(s), written notice shall be given to the appellant(s).

3. Appeal of Commission Actions

Except as expressly provided otherwise herein, any person dissatisfied with any decision of the Commission under this chapter, including any decision on an appeal of a decision of the Planning Department, may appeal that decision to the Board of Supervisors not later than ten (10) days after the date of the Commission's notice of decision and findings. Such appeal is taken by filing a notice of appeal with the Board secretary. Upon receipt of a timely appeal, the Board secretary shall forthwith transmit to the county clerk and Commission chairperson all papers and documents on file relating to the appeal. Notice of the hearing before the Board of Supervisors shall be given in the manner specified in **Section 15.124.330**; provided that, to the extent that **Section 15.124.330** does not otherwise require that notice be given to the appellant(s), written notice shall be given to the appellant(s).

ARTICLE IX. PRESERVATION INCENTIVES

1. Incentive programs

In order to further the goal of historic preservation in Alameda County and the purposes of this Chapter, the Commission shall develop economic and other incentive programs to support the preservation, maintenance, and appropriate rehabilitation of designated Landmarks and recommend to the Board of Supervisors the adoption and implementation of such programs. Such incentives may include:

A. Zoning Ordinance modifications

1. Allow for greater flexibility or exemptions from ordinance provisions such as parking requirements, use, setbacks, or landscape improvements.
2. Allow flexibility in size limit of secondary dwellings in order to preserve the historic integrity of a designated Landmark proposed for use as a secondary dwelling.
3. Provide development incentives that promote cluster development to direct new development away from sensitive designated Landmarks and their landscapes.
4. Provide for the transfer of development rights.

B. Reduction or waiver of fees for the appropriate permits required to carry out proposed improvements to a designated Landmark;

C. Expedited processing of permit applications involving a designated Landmark;

D. Promotion of Landmarks through listing in the Alameda County Register, brochures or other forms of media;

E. Recognition and plaque program (honorary and educational activity, with no legal ramifications)

1. The Commission may recommend and the Board of Supervisors may formally recognize by resolution historic resources that materially benefit the cultural, historic, architectural or aesthetic character of the local community; represent a type of building or are associated with a use which was once common but is now rare in the local community; and/or possess a distinctive location or physical characteristics that represent an established or familiar visual feature to the local community. Recognition would be accompanied by the presentation of a plaque to be placed on the exterior of the recognized historic resource.
2. Plaques, or other symbols of recognition, may also be awarded for exemplary rehabilitation of designated Landmarks.

F. Historic preservation technical assistance including workshops and education material made available to owners of designated Landmarks.

2. California State Historical Building Code

The County implements the State Historical Building Code, hereafter known as SHBC, through the adoption of **Alameda County Code Section <<>>**. The SHBC provides alternatives to the standard building regulations for the preservation, rehabilitation, relocation, related construction, change of use or continued use of a Qualified Historical Building or Property. Such regulations are intended to provide alternative solutions for the preservation of a Qualified Historical Building or Property, to provide access for persons with disabilities, to provide a cost effective approach to preservation, and to provide for the reasonable safety of the occupants or users. The SHBC is applicable to the issuance of building permits for changes to the interior and exterior of said Qualified Historical Building or Property.

3. Mills Act Contracts

A. Mills Act (California Govt. Code §§ 50280, et seq.) contracts granting property tax relief shall be made available by the county only to owners of properties listed in the Alameda County Register (either as landmarks or as contributing resources within historic preservation districts), as well as properties located within the county that are listed in: the National Register of Historic Places (either as individual listings or as contributing properties within National Register historic preservation districts); or the California Register of Historical Places. Such owners may qualify for property tax relief if they pledge to rehabilitate and maintain the historical and architectural character of the property for a minimum ten-year period. Properties that have been previously listed on the above-mentioned register(s), but that have been removed from the register(s) and are no longer listed, shall not be eligible for a Mills Act contract with the county.

B. Mills Act contracts shall be made available pursuant to California law. The Planning Department shall make available appropriate Mills Act application materials.

C. Mills Act contract applications shall be made to the Planning Department, who shall, within sixty (60) days of receipt of a completed application, prepare and make recommendations on the contents of the contract for consideration by the Board of Supervisors. A fee for the application, to cover all or portions of the costs of the preparation of the contract in the amounts set by Board of Supervisors resolution may be charged.

D. The Board of Supervisors shall, in public hearing, resolve to approve, approve with conditions, or deny the proposed contract. Should the Board of Supervisors fail to act on the proposed contract within one year of its receipt of the proposal, the proposal shall be deemed denied.

E. A Mills Act contract application that has failed to be approved by the Board of Supervisors cannot be resubmitted for one year from the date of county Board of Supervisors action, or where the Board of Supervisors fails to take action, within one year from the date that the application is deemed denied pursuant to Subsection D above.

4. Other Government-Sponsored Incentive Programs

The County shall make available information to owners of historic resources regarding where to find more detailed information to pursue the following programs:

A. Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives Program. Administered jointly by the U.S. Department of the Interior and the Department of the Treasury, the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives Program makes available a rehabilitation tax credit that equals 20 percent of the amount spent in a certified rehabilitation of a certified historic structure (listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places) or 10 percent of the amount spent to rehabilitate a non-historic building constructed before 1936. The rehabilitated structure must be an income-producing property, such as a residential rental property or commercial property.

B. Affordable Housing Tax Credits. The Tax Reform Act of 1986 (IRC Section 42) established an investment tax credit for the acquisition, construction or rehabilitation of low-income housing. The credit is approximately 9 percent per year for 10 years for each unit acquired, constructed or rehabilitated without other Federal subsidies and approximately 4 percent for 10 years for units involving the 20 percent Federal rehabilitation tax credit, Federal subsidies or tax-exempt bonds. Units must meet tests for cost per unit and number of units occupied by individuals with incomes below area median income. The law sets a 15-year compliance period. Credits are allocated by State Housing Credit Agencies.

C. Historic Preservation Easements. A preservation easement is a voluntary legal agreement that protects a significant historic resource. This resource can be either an entire structure, a portion thereof (such as a façade or interior), or a historic landscape. Under the terms of an easement, a property owner grants a portion of, or interest in, their property rights to a charitable or governmental organization whose mission includes historic preservation. Once recorded, an easement becomes part of the property's chain of title and usually runs with the land in perpetuity binding the owner who grants the easement and future owners. When the owner donates an easement the owner can claim a charitable deduction on federal income tax. The value of the easement is based on the difference between the appraised fair market value of the property prior to conveying an easement and its value with the easement restriction in place. Federal estate taxes for property heirs also may be reduced because the fair market value of the property was reduced during the donor's lifetime by the easement restriction.

ARTICLE X. MINIMUM MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

A. The owner, lessee or other person legally in possession of a listed historic resource shall comply with all applicable codes, laws and regulations governing the maintenance of property. Every historic resource shall be maintained in good repair by the owner or such other person who has legal possession or control thereof, in order to preserve it against decay and deterioration to the extent practicable. It is the intent of this section to preserve from deliberate or inadvertent neglect the exterior features of listed historic resources and the interior portions thereof when such maintenance is necessary to prevent deterioration and decay of the exterior. Listed historic resources shall be preserved against such decay and deterioration and shall remain free from structural defects through prompt corrections of any of the following defects:

1. Façades that may fall and injure members of the public or damage property;

2. Deteriorated or inadequate foundation, defective or deteriorated flooring or floor supports, deteriorated walls or other vertical structural supports;
3. Members of ceilings, roofs, ceiling and roof supports or other horizontal members which sag, split or buckle due to defective material or deterioration;
4. Deteriorated, crumbling or loose exterior plaster.
5. Deteriorated or ineffective waterproofing of exterior walls, roofs, foundations or floors, including broken windows or doors;
6. Defective or insufficient weather protection for exterior wall covering, including lack of paint or other protective covering;
7. Any fault or defect in the building which renders it structurally unsafe or not properly watertight.

B. If the Commission has reason to believe that a historic resource is being neglected and subject to damage from weather or vandalism, the Commission shall direct the Planning Department to meet with the owner or other person having legal custody and control of the resource and to discuss with them the ways to improve the condition of the property. If no attempt or insufficient effort is made to correct any noted conditions thereafter, the Commission may, at a noticed public hearing, make a formal request that the Planning Department or other appropriate department or agency take action to require corrections of defects in the subject resource in order that such resource may be preserved in accordance with this article.

ARTICLE XI. ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

1. Application of Chapter and Enforcement Powers

The code enforcement manager and building official, and designees, are hereby authorized to enforce the provisions of this chapter, and, in addition to all other powers available to them, are specifically authorized to utilize the provisions of Chapter 1.28 of Title 1 of this code in the enforcement of this chapter. The county attorney is authorized to take such legal actions as are lawfully available, including but not limited to the remedies set forth in Chapter 1.28 of Title 1 of this code.

C. A certificate of appropriateness shall not be issued for the demolition of a historic resource because of the failure of the owner to comply with the provisions of this section.

2. Prohibitions

A. No person shall cause, willfully or otherwise, by action or inaction, alteration of, environmental change to, damage to or demolition of any significant feature(s) or characteristic(s) of a landmark or all or portion of a historic preservation district, or other listed historic resource, or National Register resource or California Register resource without first having obtained a proper county authorization for same.

B. Any person who violates a requirement of this chapter or fails to obey an order issued by the commission or comply with a condition of approval of any certificate or permit issued under this chapter shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

C. For purposes of this chapter, each daily violation shall be considered a new and separate offense.

D. Any alteration or demolition of a historic resource in violation of this chapter is expressly declared to be a nuisance and shall be abated by restoring or reconstructing the property to its original condition prior to the violation. Any person or entity that demolishes or substantially alters or causes substantial alteration or demolition of a structure, in violation of the provisions of this chapter, shall be liable for a civil penalty.

E. Alteration or demolition of a historic resource in violation of this chapter shall authorize the County to issue a temporary moratorium for the development of the subject property for a period not to exceed twenty-four months from the date the County becomes aware of the alteration or demolition in violation of this chapter. The purpose of the moratorium is to provide the County an opportunity to study and determine appropriate mitigation measures for the alteration or removal of the historic resource, and to ensure measures are incorporated into any future development plans and approvals for the subject property. Mitigation measures as determined by the Planning Department and Commission shall be imposed as a condition of any subsequent permit for development of the subject property.

F. In the case of demolition, the civil penalty shall be equal to one-half the assessed value of the historic resource prior to the demolition. In the case of alteration, the civil penalty shall be equal to one-half the cost of restoration of the altered portion of the historic resource. Once the civil penalty has been paid, building and construction permits and/or a certificate of occupancy may be issued.

G. The County Attorney may maintain an action for injunctive relief to restrain a violation or cause, where possible, the complete or partial restoration, reconstruction or replacement of any structure demolished, partially demolished, altered or partially altered in violation of this chapter.

3. Additional Penalties

The penalties provided for in this chapter are designated as non-exclusive, and are in addition to any other remedies the county may have.

ARTICLE XII. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Judicial review

Judicial review of any final decision under this chapter shall be filed within thirty (30) days of the date of the decision, and review shall be pursuant to Section 1094.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

2. Fees

The Board of Supervisors may, by resolution, establish the fee(s) for submission of the nomination, and all other applications and submissions made pursuant to this chapter. In the absence of a Board of Supervisors resolution, the Planning Department may establish the fee and charge schedule.

3. County code references

All references in this chapter to sections of this code shall incorporate those sections as such sections may be amended from time to time.

ISSUE: Consistency of General Ordinance Code with this Ordinance. Sections of the Alameda County General Ordinance Code pertaining to (1) alteration and demolition, and (2) conditional use permits will require some modification in order to properly reference this Ordinance.

Alteration/Demolition Sections

- *15.28 Abatement Procedure*
- *15.08.050 CBC Section 101.3*
- *15.08.550 CBC Section 3403*
- *15.08.560 CBC Section 3404*
- *15.24.170 UHC Section 1103*

Conditional Use Permit Review

- *17.54.130*

4. Severability

Should any section or other portion of this chapter be determined unlawful or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining section(s) and portion(s) of this chapter shall be considered severable and shall remain in full force and effect.

Appendix E

Key PRHC Decision Points

Unincorporated Alameda County
Historic Survey and Preservation Ordinance
Carey & Co., Inc.

KEY PRHC DECISION POINTS

DECISIONS MADE AT 7-5-07 PRHC MEETING

1. Historic resource review body: PRHC v. Subcommittee v. New Body

Background: Making the PRHC the historic resource review body has the advantage of working within the existing system and not requiring the creation of an additional committee. Historic resource review bodies, however, tend to have far fewer than fifteen members, and working with such a large commission may prove cumbersome. The review bodies in the six counties that are CLGs have from five to nine members (Monterey County: 7 members; San Diego County: 7 members; San Francisco City & County: 9 members; Santa Cruz County: 5 members; Tuolumne County: 9 members; Ventura County: 7 members).

Regardless of the size of the body, to become a CLG, all members of the review body must have a “demonstrated interest, competence, or knowledge in historic preservation.”

Carey & Co.’s Recommendation: Consider making a subcommittee of PRHC the historic resource review body (replacing all instances of PRHC in the ordinance with the name of the subcommittee). This would require feedback from the OHP as to whether making a subcommittee the CLG body presents any problems.

Decision (7/5/07 PRHC Meeting): The entire 15-member PRHC shall function as the CLG body. Member requirements were made identical to CLG requirements, with additional preferences (architect, historian, etc.) incorporated into a separate section that specifies recommended backgrounds for PRHC members.

2. Alameda County Register: How should initial properties be set?

Background: The County basically has two choices for what to include initially on the Alameda County Register. The Register could include (1) properties deemed likely significant in previous surveys (properties rated “Y” in the Ashland & Cherryland survey, “1” in the San Lorenzo survey and “K” in the East Alameda survey) that Carey & Co. verified merited continued listing and (2) any additional landmarks, contributors and districts identified in the Comprehensive Survey (whether or not they are among the 50 DPRs from the Comprehensive Survey of Historic Sites). A more conservative approach would be to limit the Register to the 50 properties for which DPRs will be prepared as part of the Comprehensive Survey of Historic Sites. The former approach has the advantage of including a broader array of resources, while the latter approach has the advantage of including only those resources that have been intensively surveyed, and thus being less susceptible to legal challenge.

Decision (7/5/07 PRHC Meeting): At the outset, the Alameda County Register shall include (1) properties deemed likely significant in previous surveys (properties rated “Y” in the Ashland & Cherryland survey, “1” in the San Lorenzo survey and “K” in the East Alameda survey) that

Carey & Co. verified merited continued listing and (2) the 50 properties for which Carey & Co. are preparing DPRs.

Decision (8/3/07 PRHC Meeting): The Register will also include Structures of Merit to be selected by the PRHC.

DECISIONS MADE AT 8-2-07 PRHC MEETING

1. Structures of Merit and Conservation Areas: Should these designations be included in the Alameda County Register?

Background: Consideration needs to be given to whether to add a Structure of Merit category to the Register. This category would include properties that do not yet appear California Register-eligible, but may become so in the future (typically through becoming rarer due to similar buildings being demolished), and so should be included in the Alameda County Register. The Structure of Merit designation would allow the County to keep such properties on the historic resource radar without formally designating them as historic resources and triggering CEQA.

The main disadvantages to the Structure of Merit category are that (1) it adds another level of complication to the historic resource evaluation process, and (2) it may be applied inappropriately to resources that in fact merit formal designation. Ultimately, the decision needs to be made whether or not to limit the Register to CEQA-triggering resources. The Structure of Merit designation would be appropriate if the decision was made to include on the Register properties that should not be considered historic resources for purposes of CEQA, instead of just including them in the Inventory of Potential Historic Resources.

Consideration should also be given to whether to add a second district designation, typically called a "Conservation Area." OHP Bulletin 14 (pages 47-9) makes the following points about Conservation Areas:

- Geared to preserving the character rather than the historic fabric of existing neighborhoods, conservation districts are being considered or have been adopted in a growing number of jurisdictions across the United States as alternatives to more stringent historic district regulations.
- Many conservation districts have been implemented for areas that fall short of meeting the criteria for a local, state, or national historic designation, but nevertheless have important cultural, visual, or other significance. Some are intended as step-down, buffer, or transition areas immediately surrounding a protected historic district. Others are directed at preserving the residential character of a neighborhood, maintaining a unique community center, or emphasizing an important cultural element of a community.
- Conservation districts are typically established as either base districts or overlay districts within the local zoning ordinance.

- The use of conservation districts to protect neighborhood character is particularly effective when the applicable zoning regulations include specific standards addressing those characteristics.

Recommendation: The Structure of Merit designation may be unnecessary, given that the County will have an Inventory of Potential Historic Resources, as well as a Register of Historic Resources. The County, however, may want to consider using the Conservation Area designation in the future, if future survey work identifies areas deserving of such a designation.

Decision (8/3/07 PRHC Meeting): The Alameda County Register shall include Structures of Merit and Conservation Areas. In both cases, the resources so designated would not be considered historic resources for purposes of CEQA, but would be subject to PRHC review according to the terms specified in Chapter VI, "Development Project and Demolition Review."

Note: As Chapter VI is currently written, Structures of Merit would not be subject to development review.

2. Owner Consent: Should owner consent provisions be added to the Ordinance?

Background: The ordinance currently includes no owner consent provisions. According to OHP Bulletin 14 (pages 35-7), which describes the three types of owner consent provisions, owner consent should generally be avoided, although it may be necessary for political reasons: "Practical experience around the country shows that it is difficult to craft an effective historic preservation program if owner consent is required. Inevitably, the city will lose significant structures or deleterious alterations will be made. However, in some cases, practical and political considerations may dictate that owner consent provisions be present in order to ensure passage of a preservation ordinance."

Recommendation: Owner consent provisions should not be added to the ordinance, unless they are deemed politically necessary.

Decision (8/3/07 PRHC Meeting): No owner consent provisions will be added to the Ordinance at this time. If, following informal conversation with the Board of Supervisors, it is decided that such provisions may be politically necessary, then the PRHC will explore ways of integrating them into the ordinance.

3. Review Standards: Should more specific factors be added to the Ordinance for the Commission to consider in determining whether a proposed demolition or change is compatible with the historical resource?

Background: If so desired, we can add here more specific factors that would be considered by the Commission in determining whether a proposed demolition or change is compatible with the historical resource. These factors could include provisions related to:

- Mass—the height of a building, its bulk, and the nature of roof line
- Proportions between the height of a building and its width (is its appearance predominantly horizontal or predominantly vertical?)

- Nature of the open spaces around buildings, including the extent of setbacks, the existence of any side yards (with an occasional view to the rear) and their size, and the continuity of such spaces along the street
- Existence of trees and other landscaping, and the extent of paving
- Nature of the openings in the facade, primarily doors and windows—their location, size, and proportions
- Type of roof — flat, gabled, hip, gambrel, mansard, etc.
- Nature of projections from the buildings, particularly porches
- Nature of the architectural details—and, in a broader sense, the predominant architectural style
- Nature of the materials
- Color
- Texture
- Details of ornamentation
- Signs

According to OHP Bulletin 14 (page 51), these more specific standards may help protect the preservation ordinance from legal challenge: “As preservation ordinances demand more from landowners and become broader in scope, they are increasingly likely to be challenged in court on the validity of these review standards. Challengers may argue that the standards violate due process because they are vague and unclear. While court decisions in most areas of land-use law have been very favorable in upholding relatively broad review standards, fairness and regulatory efficiency dictate that local ordinances contain clear standards that result in predictable decisions by staff and review commissions and limit administrative discretion.”

Recommendation: It should first be noted that the Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings are themselves quite detailed (unlike the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties). Additional detailed standards are more common in ordinances for smaller jurisdictions. Developing specific standards that are still widely applicable to properties throughout unincorporated Alameda County would be difficult, and would take a lot of time and effort. Moreover, such standards could be developed later, following adoption of this ordinance, and do not need to be included in the ordinance at this time. (Such standards would also be easier to amend than standards written into the ordinance itself.) Given this, we recommend that the PRHC not add more specific standards to this section of the ordinance at this time.

Decision (8/3/07 PRHC Meeting): Additional preservation standards will be compiled into a stand-alone document at a later date.

4. Stays of Demolition: Should provisions be added enabling the PRHC and/or the Board of Supervisors to delay demolitions for a specified period of time?

Recommendation: We suggest adding to the ordinance a section regarding demolitions that grants the Commission the ability, as part of its decision-making process, to delay a demolition

decision for a set period of time (typically 90, 120 or 180 days) to allow for negotiations and exploration of other preservation opportunities, including documentation and relocation. If no satisfactory progress has been made at the end of that set time period, the Board of Supervisors could be given the power to extend the process for an additional set time period (90, 120 or 180 days).

Decision (8/3/07 PRHC Meeting): The Ordinance shall include a stay-of-demolition section specifying that the PRHC and Board of Supervisors will each have the power to delay a demolition decision for up to 180 days.

5. Preservation Fund: Should a historic preservation fund be included in the sample mitigation measures?

Contribution to a historic preservation fund typically arises as part of a specific settlement agreement, not as a standard option for developers in lieu of preservation.

Recommendation: We recommend that such a fund be reserved for such special circumstances and, in general, should only be used as a mitigation of last resort. If the decision is made to create such a fund, however, a schedule should be created that specifies which impacts to historic resources trigger fees, how the amounts of those fees are determined, and how the collected fees will be used for preservation ends. A nexus report would also be required for any in-lieu fees. We haven't yet found many other examples of such funds. For demolitions of historic properties, the City of Ontario assesses a fee of \$7 per square foot for residential properties and \$3.50 per square foot for accessory structures.

Decision (8/3/07 PRHC Meeting): Contribution to a historic preservation fund will be retained in the Ordinance as a sample mitigation measure, with the following conditions: (1) such contribution is clearly referenced as the mitigation of last resort, to be used only when all other mitigations are deemed impossible; and (2) the amount of such a contribution will be worked out on a case-by-case basis.

Appendix F

Alameda County Register of Historic Resources, March 2008 Draft

Unincorporated Alameda County
Historic Survey and Preservation Ordinance
Carey & Co., Inc.

**Alameda County Landmarks & Contributing Buildings
Identified in 2005-2008 Comprehensive Survey**

Carey & Co., Inc.

Address	Area	Historic Name	Description	Year Built
4951 Arroyo Road	East County	Livermore VA Hospital	Spanish Revival hospital building	1949
728 Bockman Road	San Lorenzo		Queen Anne cottage	1895
782 Bockman Road	San Lorenzo	Henry Bockman House	Folk Victorian bungalow	1904-10
2495 Castro Valley Blvd	Castro Valley	Castro Valley Lumber Co.	Industrial building	c. 1924
2520 Castro Valley Blvd	Castro Valley	California State Hatchery	Art Deco commercial building	1934
2544 Castro Valley Blvd	Castro Valley	Crowe's Feed Shop	Mission Revival store, warehouse	1924
2845-61 Castro Valley Blvd	Castro Valley	Chabot Theater	Art Deco cinema	1949
22047 Center Street	Castro Valley		Prairie Box/American Foursquare style residence	c. 1910
14563 Cull Canyon Road	Castro Valley	Red barn, Cull's Ranch	Transverse frame barn	1855-78
16874 Cull Canyon Road	Castro Valley		Farmhouse and barn	1890
2440 Depot Road	Hayward	Mt. Eden Cemetery	Cemetery	1862
2595 Depot Road	Hayward/ Eden Area	"Sea Breeze," Herman Mohr House	Modified Queen Anne	1900
22380 Eden Canyon Road	Castro Valley	King Ranch	Bank barn	c. 1905
10366 S. Flynn Road	East County		Period Revival farmstead	c. 1890
15400 Foothill Boulevard	Fairmont	Alameda County Infirmary, Fairmont Hospital	Eclectic group of medical buildings, mainly Mediterranean Revival styles	c. 1918 - c. 1960
15400 Foothill Boulevard	Fairmont	Superintendent's house	Queen Anne, White Cotton Cottage	c. 1890s
1048 Grant Avenue	San Lorenzo	Heide House	Queen Anne cottage	1901
Grove Way at Mission	Cherryland	Grove Way Bridge	Bridge	1915
24985 Hesperian Boulevard	Hayward	Cornelius Mohr House and Farm	Italianate Farmhouse, Barn, and Tank House, and ancillary Buildings	1876
Hollis Canyon off Eden Canyon	Castro Valley	Mai House	Craftsman bungalow, known as "Eastwood House"	1915-16
5922 Jensen Road	Castro Valley	Jensen farmhouse	Farmhouse and associated structures	1872
16331 Kent Avenue	Ashland		Barn	c. 1890
16490 Kent Avenue	Ashland	Holy Ghost Hall	Portuguese social hall and chapel	1903
264 E. Lewelling Boulevard	San Lorenzo	St. John's Catholic Church	Spanish Eclectic church	1925-72
Lewelling Blvd @ Embers Way	San Lorenzo	Captain William Robert's House	Italianate house	1869

**Alameda County Landmarks & Contributing Buildings
Identified in 2005-2008 Comprehensive Survey**

Carey & Co., Inc.

Address	Area	Historic Name	Description	Year Built
22319 Meekland Avenue	Cherryland		Adobe residence	late 1930s
2033 Miramonte Avenue	Fairmont		Spanish Revival "estate"	c. 1922-24
20095 Mission Boulevard	Hayward	PG&E substation, Station O	Mediterranean Revival PG&E substation	1926
3461 Old Foothill Road	East County	Francisco Alviso Adobe	Adobe residence/ranch	1854
24829 Palomares Road	Castro Valley	Bonnie Doone Ranch	Folk Victorian farmhouse	c. 1860
33853 Palomares Road	Castro Valley	Chouinard Winery and vineyards	Ranch-style house	1942
6446 Paloverde Road	Castro Valley	"Spark Stoves" barn	Transverse frame barn	c. 1915
5196 Proctor Road	Castro Valley	Borloz Farm	Poultry farming complex	c. 1920
911 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
912 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
926 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
927 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
943 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
944 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
959 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
960 St James Court	Cherryland		Mediterranean style bungalow	1926
20050 San Miguel Avenue	Castro Valley		Minimal Traditional residence	1936
20110 San Miguel Avenue	Castro Valley		Minimal Traditional residence	1935
20176 San Miguel Avenue	Castro Valley		Minimal Traditional residence	1939
4327 Seven Hills Road	Castro Valley		Craftsman Bungalow	1924
15645 Tracy Street	San Lorenzo		Shingle style residence	c. 1900
15507 Usher Street	San Lorenzo	First Southern Baptist Church	Gothic Revival church	1875
15525 Usher Street	San Lorenzo		Queen Anne cottage	c. 1895
North end of Van Avenue	San Leandro	Mount Calvary Cemetery	Cemetery	1872

Alameda County Landmarks & Contributing Buildings Identified in Previous Historic Surveys

Includes (1) Ashland/Cherryland Survey (Resources rated "Y - appears eligible"); (2) East County Survey (Resources rated "K - likely to be individually significant"); and (3) San Lorenzo Survey (Resources rated "A1 - appears eligible under NRHP Criterion A," "B1 - appears eligible under NRHP Criterion B," and "C1 - appears eligible under NRHP Criterion C")

Number	Street	Property Description	Date (Est.)	Previous Survey	Notes
1424	168th Street	Large Period Revival house	1925	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	c. 1890 carriage house, large trees on site
10605	Altamont Pass Road	Commerical garage	1925	East Alameda ("K")	Summit Garage and bungalow
	Altamont Pass Road near Greenville Road	Railroad bridge	1915	East Alameda ("K")	
	Altamont Pass Road near Sanitary Landfill	Railroad bridge	1915	East Alameda ("K")	Bridge inscribed "Western Pacific 1915"
	Arroyo Road	Gateway	1913	East Alameda ("K")	Olivina Winery Gateway; Arroyo at Wetmore; DPR exists
	Arroyo Road	Non-residential agricultural buildings and structures, such as sheds, barns, fences, windmills.	1900	East Alameda ("K")	Mission Revival Winery building and 1910 residence; now part of Veterans Park
	Arroyo Road	Non-residential agricultural buildings and structures, such as sheds, barns, fences, windmills/Winery/Spanish Revival or Mediterranean	1882	East Alameda ("K")	Cresta Blanca Winery
16294	Ashland Avenue	Queen Anne Cottage with Tankhouse	1890	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
16298	Ashland Avenue	One-story house	1900	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
16464	Ashland Avenue	One-story house	1900	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
16467	Ashland Avenue	Greenhouses	1920	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
16500	Ashland Avenue	Greenhouses	1920	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	Japanese house & gardens c. 1965
16600	Ashland Avenue	Two-story convent	1949	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
21455	Birch Street	Colonial Revival Church complex	1865/1948	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	"Pioneer Chapel" structure moved c. 1948
773	Blossom Way	Craftsman Bungalow	1920	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
740	Bockman Avenue	Italianate residence	1890	San Lorenzo ("A1")	Moved from airport, now Real Estate office, altered
752	Bockman Avenue	Residence	1885	San Lorenzo ("A1")	Address approximate
	Bond Street	Government building - school/Spanish Colonial Revival or Mediterranean	1930	East Alameda ("K")	
13550	Calaveras Road	Calaveras Dam	1930	East Alameda ("K")	Part of Hetch Hetchy System; includes Spanish-style intake structure on dam and adjoining complex of house, barn, etc.
	Cherry Way	Row of street trees	?	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
1074	Delano Street	One-story, central hall house, "Portuguese Garden"	1890	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
9635	Dublin Canyon Road	Multiple residential and agricultural buildings/Queen Anne	1895	East Alameda ("K")	Victorian house
9711	Dublin Canyon Road	Multiple residential and agricultural buildings/Ranch style	1940	East Alameda ("K")	Houses. Barn, quonset hut
	Dublin Canyon Road east of Mountain View Drive	Railroad bridge	1915	East Alameda ("K")	Arch bridge similar to 11393 Dublin Canyon Road in Pleasanton
770	El Charro Road	Multiple residential and agricultural buildings/Ranch	1940	East Alameda ("K")	"Rancho del Charro," house, stable, barn
770	El Charro Road	Non-residential agricultural buildings and landscaping	1940	East Alameda ("K")	Stable, eucalyptus row, round brick stable in field
1063	Elgin Street	Gothic Revival House	1880	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
10366	South Flynn Road	Multiple residential and agricultural buildings	1880	East Alameda ("K")	Farm/ranch with house and old barn
12565	Foothill Road	Multiple barns	?	East Alameda ("K")	Foothill Farms
536	Grove Way	Large two-story Spanish Colonial Revival house	1930	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
564	Grove Way	Large two-story house	1920	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
636	Grove Way	Large two-story Mediterranean Revival house	1915	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	

Alameda County Landmarks & Contributing Buildings Identified in Previous Historic Surveys

Includes (1) Ashland/Cherryland Survey (Resources rated "Y - appears eligible"); (2) East County Survey (Resources rated "K - likely to be individually significant"); and (3) San Lorenzo Survey (Resources rated "A1 - appears eligible under NRHP Criterion A," "B1 - appears eligible under NRHP Criterion B," and "C1 - appears eligible under NRHP Criterion C")

Number	Street	Property Description	Date (Est.)	Previous Survey	Notes
1046	Grove Way	Colonial Revival Pioneer Chapel	1865/1948	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	Moved c. 1948 to 21455 Birch St, and again c. 2005 to Grove Way; on National Register
1129	Grove Way	One-story Italianate house	1880	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	Some alterations over time
	Grove Way Bridge	Reinforced concrete bridge	1915	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	Bridges San Lorenzo Creek at Mission Blvd.
240	Hampton Avenue	Large Italianate house and carriage house	1869	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	Meek Mansion & Carriage House; On National Register
15400	Hesperian Boulevard	San Lorenzo Pioneer Cemetery	1864	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	CA Pt. of Historical Interest; address approximate
16080	Hesperian Boulevard	Theater	1946	San Lorenzo ("A1", "C1")	Lorenzo Theater, Cal. Reg. 01-0041, 7J
17975	Hesperian Boulevard	Commercial	1955	San Lorenzo ("A1")	Sam's Drive Through
	I-580 between Grant Line & Flynn Road	Railroad bridge	1915	East Alameda ("K")	Western Pacific over Lincoln Highway
16331	Kent Avenue	Large barn	1890	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	Address approximate
16341	Kent Avenue	Queen Anne Cottage	1890	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	Address approximate
16490	Kent Avenue	Religious complex	1890	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	Holy Ghost Association Hall (Portuguese); some additions
16503	Kent Avenue	One-story house	1890	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
16560	Kent Avenue	One-story house	1890	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
16561	Kent Avenue	One-story house	1890	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
6	Kilkare Road	Sunol Railroad Station	1885	East Alameda ("K")	
86	Kilkare Road	Residential building/Queen Anne	1890	East Alameda ("K")	House
141	Kilkare Road	Church/Stick-Eastlake Style	1895	East Alameda ("K")	Little Brown Church
341	Kilkare Road	Residential building	1890	East Alameda ("K")	House
463	Kilkare Road	Stone winery building	1890	East Alameda ("K")	Elliston Vineyards; on National Register
1011	Kilkare Road	Stone winery building	1888	East Alameda ("K")	On National Register
	Kilkare Road	Clubhouse, log construction	1925	East Alameda ("K")	Kilkare Woods Clubhouse, park; also 12051 Glenora Way
3837	Laughlin Road	Multiple agricultural buildings	1900	East Alameda ("K")	Farm/ranch
9	East Lewelling Boulevard	Large laurel or bay tree	?	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
264	East Lewelling Boulevard	Mediterranean Revival religious complex	1925-1955	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	St. John's Catholic Church, school, gym, rectory
130	West Lewelling Boulevard	Residence	1885	San Lorenzo ("A1", "C1")	
254	West Lewelling Boulevard	One-story house	1890	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y"); San Lorenzo ("A1")	
3981	North Livermore Avenue	Colonial Revival farmhouse with agricultural buildings	1910	East Alameda ("K")	
4157	North Livermore Avenue	Colonial Revival farmhouse with agricultural buildings	1905	East Alameda ("K")	
5459	North Livermore Avenue	Italianate farmhouse with agricultural buildings	1885	East Alameda ("K")	
1890	South Livermore Avenue	Colonial Revival farmhouse with agricultural buildings	1905	East Alameda ("K")	
21459	Locust Street	Queen Anne Cottage	1890	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
15775	Lorenzo Avenue	School	1950	San Lorenzo ("A1", "C1")	Arroyo High School
9618	Lupin Way	Multiple residential and agricultural buildings/Italianate	1885	East Alameda ("K")	Farm/ranch with house; also 10123 Patterson Pass Rd.

Alameda County Landmarks & Contributing Buildings Identified in Previous Historic Surveys

Includes (1) Ashland/Cherryland Survey (Resources rated "Y - appears eligible"); (2) East County Survey (Resources rated "K - likely to be individually significant"); and (3) San Lorenzo Survey (Resources rated "A1 - appears eligible under NRHP Criterion A," "B1 - appears eligible under NRHP Criterion B," and "C1 - appears eligible under NRHP Criterion C")

Number	Street	Property Description	Date (Est.)	Previous Survey	Notes
11882	Main Street	Commercial building/Mission Revival	1920	East Alameda ("K")	Commercial complex including tankhouse; Sunol Coffee House & Café
1163	Manning Road	Multiple residential and agricultural buildings/bungalow	1915	East Alameda ("K")	Farm/ranch with bungalow
1541	Middle Lane	Farmstead with water tower	1920	San Lorenzo ("A1")	
24495	Mohr Drive	Residence and store	1925	San Lorenzo ("A1")	
	Montgomery Avenue	Row of large street trees	?	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	West side of street
3950	Mountain House Road	Mission Revival school	1923	East Alameda ("K")	Mountain Home School
	Niles Canyon Road	Railroad bridge	1928	East Alameda ("K")	Richmond Bridge at P.M. 13.33
	Niles Canyon Road along RR	Telegraph poles	1870	East Alameda ("K")	
	Niles Canyon Road east of Idylwood	Railroad bridge	1910	East Alameda ("K")	
	Niles Canyon Road near Palomares Road	Railroad bridge	1906	East Alameda ("K")	Farwell bridge 33-335 at P.M. 13.025; abutments (1932)
	Niles Canyon Road west of Brightside	Railroad bridge	1869	East Alameda ("K")	Bridge with stone abutments
21439	Ocean View Drive	Queen Anne cottage	1890	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
	Paloma Road west of I-680	Landscape features	?	East Alameda ("K")	Tree allees on both sides
955	Paseo Grande	Church	1955	San Lorenzo ("C1")	San Lorenzo Community Church
8433	Patterson Pass Road	Queen Anne foursquare residence with water tower, agricultural buildings and palm trees	1895	East Alameda ("K")	
	Pleasanton-Sunol Road South of Verona	Landscape features	?	East Alameda ("K")	Sections of allees of trees
1565	Plaza Drive	One-story house	1880	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	
4520	Tesla Road	Multiple residential and agricultural building/Queen Anne	1895	East Alameda ("K")	Dr. Gordon farm/ranch with house; moved from Livermore in 1966
4590	Tesla Road	Winery	1883	East Alameda ("K")	Concannon Vineyard
8792	Tesla Road	Craftsman winery with tank house	1910	East Alameda ("K")	Tesla Vineyard (eucalyptus row, barns)
11450	Tesla Road	Gothic Revival farmhouse with tankhouse	1873	East Alameda ("K")	Structure built by N.B. Holmes, local blacksmith, in 1873; House was moved to this location in the 1970s and rehabilitated
15536	Tracy Street	Victorian cottage	1898	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y"); San Lorenzo ("A1")	Possible San Lorenzo Grove caretaker's house
15630	Tracy Street	Gothic Revival House	1880	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y"); San Lorenzo ("A1", "C1")	Some alterations
15651	Tracy Street	Shingle-style house	1915	Ashland/Cherryland ("Y")	Address approximate
15787	Washington Avenue	Gas station	1950	San Lorenzo ("A1")	

**Alameda County Structures of Merit
PRHC, 10/17/07**

Address	Area	Property Type	Age	Notes
2059 150th Avenue	Ashland	Queen Anne Cottage		
2135 150th Avenue	Ashland	Victorian Cottage		
1511 166th Street	Ashland	Craftsman Bungalow		
6443 Alisal Street	East County	Water tower		
21921 Arbor	Castro Valley	Victorian Cottage		
5211 Arroyo Road	East County	Dos Mesas Winery	1883	May be on grounds of VA Medical Center or in Sycamore Grove Park. Remaining are residence, office, bottling facility and wine storage tunnels. Administered by LARPD.
3178 Aylesbury Court	Castro Valley	Large English Cottage		
21019 Baker Road	Castro Valley	Minimal Traditional church and stable		Italian club
Bernal Road	East County	Possibly Hearst family home		May have become part of Castlewood Golf Course building
20997 Birch Street	Cherryland	Queen Anne Cottage		
650-88 Blossom Way	Cherryland	Mission Revival commercial/residential		
2637 Castro Valley Boulevard	Castro Valley	Dell Cafe		Moved to Castro Valley from Oakland
2806 Castro Valley Boulevard	Castro Valley	First Castro Valley Post Office		Currently Castro Valley Beauty College
2836 Castro Valley Boulevard	Castro Valley	First bakery in Castro Valley		Jenny's Café
3550-58 Castro Valley Boulevard	Castro Valley	1920s commercial building		Gained notoriety in the 1990's when owner painted it bright purple
20546 Center Street	Castro Valley	Bungalow, barns on large parcel		
741 Cherry Way	Cherryland	Modest airplane bungalow with water tower		
2768 Collier Canyon Road	East County	Farmstead: bungalow, barn, garage, outbuildings		Isolated amidst new business park development, threatened
4221 Collier Canyon Road	East County	Barn		
4760 Collier Canyon Road	East County	Barn		address incorrect
3646 Corss Road	East County	Barns		
7324 Crow Canyon Road	Castro Valley	Victorian Cottage		
Crow Canyon Road	Castro Valley	McMerritt Barn	Late 1890s	
1088 Delano Street	San Lorenzo/ Ashland/Cherryland	Agricultural property, c.1900 house, garage, large barn		
Del Valle	East County	Sanitarium		Adjacent to VA Hospital, on grounds of Camp Arroyo; only 1 building left; on EBRPD property
1578 East Street		Spanish Colonial Revival residence		
Eden Canyon Road	Castro Valley	King's Ranch		Large, well established ranch property; King's Ranch includes whole upper half of Eden Canyon Road -- need to clarify where historic resources are
964-68 Elgin Street	San Lorenzo/ Ashland/Cherryland	Duplex court, possible worker housing		
195 East Lewelling Boulevard	San Lorenzo/ Ashland/Cherryland	Bungalow with multiple outbuildings		
2200 Fairmont Drive	Fairmont	Juvenile Hall		
2700 Fairmont Drive	Fairmont	Animal Control Complex		Possible former agricultural use
1797 Fairview Avenue		Bungalow with monitor		
11761 North Flynn Road	East County	Greek Revival farmstead	1878	John Young homestead; site owned by Alameda County Waste Management Authority
19644 Forest Avenue	Castro Valley	Tudor residence		
20325 Forest Avenue	Castro Valley	Farmhouse		
20554 Forest Avenue	Castro Valley	Colonial Revival residence		
20633 Garden Avenue		Victorian Cottage		
16822 Grant Line Road	East County	1925 roadside store and residences		
2045 Grove Way	Castro Valley			Caretakers house on Lauren Lanch Strobridge Property
2833 Grove Way	Castro Valley	Victorian Cottage		
3069 Grove Way	Castro Valley	2 story farmhouse		
Grove Way & Redwood Road	Castro Valley	Castro Valley Exchange site	1881	Current site of Trader Joe's, site of Castro Valley's first business per CV General Plan
21855 Hathaway Avenue	Hayward	Classic Box residence		
Hazel at Main Street	Hayward	Hazel Street Bridge	1925	George Posey Engineer
18695 or 18701 Hesperian Boulevard	San Lorenzo	McConaghy Victorian farmhouse	1886	Restored 12 room house, tank house and carriage house, may be within Hayward city limits
Hesperian Boulevard	Hayward	House next door to Mohr estate		
Hesperian Boulevard at Hwy 92	Hayward	Original Mt. Eden Post Office		Within Hayward city limits
4658-62 Heyer Avenue	Castro Valley	1900s bungalow		
3596 Jamison Way	Castro Valley	Farmhouse		
18467 Lake Chabot Road	Castro Valley	Ranch house		

**Alameda County Structures of Merit
PRHC, 10/17/07**

Address	Area	Property Type	Age	Notes
1761 Laughlin Road	East County	Ruins of pyramidal roofed house		Shows interesting architectural conventions, like extreme pyramidal roof.
Foot of Lewelling Boulevard	San Lorenzo	Robert's Landing		
2060 South Livermore Avenue	East County	Bungalow and water tower		
3320 Lorraine/Hartford Avenue	East County	1940s radio station		
15593 Lorenzo Avenue	San Lorenzo	House	1945	Post-WWI house
15600 Lorenzo Avenue	San Lorenzo	House	1915	Perry family, stucco
3264 Magdalena Place		Victorian Cottage		
11601 Main Street	East County	Sunol Glenn School		
4529 Malabar Avenue	Castro Valley	Synagogue, was Italianate residence		May have associations with the neighboring Alcorn Chicken Ranch property
2949 Marina Avenue	East County	1940s Barns		Barn is not visible from the roadway
22217 Meekland Avenue	Cherryland	Art Deco Commercial		
3424 Middleton Ave	Castro Valley	Victorian		
3005 Mines Road	East County	Mel Winery	1913	Now Murietta's Well; first floor of winery building dates to 1913; primary significance is vine cuttings brought from Chateau d'Yquem to Livermore Valley
20102 Mission Boulevard	Hayward	Quonset hut with additions		Banchero's Restaurant
21003 Mission Boulevard	Cherryland	Commercial Building on corner of St. James and Mission Blvd		Building may have been extensively modified
27745 Palomares Canyon Road	Castro Valley	Farmstead with water tower		
9355 Patterson Pass Road	East County	Barn	c.1890	Barn was in place prior to 1890, when Hans Rasmussen Nissen and family purchased the property
21798 Princeton Street	Cherryland	1925 Period Revival residence		
4853 Proctor Road	Castro Valley	Shingle style residence		
26 Railroad Avenue	East County	Railroad worker housing		Specific use related to railroad and town of Sunol
30 Railroad Avenue	East County	Railroad worker housing		Specific use related to railroad and town of Sunol
17272 Redwood Road	Castro Valley	1910 farm complex, "Clark's Wooded Acres"		
19550 Redwood Road	Castro Valley	Craftsman Bungalow		
19693 Redwood Road	Castro Valley	Small concrete block commercial building		APN: 84B-590-17-7
16005 Rochi Court	San Lorenzo/ Ashland/Cherryland	Bungalow court		
992 St James Court	Cherryland	Commercial Building on corner of St. James and Mission Blvd		Built about the same time as Bungalows
23385 Saklan Road	Mt Eden	1915 grain elevator		
San Miguel Avenue	Castro Valley	Adobe Arts Center	1938	Possible WPA project
19083 Santa Maria Avenue	Castro Valley	English Cottage		
4952 Seaview Avenue	Castro Valley	Craftsman residence		
3832 Somerset Avenue	Castro Valley	English Cottage		Owner claims building has been gutted and remodeled
766 West Sunset Drive		Spanish Revival residence with water tower		
Sycamore Avenue	San Lorenzo	Tree	c.1915	To the side of San Lorenzo School District buildings, next to 1904 school site—should seek Heritage Tree status
15530 Usher Street	4 Corners	Classical Revival Farmhouse	1890	
6705 Vallecitos Road	East County	Vallecitos Nuclear Center	1960	
21026 Wilbeam Avenue	Castro Valley	Strobridge House, Queen Anne	1906	CA Pt. of Interest; Prior DPR exists
22588 Woodroe Avenue	Castro Valley	Spanish Revival residence		
	Castro Valley	Castro Village Center	1949	One of first shopping centers in County
	Fairview	Lone Tree Cemetery	1870	
	Castro Valley	Palomares School Site	1868	
	Castro Valley	Redwood Schoolhouse Site	1866	State Landmark per Castro Valley General Plan
	Castro Valley	Stanton House		Has been moved
	Sunol	Sunol Water Temple		
	Castro Valley	Valley Cathedral at the Crossroads	1969	Architect Welton Beckett, now Neighborhood Church
	Castro Valley	Archeological Site—ALA60		8,000-10,000 years old Indian village site

Appendix G

Regulatory Framework

Unincorporated Alameda County
Historic Survey and Preservation Ordinance
Carey & Co., Inc.

The regulatory background outlined below offers an overview of federal and state criteria used to assess the historic significance and eligibility of a building, structure, object, site or district for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

Federal Government Criteria

National Register Bulletin Number 15, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, describes the Criteria for Evaluation as being composed of two factors. First, the property must be “associated with an important historic context.”¹ The National Register identifies four possible context types, of which at least one must be applicable at the national, state, or local level. As listed under Section 8, “Statement of Significance,” of the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, these are:

- A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history.²

Second, for a property to qualify under the National Register’s Criteria for Evaluation, it must also retain “historic integrity of those features necessary to convey its significance.”³ While a property’s significance relates to its role within a specific historic context, its integrity refers to “a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance.”⁴ To determine if a property retains the physical characteristics corresponding to its historic context, the National Register has identified seven aspects of integrity:

Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.

Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.

Setting is the physical environment of a historic property.

¹ U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, National Register Bulletin 15 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1997), 3.

² U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*, National Register Bulletin 16A (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1997), 75.

³ National Park Service, National Register Bulletin 15, 3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 44.

Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.

Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.

Feeling is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.

Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.⁵

Since integrity is based on a property's significance within a specific historic context, an evaluation of a property's integrity can only occur after historic significance has been established.⁶

State of California Criteria

The California Office of Historic Preservation's Technical Assistance Series #6, *California Register and National Register: A Comparison*, outlines the differences between the federal and state processes. The context types to be used when establishing the significance of a property for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources are very similar, with emphasis on local and state significance. They are:

1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States; or
2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history; or
3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values; or
4. It has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.⁷

Like the NRHP, evaluation for eligibility to the CRHR requires an establishment of historic significance before integrity is considered. California's integrity threshold is slightly lower than the federal level. As a result, some resources that are historically significant but do not meet NRHP integrity standards may be eligible for listing on the CRHR.⁸

⁵ Ibid., 44-45.

⁶ Ibid., 45.

⁷ California Office of Historic Preservation, *California Register and National Register: A Comparison*, Technical Assistance Series 6, (Sacramento, CA: California Department of Parks and Recreation, 2001), 1.

⁸ Ibid., 1.

California's list of special considerations is shorter and more lenient than the NRHP. It includes some allowances for moved buildings, structures, or objects, as well as lower requirements for proving the significance of resources that are less than 50 years old and a more elaborate discussion of the eligibility of reconstructed buildings.⁹

In addition to separate evaluations for eligibility for the CRHR, the state automatically lists on the CRHR resources that are listed or determined eligible for the NRHP through a complete evaluation process.¹⁰

California Historical Resource Status Codes

The California Historic Resource Status Codes (status codes) are a series of ratings created by the California Office of Historic Preservation to quickly and easily identify the historic status of resources listed in the state's historic properties database. These codes were revised in August 2003 to better reflect the historic status options available to evaluators. The following are the seven major status code headings:

1. Properties listed in the National Register or the California Register.
2. Properties determined eligible for listing in the National Register or the California Register.
3. Appears eligible for National Register or California Register through Survey Evaluation.
4. Appears eligible for National Register or California Register through other evaluation.
5. Properties recognized as historically significant by local government.
6. Not eligible for listing or designation.
7. Not evaluated for National Register or California Register or needs revaluation.

⁹ Ibid., 2.

¹⁰ All State Historical Landmarks from number 770 onward are also automatically listed on the California Register. [California Office of Historic Preservation, *California Register of Historical Resources: The Listing Process*, Technical Assistance Series 5, (Sacramento, CA: California Department of Parks and Recreation, n.d.), 1.]

Appendix H

Reconnaissance Survey Database

[Submitted to the County on March 10, 2008]

Unincorporated Alameda County
Historic Survey and Preservation Ordinance
Carey & Co., Inc.