A. CALL TO ORDER: Chairperson, Mitch Elias

B. FLAG SALUTE: Chairperson, Mitch Elias

C. ROLL CALL: Development Services Manager, Brad Johnson

Chair Mitch Elias, Vice-Chair Rubio Gonzalez, Commissioner Larry Taylor, Commissioner Jim R. Gallivan, Commissioner Alice Gomez, Commissioner Jerry Tessier, and Commissioner Melissa Ayala.

D. PUBLIC/CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (Three (3) minute Limit on Non-Agenda Items Only):

1. At this time, the general public is invited to address the Historic Preservation Commission concerning any items that are not listed on this agenda, which are not public hearings, or other items under the jurisdiction of the Historic Preservation Commission. Discussion of any non-agenda items will be limited to three (3) minutes in accordance with City policy.

2. Anyone wishing to speak on any item that is listed on tonight’s agenda (e.g., public hearings and/or work study items) is requested to adhere to the following protocol procedures/guidelines:

   a) Prior to the meeting or during the meeting prior to a matter being reached, persons wishing to address the Commission may fill out a speaker card and submit it to the Planning Manager. Speaker cards are available in the foyer of the City Council Chambers and from the Minutes Clerk.

   b) When called upon, the person should come to the podium, state his/her name and address for the record and, if speaking for an organization or other group, identify the organization or group represented. Whenever any group of persons wishes to address the Commission on the same subject matter, the Chair may request that a spokesperson be chosen by the group.

   c) All remarks should be addressed to the Commission as a whole, not to individual Commissioners. Questions, if any, should be directed to the presiding Chair who will determine whether, or in what manner, an answer will be provided.

   d) Every person addressing the Historic Preservation Commission will be limited to three (3) minutes or such reasonable time as is granted by the majority of the Commission.
E. CONSENT CALENDAR:

**Note:** All items listed on the Consent Calendar may be enacted by a single motion without separate discussion. If a discussion or a separate vote on any item is desired by a Historic Preservation Commissioner, that item may be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered separately. All remaining items not removed from the Consent Calendar by a Historic Preservation Commissioner shall be voted on prior to discussion of the item(s) requested to be pulled.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**
   
   April 6, 2016

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. **MAJOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (MAJCOA 4467-2016)**
   
   **PROJECT ADDRESS:** 403 W. Alvarado Street
   
   **PROJECT APPLICANT:** Antonio Cruz
   
   **PROJECT PLANNER:** Dustin Williamson, Technical Specialist
   
   **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**
   
   Major Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the installation of eleven (11) new vinyl windows. Pursuant to the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this project is categorically exempt per Section 15303.
   
   **Recommended Action:**
   
   The Planning Division recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission adopt the HPC Resolution approving Major Certificate of Appropriateness (MAJCOA 4467-2016), subject to conditions.

2. **MAJOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA 14-013)**
   
   **PROJECT ADDRESS:** 963 & 985 S. Hamilton and 1145 W. Tenth Street
   
   **PROJECT APPLICANT:** Cambodian Buddhist Society of Pomona
   
   **PROJECT PLANNER:** Leonard Bechet, Associate Planner
   
   **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**
   
   Major Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the demolition of four residential structures constructed between 1908 and 1953. Pursuant to the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), in compliance with Article 6, Section 15074, the adoption of a Negative Declaration will be considered.
   
   **Recommended Action:**
   
   The Planning Division recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission adopt the HPC Resolution approving Major Certificate of Appropriateness (COA 14-013), subject to conditions.

G. NEW BUSINESS:

H. HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

I. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER COMMUNICATIONS:

1. Minor Certificates of Appropriateness approved March through May 2016.
J. ADJOURNMENT:

The City of Pomona Historic Preservation Commission is hereby adjourned to the next regular meeting of July 6, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

*** CERTIFICATION OF POSTING AGENDA ***
I, Brad Johnson, Development Services Manager for the City of Pomona, hereby certify that the agenda for the June 1, 2016 Historic Preservation Commission meeting was posted on May 26, 2016.

Brad Johnson
Development Services Manager
CALL TO ORDER: The Historic Preservation Commission meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Elias.

FLAG SALUTE: Chair Elias led the Commission in the flag salute.

ROLL CALL: Roll was taken by Development Services Manager Johnson

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Elias and Vice Chair Gonzalez; Commissioners Ayala, Gallivan, Gomez, and Taylor

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Tessier

STAFF PRESENT: Development and Neighborhood Services Director Lazzaretto, Development Services Manager Johnson, Technical Specialist Williamson, and Minutes Clerk Casey

ITEM D: CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:

ITEM E: CONSENT CALENDAR

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
   -October 7, 2015
   -February 3, 2016
   -March 2, 2016

Motion by Commissioner Gomez, seconded by Vice Chair Gonzalez, carried by a majority vote of the members (4-0-2-1) Commissioners Ayala and Taylor abstained and Commissioner Tessier absent, adopting the October 7, 2015, Historic Preservation Commission meeting minutes.

Motion by Commissioner Gallivan, seconded by Commissioner Gomez, carried by a majority vote of the members (4-0-1-1) Commissioner Ayala abstained and Commissioner Tessier absent, adopting the February 3, 2016, Historic Preservation Commission meeting minutes.

Motion by Commissioner Gallivan, seconded by Commissioner Taylor, carried by a majority vote of the members (4-0-1-1) Chair Elias abstained and Commissioner Tessier absent, adopting the March 2, 2016, Historic Preservation Commission meeting minutes.
PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ITEM F-1  PUBLIC HEARING – MAJOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (MAJCOA 2307-2015) TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SINGLE-STORY, SINGLE–FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH A DETACHED TWO-CAR GARAGE LOCATED AT 1062 N. PARK AVENUE.

Technical Specialist Williamson presented a staff report regarding a request to allow the construction of a new single-family residence. Commissioner Gonzalez inquired whether replacement trees were proposed. Technical Specialist Williamson stated two replacement trees would be planted: one in the front and one in the back. In addition, he stated a condition was included requiring a landscaping plan to be submitted to the City. Chair Elias inquired on the materials which would be utilized including the windows and inquired whether the garage would be consistent with the main structure. Technical Specialist Williamson stated redwood and river rock would be utilized for the structure and he provided a sample of the true divided light wood windows which would be installed. In addition, he stated the garage would be consistent with the main structure and a condition had been included requiring the windows to be real wood. Commissioner Gallivan inquired whether there would be fencing. Technical Specialist Williamson stated fencing would be installed and a condition had been included requiring the applicant to work with the neighboring properties to ensure there would not be any double fencing. Chair Elias opened the public hearing.

Mr. James Luis agreed with the staff report and asked the Commission to approve. In addition, he stated he was constructing the home to put on the market to be sold. Commissioner Gomez urged the applicant to inform the buyer that he/she was purchasing in a historic district. Chair Elias inquired on the regulations for the home since it was being constructed in 2016. Development Services Manager Johnson stated even though the home would be noncontributing, all the same historic district guidelines would apply. Chair Elias invited the public for comments. Mr. Dan McIntire thanked the applicant for considering construction in a historic district. He stated he felt the home would be a great addition to the neighborhood. He suggested researching river rock manufacturers who offer a variety to provide some variation throughout the river rocks being installed on the structure. In addition, he suggested a human side door be installed on the garage, plants and shrubs be planted, and he asked the Commission to approve. Chair Elias inquired whether the applicant would agree to the human door on the garage. Mr. James Luis stated he is in agreement with the door as well as utilizing a variety of river rock to provide variation. Chair Elias closed the public hearing.

The Commission discussed and agreed to add a condition requiring a human door be added to the garage and to add a condition requiring a variety of river rock be utilized to provide variation throughout the river rocks installed on the structure.

Motion by Vice Chair Gonzalez, seconded by Commissioner Gallivan, carried by a unanimous vote of the members present (6-0-0-1) Commissioner Tessier absent, adopting Resolution No. 16-007 approving Major Certificate of Appropriateness (MAJCOA 2307-2015).
ITEM G:
NEW BUSINESS:

ITEM H:
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

ITEM I:
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER COMMUNICATIONS:


ITEM J:
ADJOURNMENT: Chair Elias adjourned the meeting at 7:15 pm to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on May 4, 2016, in the City Council Chambers.

Brad Johnson
Development Services Manager
DATE: June 1, 2016

TO: HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

FROM: PLANNING DIVISION

SUBJECT: MAJOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (MAJCOA 4467-2016) TO INSTALL ELEVEN (11) VINYL WINDOWS ON AN EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE LOCATED AT 403 W. ALVARADO STREET IN THE WILTON HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT.

SUMMARY

Issue – Should the Historic Preservation Commission approve Major Certificate of Appropriateness (MAJCOA 4467-2016) to install eleven (11) vinyl windows on an existing single family residential building located at 403 W. Alvarado Street in the Wilton Heights Historic District?

Recommendation – Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving Major Certificate of Appropriateness (MAJCOA 4467-2016), as conditioned, to allow the installation of vinyl sash windows consistent with the original windows.

Applicable Codes and Guidelines –
1) Historic Preservation Design Guidelines dated July 19, 1999
2) Zoning Ordinance Section .5809-13 (Historic Preservation) adopted June 15, 1998
3) Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties

Public Noticing Requirements – At a minimum of ten days prior to the public hearing, notice was sent to the applicant, posted at the subject site, and mailed to all owners of property located directly adjacent to and directly across the street from the subject site.

City Initiated Corrective Action –
1) On August 16, 2015, the City of Pomona Code Compliance Division issued an Administrative Citation Correction Notice requiring the applicant to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness for the windows that were changed-out.
2) On March 9, 2016, the City of Pomona Code Compliance Division issued an Administrative Citation requiring the applicant obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness for the windows that were changed-out.
Environmental Determination – Pursuant to the Guidelines for Implementation of the Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the proposed project meets the criteria for a Class 31, Section 15331 Categorical Exemption in that the project involves preservation and rehabilitation of a historic resource in a manner that meets the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

BACKGROUND

Property Description and Background

The subject residence is a one-story, single-family residence constructed in the Minimal Traditional style in 1953. The structure is located in the Wilton Heights Historic District as a non-contributing structure (Attachment 2). City records show the structure was relocated to the subjected property in 1979 under a Conditional Use Permit (Attachment 3). The current windows were installed without the benefit of a permit or Certificate of Appropriateness at an unknown date.

The structure has a rectangular plan and a symmetrical south-facing façade. The foundation is concrete and is raised. The wood framed structural system has a rough stucco exterior cladding. It is sheltered by a low-pitched, cross-gabled roof clad with composite shingles. The roof has open overhanging boxed eaves with exposed rafters.

This building is an asymmetrical façade. The primary entrance into the house is located on the east portion of the façade. It is sheltered by the continuation of the side-gable. The door is wood with a decorative window. On the façade, there are three multi-paned horizontal sliding with aluminum sash windows. These windows appear to be of a different size than the original windows. On the east elevation there are four sets of horizontal sliding with aluminum sash and have a wood case and sill. There are wood horizontal vents located within the gables on the east and west elevation. On the west elevation there are three horizontal sliding with aluminum sash windows. This elevation also shows evidence of a change in window sizes. The north elevation has a single horizontal aluminum sash windows. The east elevation windows appear to have maintained the original window shapes.

There is a detached garage that fronts onto the alley located in the rear of the property and a driveway that fronts on to N. Wisconsin Street.

Applicant’s Proposal

The applicant is proposing to install new vinyl windows to replace the existing aluminum windows (Attachments 4 and 5). According to the applicant, the current windows were installed prior to the formation of the Wilton Heights Historic District and thus lack a Certificate of Appropriateness. Furthermore, the windows were installed without the benefit of a building permit.
ANALYSIS

Section .5809-13 of the Pomona Zoning Ordinance does not require that proposed projects involving noncontributing structures within historic districts be induced to conform to the special character or aesthetic value of the historic district, rather ensuring the alteration does not markedly detract from the special character, historic interest, or aesthetic value of the historical district. This project is analyzed for consistency with Section .5809-13 of the Pomona Zoning Ordinance, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the City’s Design Guidelines for historic preservation.

Section .5809-13 requires the Commission to consider the following standard when reviewing the request to install vinyl windows:

Architectural Details. Architectural details, including materials and textures shall be treated so as to make any new construction compatible with the architectural style and character of the historic district.

The SOI Standards for rehabilitation of historic properties contains the following standard that is related to replacement of distinctive features (i.e. windows and doors).

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

The City’s Design Guidelines for historic preservation considers the following guidelines as the ideal approach to window alteration or replacement:

- Replacing windows that cannot be repaired with windows of a similar type, for example, replacing original wooden sash windows with new wooden sash windows.
- Maintaining historic window openings.

Windows

The currently installed horizontal sliding aluminum windows are not compatible with the Minimal Traditional architectural style. There is no photographic record of the original window shapes or materials. All eleven windows currently installed are horizontal, aluminum sash windows. The windows on the façade and the western elevation have divided lites in a two over three formation. The proposed window alterations are not consistent with the standards contained in Section .5809-13 of the Zoning Ordinance.

SOI Standard SOI-6 requires that replacement windows match the old in design, color, texture and where possible, materials. Additionally, missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. As conditioned, the proposed project will restore the windows openings where altered, using the eastern elevation as a guide. The original material of the windows cannot be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. The proposed window alterations are not consistent with the SOI standards.
The ideal preservation approach in the Design Guidelines recommends replacing windows with windows of a similar type as the original. As discussed above, there is no pictorial evidence of the original windows, but the structure shows evidence of altered window openings. The proposed window replacements are not necessarily consistent with the ideal preservation approach described in the Design Guideline, however by recreating historical window opening details such as sloped wood sills, recesses, and wood frames the appearance will reflect what staff believes was the original style.

CONCLUSION

The installation of the vinyl windows does not meet the requirements of the Design Guidelines, the standards contained in Section .5809-13 of the Zoning Ordinance or the SOI standards for rehabilitation for a contributing structure. As the structure is non-contributing and the installed windows do not match the original in design, size, or materials and are historically inappropriate for the residence, staff is recommending approval of the window replacement with the condition of approval requiring the window sizes, sloped wood sills, wood frames, and recesses found on the eastern elevation be replicated across the home to create an appearance that will reflect what staff believes was the original style.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission adopt the attached resolution approving Major Certificate of Appropriateness (MAJCOA 4467-2016).

Respectfully submitted,

Brad Johnson
Development Services Manager

Prepared by,

Dustin Williamson
Technical Specialist

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Draft HPC Resolution
2. Wilton Height Historic District Map
3. Planning Commission Resolution 4827
4. Photographs of existing windows
5. Photographs of proposed windows.
6. Amerimax Windows and Doors Brochure
ATTACHMENT 1: DRAFT HPC RESOLUTION
A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF POMONA, CALIFORNIA APPROVING MAJOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (MAJCOA 4467-2016) TO ALLOW THE REPLACEMENT OF ELEVEN (11) ALUMINUM SASH WINDOWS WITH VINYL WINDOWS ON AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE LOCATED AT 403 W. ALVARADO STREET.

THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF POMONA DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

WHEREAS, the subject property is a non-contributing structure to the Wilton Heights Historic District, which was designated as a historic district by the Pomona City Council on August 2, 1999;

WHEREAS, the applicants, Antonio Cruz and Maria Hernandez, have submitted a Major Certificate of Appropriateness (MAJCOA 4467-2016) to allow the installation of eleven (11) horizontal sliding vinyl windows on a single family residence located at 403 W. Alvarado Street;

WHEREAS, replacement of windows that noticeably change the design of the windows within a designated historic district requires the Historic Preservation Commission to approve a Major Certificate of Appropriateness prior to the issuance of building permits;

WHEREAS, the residential structure at the site was constructed in the Minimal Traditional style of architecture;

WHEREAS, the proposed modifications, as conditioned, will not significantly alter the special character or aesthetic value of the district;

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission must make findings as described in Section .5809-13.F.6 of the Zoning Ordinance to approve a Major Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement of windows on a property located in a historic district;

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Pomona, has, after giving notice thereof as required by law, held a public hearing on February 3, 2016 concerning the requested Major Certificate of Appropriateness (MAJCOA 4467-2016); and

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission has carefully considered all pertinent testimony and the staff report offered in the case presented at the public hearing.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Pomona, California, as follows:
SECTION 1. Pursuant to the Guidelines for Implementation of the Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the proposed project meets the criteria for a Class 1, Section 15301 Categorical Exemption in that the project involves the minor alteration of an existing structure.

SECTION 2. Section .5809-13.F.6 of the Zoning Ordinance requires the Historic Preservation Commission to make findings to approve a Major Certificate of Appropriateness. The Historic Preservation Commission hereby makes the following findings:

a. The proposed change will not adversely affect any significant historical, cultural, architectural, or aesthetic features of the concerned property or the historic district in which it is located.

The replacement of eleven (11) windows, as conditioned, will not adversely affect any significant historical, cultural, architectural, or aesthetic features of historic district in which it is located in that the replacement windows are conditioned to be consistent with the original window openings. The existing house is a non-contributing structure within the district.

b. The proposed change is compatible in architectural style with the existing adjacent contributing structures in an historic district.

The proposed window replacements, as conditioned, are compatible in architectural style with the existing adjacent contributing structures in the Wilton Heights Historic District in that the neighboring contributing structures were built in architectural styles common to the early 20th century and have maintained the distinctive historic architectural features of the original Minimal Traditional architectural style and the period of construction.

c. The proposed change is consistent with the architectural style of the building as specified in Section .5809-13 F 5 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed window replacements, as conditioned to install wood sills and return to the historic window openings, are consistent with the architectural style of the residence and will not damage the special character of the historic district and restore the historical rhythm of the façade.

d. The scale, massing, proportions, materials, textures, fenestration, decorative features, and details proposed are consistent with the period and/or compatible with adjacent structures.

The proposed window replacement, as conditioned, will be more consistent with the original residence by returning the original window sizes and the a frame compatible with the Minimal Traditional architectural style.
SECTION 3. The Historic Preservation Commission hereby approves the Major Certificate of Appropriateness (MAJCOA 4467-2016) to replace eleven (11) windows with the following conditions:

1. Prior to obtaining building permits and installation of windows, plans detailing how the original window openings are to be restored and wooden frames installed shall be submitted for the Development Services Manager’s approval.

2. This approval shall lapse and become void if the privileged authorized is not utilized or where some form of construction pursuant to issuance of a building permit has not commenced within one (1) year from the date of approval (June 1, 2017).

3. The three (3) aluminum windows located on the east elevation of the residence shall be replaced with vinyl single hung windows while retaining the existing window sizes and wood frames within (1) year from the date of approval (June 1, 2017).

4. The remaining eight (8) vinyl windows located on the south, north, and west elevations of the residence shall be replaced with vinyl single hung windows with windows openings and wood frames to match the eastern elevation within (1) year from the date of approval (June 1, 2017).

5. The windows to be installed shall be manufactured by Amerimax Windows and Doors and shall be Single Hung Craftsman Portrait with Ameriglass AG3 insulated glass system.

6. In the event that conditions imposed by the Historic Preservation Commission are inconsistent with provisions of the California Code of Regulations, Title 24 (also known as the California Building Standards Code) or any uniform construction code applicable within this jurisdiction, such conditions of the Historic Preservation Commission shall be waived in favor of such code.

SECTION 4. The Secretary shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution and forward the original to the City Clerk.

APPROVED AND PASSED THIS 3rd DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2016.

______________________________
MITCH ELIAS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CHAIRPERSON
Pursuant to Resolution No. 76-258 of the City of Pomona, the time in which judicial review of this action must be sought is governed by Sec. 1094.6 C.C.P.
ATTACHMENT 2: VICINITY MAP & AERIAL PHOTOS
ATTACHMENT 3: PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION 4827
RESOLUTION NO. 4827

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF POMONA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT.

A. REQUEST:

1. APPLICATION FOR: Conditional Use Permit to move-on a single family residence.
2. APPLICANT: Gilbert Saavedra and Assoc.
3. LOCATION: 403 W. Alvarado Street, Pomona, Calif.

B. ACTION:

BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission as follows:

According to the procedure as set forth in Section .580, Ordinance 1466, the Planning Commission has heard this request for a Conditional Use Permit and it is hereby found and determined that this request be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. All requirements of the Fire and Public Works Departments, the Planning and Building Divisions, and their respective codes shall be met.
2. The front yard setback shall be a minimum of 25 ft.
3. The new 2-car garage shall have minimum inside dimensions of 20 ft. by 20 ft.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

1. The proposed move-on single family residence is about the same age as some of the newer residences in this older, well maintained neighborhood, and therefore may"blend-in" better than would a newly constructed "modern" single family or duplex residence.
2. The house can and will be brought up to the construction and development standards of a new single family residence.
3. A single family residence, whether of new construction or a move-on will be more compatible with this predominately single family residential neighborhood than would any type of multiple family residential (rental) development.

AYES: Bess, Kawa, Nabarrete, Whitaker, Hill, Crockett
NOES: None
ABSENT: Siler

APPROVED AND PASSED this 13th day of June, 1979.

ATTEST:

[Seal]
PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

[Seal]
PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIRMAN
ATTACHMENT 4: PHOTOS OF EXISTING WINDOWS
WEST ELEVATION:

South Elevation
East Elevation:
Attachment 6: AMERIMAX Brochure
DATE:       JUNE 1, 2016

TO:        HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

FROM:      PLANNING DIVISION

SUBJECT:   MAJOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA 14-013) TO ALLOW THE DEMOLITION OF FOUR RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES BUILT BETWEEN 1908 AND 1953 LOCATED ON PROPERTIES AT 963 & 985 S. HAMILTON BOULEVARD AND 1145 W. TENTH STREET.

SUMMARY

Issues – Should the Historic Preservation Commission approve a Major Certificate of Appropriateness (COA 14-013) to allow the demolition of four residential structures built between 1905 and 1953 located at 963 & 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard and 1145 W. Tenth Street?

Recommendation – Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving Major Certificate of Appropriateness (COA 14-013), subject to conditions, to allow the demolition of four residential structures built between 1908 and 1953 located at 963 & 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard and 1145 W. Tenth Street.

Applicable Codes and Guidelines –

Public Noticing Requirements – At least thirty days before the Historic Preservation Commission public hearing, the applicant, owners of property located directly adjacent to and across the street from the subject properties, Pomona Heritage, the Historical Society of Pomona Valley and other local preservation groups/preservationists were notified of the COA application and the opportunity to relocate the subject buildings, by first class mail on May 2, 2016 (Attachment 7).

At least ten days before the Historic Preservation Commission public hearing, a notice of the hearing for the subject COA application and the intent to adopt a Negative Declaration was published on May 9, 2016 in the Inland Valley Daily Bulletin, a local newspaper of daily circulation, as well as sent by first class mail on May 5, 2016 to the applicant, owners of property
located directly adjacent to and across the street from the subject properties, Pomona Heritage, the Historical Society of Pomona Valley and local preservationists (Attachment 7).

City Initiated Corrective Action – None

Environmental Determination – Pursuant to Article 6, Section 15070, of the CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study and a Negative Declaration have been prepared for the project finding that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment (Attachment 2). In accordance with Article 6, Section 15073(a) of CEQA, the Initial Study and a Negative Declaration were made available for public review between May 9, 2016 and May 31, 2016. As of the date of this report, no comments have been received regarding the Initial Study and the Negative Declaration (Attachment 2).

BACKGROUND

The applicant, Cambodian Buddhist Society of Pomona, has submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the demolition of three pre-1945 residential structures and one structure built in 1953 at 963 & 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard and 1145 W. Tenth Street. The buildings have an estimated construction date between 1905 and the 1953, based on the information provided by the Los Angeles County Assessors Office and the City of Pomona’s Historic Resources Survey. The project site is located within the R-2 (Low Density Multiple Family) zone (Attachment 3). The property is currently in the process of being developed into a public assembly (religious temple) use and the applicant is proposing to demolish the subject buildings in order to allow for the construction of new temple buildings and parking areas.

DISCUSSION

The Historic Preservation Ordinance requires that, prior to approving a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of buildings constructed before 1945, it must be determined if the buildings would meet any of the required ten (10) criteria used in historic landmark designations contained in Section .5809-13.D of the Pomona Zoning Ordinance:

1. It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City of Pomona’s cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, architectural, or natural history;

2. It is identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history;

3. It embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;

4. It contributes to the significance of an historic area, being a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic or scenic properties or thematically related grouping of properties which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan or physical development;

5. It is the work of a notable building, designer, landscape designer, or architect;
6. It has a unique location or singular physical characteristics or is a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the City of Pomona;

7. It embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation;

8. It is similar to other distinctive properties, sites, areas, or objects based on an historic, cultural, or architectural motif;

9. It reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth, particular transportation modes, or distinctive examples of park or community planning; and

10. It is one of the few remaining examples in the City of Pomona, region, state, or nation possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural or historical type or specimen.

If the subject buildings meet any one of the ten (10) criteria, then the buildings may be deemed historically significant and the City may deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition. Therefore, in order for the City to deny the proposed Certificate of Appropriateness, a finding that the buildings meet at least one of the criteria must be made. Conversely, in order for the City to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness, it must determine that the buildings do not meet any of the criteria (see Attachment 1 – Section 3, Findings).

ANALYSIS

Code Requirements for Demolition

Per Section .5809-13-F8 of the City of Pomona Zoning Ordinance pertaining to Historic Preservation, all applications for demolition of structures built before 1945 shall first be considered for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Per Section .5809-13 of the Zoning Ordinance, staff sent a public hearing notice, notice of intent to adopt a Negative Declaration and notice of availability of the structure for relocation on May 2, 2016 and May 9, 2016 to the applicant, the owner of the subject property, the property owners directly adjacent to and across the street from the subject property, Pomona Heritage, Pomona Historical Society of Pomona Valley and other local historic groups. Additionally, a public hearing notice was sent to surrounding property owners (Attachment 7). As of the writing of this report, staff has not received any correspondence with interest for relocation.

Description of Structures

The proposed site is currently used for public assembly associated with a religious temple. There are approximately six permanent buildings, and several temporary structures. Historically all
size buildings were used for residential purposes however the applicant has established a
religious temple and is in the process of redeveloping the site to allow for new temple buildings
and associated parking and landscaping areas.

A historic resources report was completed for the oldest of the structures proposed for demolition
of the buildings proposed for demolition located at the southeast corner of the site (985 S.
Hamilton Blvd.) and identified herein as Residential Structure 1 and 2 (Attachment 4). The
Citywide Historic Resources Survey (Citywide Survey) identified the site as having a structure
that is contributing because the building contributes to the historic streetscape of the city because
it is over 50 years old (at the time the survey was conducted) and still possesses it architectural
integrity and character (Attachment 5). The residential structure located at 1145 W. Tenth Street
and identified herein as Residential Structure 3 was constructed in 1953 and the residential
structure located at 963 S. Hamilton Boulevard and identified herein as Residential Structure 4
was also constructed in 1953.

Residential Structure 1

The City of Pomona’s Historic Resources Inventory, prepared in 1993 by Dianne Marsh,
contains records for only one of the four structures proposed for demolition (Attachment 5). The
survey describes the home addressed 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard as being built in the Colonial
Revival architectural style, however the Historic Resources Survey prepared by Pamela Daily
(Attachment 4) describes the home as an Queen Anne style cottage, having “no” alterations done
to the exterior, and having an estimated construction date of 1908. The survey rates the structure
as “C”, indicating that it does possess architectural character with few alterations as described
below.

The house was designed to be a single-family Queen Anne style cottage, and it is set back from
the roadway, on a corner lot at the intersection of South Hamilton Boulevard and West 10th
Street. The house has a rectangular mass and measures approximately 32 feet wide by 48 feet
long, not including the rear addition that measures approximately 5 feet wide by 18 feet long.
The house has approximately 1,398 square feet of living space.

The one-story building is of wood frame construction and is clad on the exterior with narrow
shiplap boards, with the corners of the house trimmed with plain flat boards set vertically. The
foundation of the house is comprised of poured concrete walls that raise the building
approximately 18 inches above ground level. The roof is hipped, clad with composition
shingles, and has wide overhanging eaves that contribute to the Edwardian-era Queen Anne
architectural style. A hipped roof dormer is set in the middle of the front (east) roof plane over
the front entrance of the building.

The front (east) façade exhibits the Queen Anne style of influence with its asymmetrical design
in the recessed porch area and location of the front door. The main entrance to the house is
located within the porch area on the north facing façade. A set of three poured concrete steps,
with low side walls, lead to the wood floor of the front porch. On the front façade facing east,
the original window unit has been removed. The porch roof is supported by two turned posts
that sit on a knee wall railing clad with the same narrow siding as the house. It appears that the window that would have been situated in the roof dormer has been removed and replaced with a plywood panel with vents.

On the north and south elevations of the house there still remain paired, one-over-one wood sash double hung window units. The windows are framed and have a protruding sill. A shed roof addition was added to the rear elevation of the building. It appears this addition was made in 1929 and provided space for bath and laundry facilities. The addition was clad with the same style siding as the main block.

City building permits records for the property date back to only 1930. The earliest permits were filed starting in 1930 by E. H. Gibson. In 1930 and 1931, Gibson filed permits for additions to existing chicken houses. Gibson re-shingled the house on the property in 1937, and in 1938 added a basin to the house. In 1940, Gibson added two more poultry houses, and a “20 foot by 40 foot alteration to existing buildings”. The last permit filed by Gibson was in 1942, and it was also for the construction of a poultry house. Charles Fast filed a permit for a poultry house in 1945. Property owner Erik Molin filed permits for various small improvements to the house dating from 1951 to 1967.

It appears that the property was utilized as a chicken/poultry ranch up to the 1950s. No further permits were requested for the repair, maintenance, or construction of poultry ranching-related structures after 1945. The general purpose barn currently on the subject property may have been related to the poultry raising operation.

**Residential Structure 2**

The general purpose barn/garage appears to date from the 1930s. It is a one-story, wood frame building with a gable roof that measures approximately 36 feet long by 20 feet wide. The roof is set on a north/south axis and large hinged doors span the south gable end of the barn that face 10th Street, and a single entrance door is located on the north elevation. The building sits on the concrete pad of the driveway. The building was most probably constructed and used for the operation of the chicken ranch that was located on the property up to the 1950s.

**Residential Structure 3**

Present on this site is a rectangular plan building proposed for demolition located at the southwestern corner of the project site is stucco clad and features a hipped gable roof. A single entry door is located to the center of the southern elevation. Windows are aluminum. Los Angeles County Assessor records indicate an estimated construction date between 1931 and 1939. However, City building permit records indicate the structure was constructed in 1953. The structure is not listed in the 1993 Citywide Historic Resources Survey as it was not yet fifty years old at the time the survey was taken, however it is included in this initial study because the property is now over fifty years old was examined a possible cultural resource because of its age.
Residential Structure 4

Present on this site is an L-shaped plan residential structure proposed for demolition located in the center of the property. The structure was built as single-family residence and includes an attached two-car garage. The structure is an example of the Ranch architectural style and is stucco clad and features a gable roof with a shed roof sheltering the front portion of the residence. The garage door is the most prominent feature on the front elevation of the home as it projects forward from the remaining structure approximately ten feet. Windows are aluminum. Los Angeles County Assessor records indicate an estimated construction date of 1953. The structure is not listed in the 1993 Citywide Historic Resources Survey as it was not yet fifty years old at the time the survey was taken, however it is included in this initial study because the property is now over fifty years old and was examined as a possible historical resource because of its age.

Previous Tenants

City directories on-file in the Special Collections of Pomona Library date from 1909-1910; the directories up to 1948 were reviewed to identify the residents of the property at 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard. The results per directory are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1909-1910</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>L. J. Stevens, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>George Heckthorne, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>George Heckthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>J. C. Mathews, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>E. E. Wayman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-23</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>J. C. Mathews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>Reverend A.L. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>J. C. Mathews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>Reverend A.L. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>J. C. Langston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>W. F. Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>W. H. Gibson, owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>W. H. Gibson, rancher, owner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Occupant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>William H. Gibson, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>C. J. and Freda Fast, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>C. J. and Freda Fast are now proprietors of Fast Motel, 1129 West 10th St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the date of construction of Residential Structures 3 and 4 occurring in 1953, there are no reverse telephone directory records for the structures.

**Historic Significance**

The residential structures do not appear to be associated with significant events in history. Although the structures were built between 1908 and the 1953, there is no evidence of them being associated with a historically significant event, person, architectural style or period. In addition, there are numerous residences of a similar vintage and style in the City. Therefore, the residence is not the only representative of early residential development in Pomona. The residences are a modest example of the Queen Anne cottage, California Ranch, and Minimal Traditional that do not retain a high degree of integrity. They are not distinctive or elaborate examples of the styles, nor do they represent the work of a master, possess high artistic values, or appear particularly unique. Information regarding the various occupants from 1910 to today indicates that they have no importance in local, state or national history.

**CONCLUSION**

In summary, the residential structures proposed to be demolished by the applicant are neither identified with historically significant persons or events, exemplifies an important period of local history, reflects the architecture of a period of significance nor contributes to the historic streetscape in the area. Further, the buildings do not meet any of the national, state, or local criteria to deem the buildings historically significant based on the analysis and conclusion of the initial study and Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared to address the environmental impacts, as it relates to Cultural Resources (Attachment 2 – Environmental Impacts, section V – Cultural Resources). Therefore, the subject buildings do not qualify as “historical resources” as defined by CEQA and the demolition of the subject structures would have no impact in causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving Major Certificate of Appropriateness (COA 14-013), subject to conditions, to allow the demolition of four residential structures built between 1905 and 1953 located at 963 & 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard and 1145 W. Tenth Street.
Respectfully submitted,Brad Johnson
Development Services Manager

Prepared by,Leonard Bechet
Associate Planner

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Draft HPC Resolution
2. Initial Study and Negative Declaration
3. Location Map and Aerial Photograph
5. Historic Resources Inventory Form, 1993
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7. Public Hearing Notices
ATTACHMENT 1
DRAFT HPC RESOLUTION
HPC RESOLUTION NO. 16-


THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF POMONA DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

WHEREAS, the applicant, Cambodian Buddhist Society of Pomona, has submitted an application for a Major Certificate of Appropriateness (COA 14-013) to allow the demolition of four residential structures built between 1908 and 1953 located at 963 & 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard and 1145 W. Tenth Street;

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission must make findings as described in Section .5809-13.F.8 of the Zoning Ordinance before approving a Major Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of any structure constructed before 1945;

WHEREAS, available records indicate that the residential structures located at 963 & 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard and 1145 W. Tenth Street have an estimated construction date of between 1908 and 1953;

WHEREAS, the Major Certificate of Appropriateness may be granted if a determination is made that the subject buildings and/or properties would not meet any of the ten criteria used in historic landmark designation thus not deeming the buildings of historical significance pursuant to Sections 5809-13 D and F of the Pomona Zoning Ordinance;

WHEREAS, in accordance with Article 6, Section 15073 of CEQA, the applicant, Pomona Heritage, The Pomona Historical Society of Pomona Valley and the property owners directly adjacent to and across the street from the subject property were notified of the public hearing for the subject application and the intent to adopt a Negative Declaration on May 2, 2016 and May 9, 2016;

WHEREAS, in accordance with Article 6, Section 15073(a) of CEQA, the Negative Declaration was made available for public review between May 9, 2016 and May 31, 2016;

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Pomona has, after giving notice thereof as required by law, held a public hearing on June 1, 2016 concerning the requested Major Certificate of Appropriateness; and

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission has carefully considered all pertinent testimony and the staff report offered in the case presented at the public hearing.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Pomona, California, as follows:
**SECTION 1.** Pursuant to the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environment Quality Act (CEQA), an Initial Study and Negative Declaration has been prepared and reviewed, finding that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment. The Initial Study was made available for the required 20-day public review period which began May 9, 2016 and concluded on May 31, 2016. The Historic Preservation Commission hereby adopts said Negative Deceleration.

**SECTION 2.** In any part, provision, or section of this resolution is determined by a court or other legal authority with jurisdiction over the subject matter of this resolution to be unenforceable or invalid, the remainder of the entirety of this resolution shall not be affected and shall continue in full force and effect. To this end, the provisions of this resolution are severable.

**SECTION 3.** In accordance with Section 5809-13.F of the Pomona Zoning Ordinance, the Historic Preservation Commission, in order to approve Major Certificate of Appropriateness (COA 14-013), must determine that the subject structure is not of historical significance by making ten (10) findings that the structure would not meet the criteria used in historic landmark designation. Based on consideration of the whole record before it, including but not limited to, the staff report, public testimony received at the public hearing on this matter, and evidence made part of the public record, the Historic Preservation Commission hereby finds that the subject structures do not meet any of the following criteria:

1. **The structures do not exemplify or reflect special elements of the City of Pomona's cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, architectural, or natural history.**

   Although the four residential structures date between 1908 and 1953, their integrity is poor and they do not exemplify or reflect any special elements of the City of Pomona’s history that would set them apart as significant historic resources. There are a number of other residential buildings in the City of a similar vintage and style that also retain good integrity. The buildings do not exemplify or reflect special elements of the City’s past that would distinguish them from other similar examples of residential structures that date to the early 20th century.

2. **The structures are not identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history.**

   Research indicates that the residential structures were occupied by a series of individuals beginning in 1909. There is no evidence to suggest that the owners or tenants of the residential structures made significant contributions to local, state or national history that would distinguish them from other residents in the City of Pomona.

3. **The structures do not embody distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction, nor are they a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.**
One of the residential structures retains some of its original integrity, however the remaining three have been altered. The buildings are examples of a common architectural style; however, they do not have any distinctive features nor were they built in a method of construction that would distinguish them from other examples of the type of residential structure.

4. **The structures do not contribute to the significance of a historic area, being a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic or scenic properties or thematically related grouping of properties that contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan or physical development.**

The residential structures are located within a neighborhood that contains a mix of single and multiple family residential uses. A reconnaissance-level survey of the surrounding neighborhood revealed that some of the properties date to the historic period, but are severely altered. In addition, the area is interspersed with modern infill construction and vacant lots. Therefore, the residential structures do not appear to contribute to a potential historic district.

5. **The structures are not the work of a notable builder, designer, landscape designer, or architect.**

No evidence was found indicating that the residential structures are the work of a notable architect or builder. They are modest residential structures in a working class neighborhood. It is unlikely that they were designed or built by noteworthy individuals.

6. **The structures do not have a unique location or singular physical characteristics nor are they a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the City of Pomona.**

The residential structures are located on a project site located at the northwest corner of S. Hamilton Boulevard and W. Tenth Street. All four residential structures are visible from the street; however, they are not situated in a unique location, have no view or vista, and nothing about their location or physical characteristics make them visible or noteworthy to the larger community.

7. **The structures do not embody elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation.**

The residential structures appear to be of standard construction for their time. They do not appear to employ any structural or architectural achievements or innovations.

8. **The structures are not similar to other distinctive properties, sites, areas, or objects based on a historic, cultural, or architectural motif.**
The residential structures are modest and a relatively common example of early to mid-20th century (Queen Anne Cottage/Ranch/Minimal Traditional) residential building construction, they are not particularly distinctive.

9. The structures do not reflect significant geographic pattern including those associated with different areas of settlement and growth, particular transportation modes, or distinctive examples of park or community planning.

The residential structures do not reflect a significant geographical or development pattern either individually or as part of a larger area. Although they were once part of largely agricultural area, they now sit in a neighborhood that has transitioned from agriculture to residential development.

10. They are not one of the few remaining examples of the City of Pomona, region, state, or nation possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural or historical type of specimen.

The commercial building is an example of early to mid-20th century (Queen Anne Cottage/Ranch/Minimal Traditional) residential building architecture built during the time period. They are simple structures and possess no distinguishing characteristics that set them apart from other structures. The residential structures do not have any distinguishing features that set them apart from other examples of that type of building built during that time period.

SECTION 4. The Historic Preservation Commission hereby approves Major Certificate of Appropriateness (COA 14-013) to allow the demolition of four residential structures built between 1908 and 1953 located at 963 & 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard and 1145 W. Tenth Street, subject to the following conditions:

1. Before issuance of a permit for demolition of the existing structures, the applicant shall take those steps necessary to allow interested persons or organizations a minimum of thirty (30) days for salvage opportunity and instruct the applicant's demolition contractor to salvage, rather than destroy, those elements of architectural interest found within/on the four residential structures.

2. Prior to issuance of permits for demolition of the subject commercial buildings, the applicant shall provide documentation to the Special Collections Division of the Pomona Public Library in accordance with the Pomona Historic Building Survey documentation requirements, Level 3.

3. If unanticipated archaeological or paleontological resource remains are encountered during construction activities (any permitted action requiring physical digging or grading of a project area using mechanical equipment or hand tools, including core sampling, soil borings, work required for placing caissons or footings, planting trees, diskng, grubbing, trenching and installation of poles, underground electrical systems, sewers, water mains, or other utilities, or geological/ geotechnical testing) work shall cease until the nature,
extent, and possible significance of any cultural remains can be assessed and, if found to be significant pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines), remediated. Such assessment and remediation shall be implemented by the City through consultation with a qualified cultural resources professional prior to recommencement with onsite construction/grading activities. If remediation is necessary, possible techniques include removal, documentation, curation, or avoidance of the resource, depending upon the nature of the find. Cultural resource remains may include artifacts, shell, bone, features, foundations, trash pits and privies, etc.

4. Prior to any work within the public street right-of-way, the project’s construction contractor shall submit a street closure plan to the City Engineer for review and approval. To the satisfaction of the City Engineer, the project contractor shall implement adequate and appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures. In addition, at least two (2) weeks prior to any road closures, the contractor shall notify the surrounding property owners, all emergency services, and school bus services of the time and dates of any scheduled road closures.

SECTION 5. The Secretary shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution and forward the original to the City Clerk.

APPROVED AND PASSED THIS 1st DAY OF JUNE, 2016.

MITCH ELIAS  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:

BRAD JOHNSON  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION SECRETARY  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
CITY OF POMONA

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSTAIN:  
ABSENT:
Pursuant to Resolution No. 76-258 of the City of Pomona, the time in which judicial review of this action must be sought is governed by Sec. 1094.6 C.C.P.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This Initial Study was prepared to analyze environmental impacts from a proposed project involving the demolition of four residential structures built between 1908 and 1953 located at 963 & 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard and 1145 W. Tenth Street. After demolition the project site will be developed as part of a future project to construct buildings and site improvements associated with a religious facility.

The City of Pomona requires approval of a Major Certificate of Appropriateness (COA), before demolition or relocation of all undesignated pre-1945 structures located in the City of Pomona that will entail an assessment of whether the structures have historical significance.

This Initial Study concludes that the pre-1945 single-family residential structure and detached garage is not a significant historic resource with respect to CEQA and does not meet any of the criteria for listing on the local register as single historic landmark.

The current project would not be categorically exempt from CEQA because of the potential for historical resources to be present on the site. CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2(f) states that exceptions to Categorical Exemptions will not be used if there is a possibility that the proposed project may result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. This Initial Study assesses the potential impacts from the demolition of the pre-1945 single-family residential structure.

Project title: Demolition of Four Residential Structures

A. Lead agency: City of Pomona
   505 S. Garey Avenue
   Pomona, California 91767
   Contact person: Leonard Bechet, Associate Planner
   (909) 620-2191

   Project sponsor: The Cambodian Buddhist Society of Pomona

B. Project location: The project site is located in an area of the City characterized by a mixture of single-family and multi-family dwellings. The project site is comprised of the following individual parcels:

   1. APN: 8349-017-025 – 963 S. Hamilton Boulevard
   2. APN: 8349-017-026 – 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard
   3. APN: 8349-017-066 – 1129 W. Tenth Street
   4. APN: 8349-017-067 – 1145 W. Tenth Street
The project site is currently improved with approximately ten structures being used as a public assembly use. The site is relatively flat.

Regionally, the City of Pomona is located at the eastern edge of Los Angeles County, approximately 25 miles east of downtown Los Angeles.

C. **Project description:** The proposed project involves a request by the property owner to allow the demolition of four residential structures constructed between 1908 and 1953. Demolition of structures built before 1945 in the city of Pomona require approval of a Major Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) from the City. The purpose of the demolition is to allow the property owner the ability to expand a religious facility operating on the subject site.

D. **Project Construction Schedule:** Demolition of the four residential structures will take place within the next nine months. New buildings associated with the religious facility will be constructed, pending approval of a Conditional Use Permit from the City at a future date.

E. **General Plan Designation:** Residential Neighborhood Place Type

F. **Zoning Designation:** R-2 (Low Density Multiple Family)

G. **Existing land uses on the project site:** The project site is improved with approximately ten structures being used collectively as religious facility and built between 1908 and the 1990s. The project site has an area of 36,391 sq. ft. The existing vegetation consists of a combination of native and non-native vegetation, and mature trees. Topography of the site is relatively flat.

H. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The project site is surrounded by a combination of single-family and multi-family homes immediately to the east, west, north, and south.

J. **Other public agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): The proposed project would require the following discretionary approvals:

- City of Pomona: Approval of a major Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Preservation Commission
- City of Pomona Building and Safety Division: demolition permit
- South Air Quality Management District: notification of demolition

No discretionary approvals from any other agencies are known or expected to be required for the proposed demolition project.
EXHIBIT 1.2: PROJECT LOCATION
EXHIBIT 1.3: ASSESSOR’S MAP
EXHIBIT 1.4: SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Structure #1 proposed for demolition, built in 1908
Structure #2 proposed for demolition, built in 1953
Structure #3 proposed for demolition, built in the 1930s
Structure #3 proposed for demolition, built in the 1930s
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils (Liquefaction)
- Hazards & Hazard Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population/Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on the attached pages have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a &quot;potentially significant impact&quot; or &quot;potentially significant unless mitigated.&quot; An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: [Signature] 
Date: May 9, 2016
Printed Name: Brad Johnson 
Title: Development Services Manager
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

An Environmental Checklist Form (Form) has been used to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. The Form has been prepared by the Resources Agency of California to assist local governmental agencies, such as the City of Pomona, in complying with the requirements of the Statutes and Guidelines for implementing the California Environmental Quality Act. In the Form, environmental effects are evaluated as follows:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in its response. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is “Potentially Significant”, “Less Than Significant with Mitigation”, or “Less Than Significant”. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from an "Earlier Analyses," as described in #5 below, may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances).

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. The explanation of each issue should identify:

   (a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question.

   (b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. a-b) No Impact:</strong> The project site is flat and is surrounded by residential land uses. There are no identified scenic vistas or scenic resources such as trees or rock outcroppings or a state scenic highway within or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, there is no potential for project implementation to result in adverse impacts on scenic vistas or resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. c-d) No Impact:</strong> The proposed project involves the demolition of four residential structures. It is not expected that the project will create sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore, there is no potential for the project to degrade the existing visual character and quality of surroundings, and the project would not result in a new source of light or glare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. a-c) **No Impact:** No part of the project site is currently used for agricultural purposes, nor is the project area or surrounding land designated as farmland of local, regional, or statewide importance. The project site and surrounding areas are zoned R-2 (Low Density Multiple Family), therefore, are not zoned for agricultural uses, nor designated for agricultural purposes by the City’s General Plan. Further, no Williamson Act Contracts exist for the project site. The project will have no impact on agricultural lands or agricultural uses.
### III. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III. a) No Impact:

The City of Pomona is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is bordered by the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains on the north and east, and the Pacific Ocean on the south and west. The air quality in the SCAB is managed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

The SCAB has a history of recorded air quality violations and is an area where both state and federal ambient air quality standards are exceeded. Because of the violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), the California Clean Air Act requires triennial preparation of an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The AQMP analyzes air quality on a regional level and identifies region-wide attenuation methods to achieve the air quality standards. These region-wide attenuation methods include regulations for stationary-source polluters; facilitation of new transportation technologies, such as low-emission vehicles; and capital improvements, such as park-and-ride facilities and public transit improvements. The most recently adopted plan is the 2007 AQMP. This plan is the South Coast Air Basin’s portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

The SCAQMD’s CEQA Handbook identifies two key indicators of consistency with the AQMP:

1. Whether the project will result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP (except as provided for CO in Section 9.4 for relocating CO hot spots).

2. Whether the project will exceed the assumptions in the AQMP in 2010 or increments based on the year of project buildout and phase.

Consistency criterion #1 pertains to long-term local air quality impacts, rather than regional emissions, as defined by the SCAQMD. The SCAQMD has identified carbon monoxide (CO) as the best indicator pollutant for determining whether air quality violations would occur, as CO hot-spots are the most likely cause of air quality violations from land use projects. Since the air basin is now in attainment for the CO standards and CO standards are not expected to be exceeded, local air quality impact modeling is no longer performed. Local CO concentrations would not be expected to exceed the ambient air quality concentration standards, with or without the project. Since the proposed project is not anticipated to impact the local air quality, the project is found to be consistent with the AQMP for the first criterion.

In regards to criterion #2, the assumptions used to develop the AQMP are based upon projections from local general plans. Therefore, conformity with the AQMP of land development projects is measured by...
the project’s consistency with adopted land use plans, growth forecasts, and programs relative to population, housing, employment, and land use. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning and General Plan Land Use designations for the site. As a result, the project is consistent with the growth expectations for the region. The proposed project is therefore consistent with the AQMP, and would not result in any associated impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III. b-c) Less than Significant:** The City of Pomona is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is an airshed that regularly exceeds both national and state ambient air quality standards (AAQS) – i.e., a non-attainment area. The SCAB is designated a non-attainment area for particulate matter (PM$_{10}$), fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$), and ozone (O$_3$). The SCAB is currently a designated attainment area for the remaining pollutants with established AAQS, which include carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$), sulfur dioxide (SO$_2$), lead, hydrogen sulfide, and vinyl chloride.

The proposed project would generate air pollutants only from demolition activities. Implementation of the project would not result in any long term increase in air pollutants since no new development is proposed for the site. Construction activities of the proposed project would include demolition of existing street improvements and construction of the cul-de-sac and related street improvements (gutters, curb, sidewalk...etc.). These construction activities would generate air pollutants from equipment exhaust, and earth disturbance.

*An Air Quality Assessment* was prepared for the proposed project that included quantifying the project’s construction emissions using the CalEEMod (version 2013.2.2). Tables III-1 and III-2 respectively identify the resulting estimated construction emissions and compare the project’s emissions to the SCAQMD’s regional significance thresholds.
As shown in Table 1.1 construction of the proposed project would not generate air pollutants in excess of the SCAQMD’s regional significance thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause or substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, would not generate pollutants in excess of SCAQMD standards, and would not result in a cumulative considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

As shown in Table 1.2 implementation of the proposed project would not generate air pollutants in excess of SCAQMD’s regional significance thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause or substantially contribute to an existing or project air quality violation, would not generate pollutants in excess of SCAQMD standards, and would not result in a cumulative considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

III. d) Less Than Significant: Sensitive receptors are considered to be the very young, the elderly and those suffering from certain illnesses or disabilities, since they are particularly sensitive to air pollution. Active park users, such as participants in sporting events, are sensitive air pollutant receptors due to increased respiratory rates. Land uses where sensitive air pollutant receptors congregate include schools, day care centers, parks, recreational areas, medical facilities, rest homes, and convalescent care facilities.

To assess a project’s air quality impact on nearby sensitive receptors, the SCAQMD identifies localized significance thresholds (LST) for stationary pollutant sources and construction sites. Since the proposed project would not be a stationary pollutant source, only the construction LSTs apply to this project. The appropriate LSTs vary on a project-by-project basis depending on the project’s location, the acreage of the construction site, and the distance to the nearest sensitive receptor. The proposed project would be
located on a site that is less than an acre in size, approximately 5,344 sq. ft. in size. The closest sensitive receptors to the project site may be located at Lopez Elementary, a public school, located approximately .330 meters to the northeast and Ralph Welch Park, a public park, located approximately .200 meters to west. The most comparable LSTs for this project are those associated with 1-acre sites in the Pomona/Walnut Valley, with sensitive receptors that are within 200 meters from the site.

Table III-3 compares the peak-day onsite construction emissions to the relevant LSTs. (Offsite construction emissions are not relevant to the LST analysis since they do not affect the localized air quality conditions.) As shown in this table, construction of the proposed project would not generate pollutants in excess of the LSTs. Therefore, the proposed project’s impact on local air quality is considered less than significant and the project would not significantly impact any sensitive receptors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.3</th>
<th>Localized Significance Threshold Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(lbs/day on the worst day for onsite construction activities only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>NOx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmitigated Construction Emissions</td>
<td>23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds</td>
<td>1,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

III. e) Less than Significant Impact: During construction activities, the project would potentially generate odors from diesel exhaust on-site and within the surrounding area due to operation of construction equipment. However, odors from the diesel exhaust would be temporary in nature and limited to the immediate vicinity of the construction activities. Because the project would not result in any new construction for the foreseeable future, the project would not generate objectionable odors after construction. Therefore, the overall impacts from the project would be less than significant.
### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife? | | | ■ |

**IV. a) No Impact:** The project site is located within an urbanized residential area and contains structures and paved areas and little vegetation. The site is devoid of any natural habitat and has no significant biological resource value. Consequently, project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on candidate, sensitive, or special status species, directly or indirectly.

| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife? | | | ■ |

**IV. b) No Impact:** No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities exist on the project site. Moreover, no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities exist near the project site. The project will therefore have no impacts on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling hydrological interruption, or other means? | | | ■ |

**IV. c) No Impact:** The project site does not contain any federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Nor would the project affect any offsite Section 404 wetlands. No
impacts to federally protected Section 404 wetlands will occur due to project implementation or operations.

| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |

**IV. d) No Impact:** The project site is surrounded on all sides by urban residential development. The project site is not designated as, and is not considered potentially valuable as, wildlife movement or migration corridors, or as a wildlife nursery site. As such, the project will have no impacts in this area.

| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |

**IV. e) No Impact:** No local preservation or conservation plans or policies are applicable to the subject sites. The City of Pomona’s Oak Tree Ordinance applies to the trimming and removal of oak trees and the Historic Sites Tree Protection & Preservation Program applies to the trimming and removal of trees in historic districts. Since there are no oak trees on the project site, there would not be any permit required to remove or trim trees pursuant to local ordinances. As such, the project will have no impacts in this area.

| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservancy Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservancy Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |

**IV. f) No Impact:** No local, State or regional preservation or conservation plans or policies are applicable to the subject site. The project will have no impact on preservation or conservation plans.
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

\[\square\]

V. a) Less than Significant Impact: There are no previously recorded cultural resources within the project boundaries and the subject buildings are not listed in the National or California Registers or designated as California Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, or City Landmarks. The City of Pomona’s Historic Resources Inventory, prepared in 1993 by Dianne Marsh, contains records for only one of the four structures proposed for demolition. The survey describes the home addressed 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard as being built in the Colonial Revival architectural style, having “no” alterations done to the exterior, and having an estimated construction date of 1908. The survey rates the structure as “C”, indicating that it does possess architectural character with few alterations as described below.

985 S. Hamilton Boulevard

Present at the subject site and proposed for demolition is a one-story, Queen Anne style cottage, and a barn used for general purposes. From the data available on-line from the Los Angeles Tax Assessor Property Information for APN 8349-017-026, the date of construction of the houses is estimated to have been constructed in 1908, and altered in 1929. According to City of Pomona building permits, the exterior of the house has not been substantially altered since that time.

The house was designed to be a single-family Queen Anne style cottage, and it is set back from the roadway, on a corner lot at the intersection of South Hamilton Boulevard and West 10th Street. The house has a rectangular mass and measures approximately 32 feet wide by 48 feet long, not including the rear addition that measures approximately 5 feet wide by 18 feet long. The house has approximately 1,398 square feet of living space.

The one-story building is of wood frame construction and is clad on the exterior with narrow shiplap boards, with the corners of the house trimmed with plain flat boards set vertically. The foundation of the house is comprised of poured concrete walls that raise the building approximately 18 inches above ground level. The roof is hipped, clad with composition shingles, and has wide overhanging eaves that contribute to the Edwardian-era Queen Anne architectural style. A hipped roof dormer is set in the middle of the front (east) roof plane over the front entrance of the building. (Photograph 3)

The front (east) façade exhibits the Queen Anne style of influence with its asymmetrical design in the recessed porch area and location of the front door. The main entrance to the house is located within the porch area on the north facing façade. A set of three poured concrete steps, with low side walls, lead to the wood floor of the front porch. On the front façade facing east, the original window unit has been removed. The porch roof is supported by two turned posts that sit on a knee wall railing clad with the
same narrow siding as the house. It appears that the window that would have been situated in the roof
dormer has been removed and replaced with a plywood panel with vents.

On the north and south elevations of the house there still remain paired, one-over-one wood sash double
hung window units. The windows are framed and have a protruding sill. A shed roof addition was added
to the rear elevation of the building. (Photograph 4) It appears this addition was made in 1929 and
provided space for bath and laundry facilities. The addition was clad with the same style siding as the
main block.

The general purpose barn/garage appears to date from the 1930s. It is a one-story, wood frame building
with a gable roof that measures approximately 36 feet long by 20 feet wide. (Photograph 5) The roof is
set on a north/south axis and large hinged doors span the south gable end of the barn that face 10th
Street, and a single entrance door is located on the north elevation. The building sits on the concrete pad
of the driveway. The building was most probably constructed and used for the operation of the chicken
ranch that was located on the property up to the 1950s.

City directories on-file in the Special Collections of Pomona Library date from 1909-1910. The directories
up to 1948 were reviewed to identify the residents of the property at 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard. The
results per directory are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1909-1910</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>L. J. Stevens, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>George Heckthorne, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>George Heckthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>J. C. Mathews, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>E. E. Wayman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-1923</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>J. C. Mathews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>Reverend A.L. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>J. C. Mathews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>Reverend A.L. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>J. C. Langston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>W. F. Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>W. H. Gibson, owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>W. H. Gibson, rancher, owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>William H. Gibson, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>C. J. and Freda Fast, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>C. J. and Freda Fast are now proprietors of Fast Motel, 1129 West 10th St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The building permits and records at the City of Pomona for the property date back to only 1930. The earliest permits were filed starting in 1930 by E. H. Gibson. In 1930 and 1931, Gibson filed permits for additions to existing chicken houses. Gibson re-shingled the house on the property in 1937, and in 1938 added a basin to the house. In 1940, Gibson added two more poultry houses, and a “20 foot by 40 foot alteration to existing buildings”. The last permit filed by Gibson was in 1942, and it was also for the construction of a poultry house. Charles Fast filed a permit for a poultry house in 1945. Property owner Erik Molin filed permits for various small improvements to the house dating from 1951 to 1967.

It appears that the property was utilized as a chicken/poultry ranch up to the 1950s. No further permits were requested for the repair, maintenance, or construction of poultry ranching-related structures after 1945. The general purpose barn currently on the subject property may have been related to the poultry raising operation.

**1145 W. Tenth Street**

Present on this site is a rectangular plan building proposed for demolition located at the southwestern corner of the property is stucco clad and features a hipped gable roof. A single entry door is located to the center of the southern elevation. Windows are aluminum. Los Angeles County Assessor records indicate an estimated construction date of 1931. The structure is not listed in the 1993 Citywide Historic Resources Survey. While the structure was built before 1945 the degree of alterations is difficult to determine beyond the fact that original wood windows and window openings were altered and replaced with aluminum windows. It appears that the structure may be an example of the Minimal Traditional architectural style.

**963 S. Hamilton Boulevard**

Present on this site is an L-shaped plan residential structure proposed for demolition located in the center of the property. The structure was built as single-family residence and includes an attached two-car garage. The structure is an example of the Ranch architectural style and is stucco clad and features a gable roof with a shed roof sheltering the front portion of the residence. The garage door is the most prominent feature on the front elevation of the home as it projects forward from the remaining structure approximately ten feet. Windows are aluminum. Los Angeles County Assessor records indicate an estimated construction date of 1953. The structure is not listed in the 1993 Citywide Historic Resources Survey.
Survey as it was not yet 50 years old, however it is included in this initial study because the property is now over 50 years old.

CEQA Section 15064.5(a) defines historical resource as one that includes: 1) a resource either listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources; 2) a resource listed in a local register; or 3) any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be significant provided, the agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record.” (Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines) CEQA Section 15064.5(b) states that a project that may result in a “substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.”

Currently, none of the structures are listed either on the California Register or the local register and has not been determined to be eligible for either list.

Pursuant to CEQA, a resource may also be historically significant if the Lead Agency determines that “in the light of the whole record”, the structure is historically significant. Generally a historic resource must meet the criteria listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1) that are as follows:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural history;
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic value; or
4. Has yielded, or may likely to yield, information important in prehistoric or history.

None of the structures were found not to meet any of the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources. Under criterion 1, the residential structures do not appear to be associated with significant events in history.

Under criterion 2, the evidence from research conducted in the Pomona Library Special Collections room and consultation with the Pomona Valley Historical Society did not show any relation to persons important in local, state or national history. The residential structures do not qualify under criterion 3 in that the residential structures appear to be of standard construction for their time. They do not appear to employ any structural or architectural achievements or innovations. They are not a distinctive or elaborate example of the building style, and do not represent the work of a master or possess high artistic value. The residential structures would also not qualify under criterion 4; the residential structures also would not appear to have the potential to yield information to the prehistory of history of the local area, California or the U.S. Therefore, the structures are not significant under this criterion.

The residential structures do not meet any of the criteria for listing on the California Register and are not listed or formally determined to be eligible for listing on the California Register, the National Register of Historical Places or the local historical register. Research conducted through City records and at Pomona
Library’s Special Collections records did not find any evidence to support eligibility for these registers. Therefore, the structures are not a historical resource pursuant to CEQA and the project would not result in any impacts to any historical resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V. b) Less Than Significant Impact: | There are no known prehistoric or historic archeological sites on the project site. The project involves the demolition of four residential structures. The entire site has been disturbed and if archaeological resources once existed on-site, it is likely that previous grading, construction, and modern use of the site have either removed or destroyed them. Consequently, surface soils on the sites are likely devoid of archaeological resources. According to the Pomona General Plan, no significant archaeological or paleontological resources or human remains have been recorded in or adjacent to the project site.

In the unlikely event that archaeological resources are encountered during grading or construction of the project, a condition of approval will be added to the project resolution (CULT-1) that requires all project grading and construction efforts to halt until an archeologist examines the site, identifies the archaeological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. The following condition of approval will be added to the resolution for the project and would ensure the proposed project would not significantly impact archaeological resources.

**CULT-1:** If archaeological resources are encountered during the project construction phase, all construction and construction-related activities in the vicinity of the find shall halt until an archeologist certified by the Society of Professional Architects examines the site, identifies the archaeological significance of the find, and recommends a course of action. Construction in the vicinity of the find shall not resume until the site archaeologist states in writing that the proposed construction activities will not significantly damage archaeological resources.

Compliance with the condition of approval CULT-1 would ensure that the project would not result in any significant adverse impacts to an archeological resource. Therefore, the project would be less than significant.

<p>| c) | Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | | |
| V. c) No Impact: | This portion of the City does not contain any unique geologic features and is not known or expected to contain paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not destroy any unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature, and would have no related impacts. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Disturb any human remains including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**V. d) Less than significant Impact:** There are no known human remains on the project site. The project site is not part of a formal cemetery and is not known to have been used for disposal of historic or prehistoric human remains. Thus, human remains are not expected to be encountered during construction of the proposed project. In the unlikely event that human remains are encountered during project construction, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires the project to halt until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition of the remains pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Compliance with these regulations would ensure the proposed project would not result in significant impacts due to disturbing human remains.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VI. a) No Impact:** The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or within any other fault zones identified on the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology’s (DMG’s) Seismic Zones Hazard Map for the San Dimas Quadrangle (Released March 25, 1999). Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects from the rupture of a known earthquake fault and would cause no associated impacts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

**VI. a)ii) Less than Significant Impact:** The City of Pomona is within a seismically active region of Southern California. Consequently, the project site will likely be subject to strong seismic ground shaking. The potential sources of ground shaking that could impact the project site include the following known active faults: the San Andreas, Indian Hill, San Jose, and Chino faults. Each one of these faults could generate an earthquake and the distance from the planning area depends on the magnitude of the earthquake and the distance from the planning area to the epicenter. The California Building Code (CBC) requires construction methods that minimize the effects of earthquake on structures. As part of the City’s standard review and approval of development projects, any new development must both provide a geotechnical study for review and approval by the City Engineer, and comply with the requirements of the approved geotechnical report and Uniform Building Code (UBC) or CBC, as appropriate. Compliance with these measures is expected to reduce potential risks relative to geologic or soils conditions to acceptable levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>iii)</th>
<th>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VI. a)iii) No Impact:** The project site is not within a liquefaction or landslide area shown on the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology’s (DMG’s) Seismic Zones Hazard Map for the San Dimas Quadrangle (Released March 25, 1999). Therefore, the project will have no impacts related seismic related ground failure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>iv)</th>
<th>Landslides?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VI. a)iv) No Impact:** The project site is not within a liquefaction or landslide area shown on the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology’s (DMG’s) Seismic Zones Hazard Map for the San Dimas Quadrangle (Released March 25, 1999). Furthermore, there are no unstable slopes on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides and would have no associated impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b)</th>
<th>Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VI. b) Less than Significant Impact:** During construction of the proposed project, the soils onsite may become exposed, and thus subject to erosion. However, the project is required to comply with existing regulations that reduce erosion potential. The proposed project is required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403, which requires that dust suppression techniques be implemented during construction. Compliance with Rule 403 would ensure that there would not be substantial wind-borne soil erosion during construction. Similarly, water erosion during construction would be reduced to the maximum extent
practicable by complying with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). As further detailed in Section VIII of this Initial Study, NPDES requires the construction of the project to incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce erosion and prevent eroded soils from washing offsite. Thus, the potential to increase erosion during any construction activity would be effectively mitigated through the required compliance activities. Implementation of the project would not cause wind or water erosion or the loss of topsoil. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact from substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

### Table: Potential Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Category</th>
<th>Practicable</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VI. c) No Impact:** The project site is a relatively flat and is not located on a cliff, mountainside, bluff, or other geographic feature with stability concerns. The site and vicinity are not susceptible to liquefaction, landslide, subsidence, or collapse. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any impacts related to unstable geologic units or soils.

**VI. d) Less than significant Impact:** As discussed in the *Pomona General Plan Update Existing Conditions, Opportunities, and Challenges Report* (2004), there are a variety of soils series within the City and the Altamont and San Andreas soils have the highest potential for expansion. Man-made soils can also be expansive. Unsuitable soils for fill and foundation support have the potential to create heaving, subsidence, spreading or collapse leading to building settlement and pavement disruption. While the project being reviewed in this initial study includes the demolition of buildings only, any future construction on the project site will be required to comply with City of Pomona Public Work Standards, which requires that the appropriate construction techniques be implemented to account for the expansion potential of the underlying soils. With the required compliance with City Standards, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to expansive soil.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VI.e) No Impact:** The project involves the demolition of four residential structures. The use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems is not a part of the proposed. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any impacts relating to soils incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems.

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.**

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? ☒

B) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? ☒

**VII. a-b) No Impact:** “Greenhouse gases” (so called because of their role in trapping heat near the surface of the earth) emitted by human activity are implicated in global climate change, commonly referred to as “global warming.” These greenhouse gases contribute to an increase in the temperature of the earth’s atmosphere by transparency to short wavelength visible sunlight, but near opacity to outgoing terrestrial long wavelength heat radiation. The principal greenhouse gases (GHGs) include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane, and nitrous oxide. Collectively GHGs are measured as carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e).

Fossil fuel consumption in the transportation sector (on-road motor vehicles, off-highway mobile sources, and aircraft) is the single largest source of GHG emissions, accounting for approximately half of GHG emissions globally. Industrial and commercial sources are the second largest contributors of GHG emissions with about one-fourth of total emissions.

California has passed several bills and the Governor has signed at least three executive orders regarding greenhouse gases. GHG statues and executive orders (EO) include Assembly Bill (AB) 32, Senate Bill (SB) 1368, Executive Order (EO) S-03-05, EO S-20-06 and EO S-01-07. AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, is one of the most significant pieces of environmental legislation that California has
adopted. Most notably AB 32 mandates that by 2020, California’s GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels.

The SCQAMD has adopted a “Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold”. This document establishes a draft GHG Significance Threshold for projects where the SCAQMD is the lead agency. While the SCAQMD is not the lead agency for the proposed project, the SCAQMD’s threshold is utilized in this CEQA document as a reference for comparative purposes. The SCAQMD’s draft GHG Significance Threshold establishes a 5-tier threshold flowchart, with Tier 3 identifying screening thresholds of 10,000 metric tons per year (MT/yr) of CO₂e for stationary source industrial projects and 3,000 MT/yr of CO₂e for commercial and residential projects. If a project exceeds these thresholds, the project should then be evaluated against Tier 4, titled “Performance Standards”. The proposed project is most closely related to commercial projects. Therefore, for this project a significance threshold of 3,000 MT/yr of CO₂e per year is used.

The only GHG emissions attributable to the project would be those resulting from construction equipment. The CalEEMod analysis of the project construction impacts found that the proposed project would result in short-term CO₂ emissions of 1,963.81 unmitigated pounds per day. Construction activities of the project are expected to last approximately five months, over a five-day work week. Therefore, the total estimated CO₂ emissions per year would equal 196,300 pounds per year or 98.15 metric tons per year. As such the short-term CO₂ emissions of 98.15 MT from the construction activities are well under the AQMD draft threshold of 3,000 MT/yr.

Project construction activities consist of the demolition of the single-family residential structure and construction of a new single-family residential structure. For the purposes of this analysis, the project was evaluated against the AB 32 scoping Plan, as the City of Pomona General Plan does not address climate change and GHG emissions at this time. The general goal of AB 32 Scoping Plan is reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels. Since the proposed project would not result in the project site being developed with uses that contribute to the GHG levels and the purpose of the project is to eliminate vehicle cut-through traffic, project GHG emissions will be the same or less than as existing conditions on the site, the project would be consistent with the overall goal of the Scoping Plan. GHG emissions from construction activities would be minor and short-term. Therefore, the project would not result in any impact due to a conflict with an applicable plan adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. a) Less than Significant Impact: During construction, project activities would involve limited transportation, storage, use and disposal of hazardous materials that would be short-term and temporary. Fueling and servicing of the construction equipment would not take place on site. Any debris from the demolition process would be disposed of in accordance with Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC), the United States National Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Occupational Safety and Heath Administration (OSHA) procedures. All new developments that handle or use hazardous materials would be required to comply with the regulations, standards, and guidelines established by the EPA, State, Los Angeles County, and city of Pomona related to storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Demolition activities would also be required to be compliant with SCAQMD Rule 1403 pertaining to the removal of asbestos in association with demolition/renovation activities. Rule 1403 specifies work practice requirements to limit asbestos emissions from building demolition and renovation activities.

Demolition of the residential structures is not anticipated to result in any hazards to the public or the environment through upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, the overall project impact related to the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials will be less than significant.

VIII. b) Less than Significant Impact: During construction activities, the proposed project would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials that would include vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. However, all hazardous materials would be contained, stored and used in accordance with manufacturers’ instructions and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. Demolition activities would also be required to be compliant with SCAQMD Rule 1403 pertaining to the removal of asbestos in association with demolition/renovation activities. Rule 1403 specifies work practice requirements to limit asbestos emissions from building demolition and related activities.

Demolition of the residential structures is not anticipated to result in any hazards to public or the environment through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any hazards to the public or the environment through upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Consequently, overall the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact resulting from accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c)</th>
<th>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VIII. c) No Impact:** The nearest school to the project site is Lopez Elementary at 701 S. White Avenue, which is approximately .21 miles to the south from the project site. However, construction activities would be short-term and take place only once and would involve limited transport, storage, use and disposal of hazardous materials. Materials used in the construction activities are not acutely hazardous and storage, handling, and disposal of materials during construction are regulated by the USEPA, DTSC, and OSHA.

Adherence by the construction contractor to the regulations of these agencies would reduce exposure of school children to hazardous materials to less than significant impacts. After the construction/demolition phase, no new construction is proposed for the foreseeable future. Therefore, the overall project impact due to release of hazardous materials, substances, or waste within .21 miles of a school would be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d)</th>
<th>Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VIII. d) No Impact:** The California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database does not show the project site as listed on a database pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, which lists Federal Superfund, State Response, Voluntary Cleanup, School Cleanup, Hazardous Waste permit and Hazardous Waste Corrective Action sites. Other sites pursuant to Government Code Section 659625, Cortese list data resources, include:

- List of leaking underground storage tank sites from Water Board GeoTracker database;
- List of solid waste disposal sites identified by Water Board with waste constituents waste levels outside the waste management unit;
- List of “active” CDO and COA from Water Board.

---

As such, the proposed project is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

### VIII. e-f) No Impact:

The project site is approximately 8.5 miles west of the Ontario International Airport, a civil aviation/schedule air transport airport located in the City of Ontario; approximately 2 miles southeast of Brackett Field Airport, a general aviation facility located in the City of La Verne; and approximately 8.7 miles northwest of the Chino Airport, a general aviation facility in Chino, California. The project site is not within the airport land use plans for any of these airports and there are no airports or private airstrips within two miles of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport or airstrip and the project would cause no related impacts.

### VIII. g) Less than Significant Impact:

The proposed project consists of the demolition of structures. As such, the project will not require closure or block portions of adjacent public streets during construction activities. Because construction activities may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic, the contractor will be required to implement adequate and appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures. The City requires contractors to notify the surrounding property owners of the time and dates of construction and submit to the City Engineer for approval. The City also requires contractors to obtain approval from the City Engineer before closing a street for construction and notification in advance sent to all emergency services, and school bus services as to the time and date of the closures. The construction activities of the project are also required to comply with all applicable local, regional, state, and/or federal requirements related to emergency access and evacuation plans. Adherence to these measures will reduce potential impacts related to the
impairment or interference with emergency response plans and emergency evacuation plans to less than significant.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

VIII. h) No Impact: The project area is fully developed with urban land uses. No wildlands are located on or in the vicinity of the project site. The Pomona General Plan does not identify risk of wildland fires as a concern within the area of the project site. The proposed project would have no impacts resulting from exposure of people or structures to the risks of wildlands fires.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

IX. a) Less than Significant Impact: Construction of the proposed project includes demolition of four residential structures that may result in discharge of pollutants that, if not treated, may impact the quality of groundwater or surface water resources. Since the area of the site to be disturbed by the project is less than one acre of land, the proposed project would not be subject to the Construction General Permit, 99-08-DWQ adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB and would not require preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). However, construction activities would be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMP) to comply with regional and local regulations in order to minimize water quality degradation from construction activities. Preparation and submittal of an Erosion Control Plan would be required in compliance with the NPDES requirements before the City of Pomona will issue an environmental clearance before issuance of a grading permit for the proposed project.

After the construction activities phase, there will be a small increase in impervious surface area added beyond what existed before. However it is not anticipated that the small increase of impervious surface area will violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, violation of waste discharge requirements or water quality standards would be minimized and the project overall would result in a less than significance impact.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that
there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

IX. b) Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project involves the demolition of four residential structures. Associated activities would not reach 17 feet below ground and, therefore, would not encounter groundwater that occurs between 17 feet and as much as 270 feet below ground².

During construction activities, some additional water may be used for cleaning; dust control and other uses would be minimal and would be temporary and minor. Therefore, the proposed project will result in a less than significant impact to groundwater supply and the proposed project would not affect groundwater recharge.

²Draft City of Pomona General Plan Update EIR, March 2007

IX. c) Less than Significant Impact: No streams or rivers are located on, adjacent to or within the project site. The proposed project involves the demolition four residential structures. However, construction activities would be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMP) to comply with regional and local regulations in order to minimize water quality degradation from construction activities. Preparation and submittal of an Erosion Control Plan would be required in compliance with the NPDES requirements before the City of Pomona will issue an environmental clearance before issuance of a grading permit for the proposed project.

Demolition of the residential structures is not anticipated that the proposed project would not result in a net increase in impervious surface over what currently exists on the site that may result in erosion and siltation and an increase in the rate of surface runoff that could result in on- or off-site flooding. Overall,
the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact in relation to an increase in surface runoff and flooding.

| d) | Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

**IX. d) Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project would be required to be consistent with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The city of Pomona implements the Los Angeles County NPDES requirements for wastewater discharge through an environmental clearance that must be approved before grading permits are issued and grading activities may take place. Before issuance of the environmental clearance from the City of Pomona, project applicants are required to submit and have approved any applicable requirements for wastewater discharge, Best Management Practices (BMPs). (A SWPPP is not required for sites of less than one acre.) Compliance with the NPDES requirements must be achieved before the City of Pomona will issue an environmental clearance before issuance of a grading permit for the project. Implementation of the proposed project will not result in an increase in impervious surface that could increase stormwater runoff. Compliance with the NPDES requirements and the City’s Municipal Code requirements would result in construction of the proposed project having a less than significant impact. As a result of consistency with applicable NPDES requirements for stormwater, the project would result in a less than significant impact due to the amount of runoff resulting from the project and would not result in flooding on or off-site.

| e) | Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

**IX. e) Less than Significant Impact:** Construction of the proposed project would be required to be consistent with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The city of Pomona implements the Los Angeles County NPDES requirements for wastewater discharge through an environmental clearance that must be approved before grading permits are issued and grading activities may take place. Before issuance of the environmental clearance from the City of Pomona, project applicants are required to submit and have approved any applicable requirements for wastewater discharge, Best Management Practices (BMPs). (A SWPPP is not required for sites of less than one acre.) Compliance with the NPDES requirements must be achieved before the City of Pomona will issue an environmental clearance before issuance of a grading permit for the project. Implementation of the proposed project will not result in an increase in impervious surface that could increase stormwater runoff. Compliance with the NPDES requirements and the City’s Municipal Code requirements would result in construction of the proposed project having a less than significant impact. As a result of consistency with applicable NPDES requirements for stormwater, the project would result in a less than significant impact due to the amount of runoff resulting from the project and would not result in flooding on or off-site.
discharge, Best Management Practices (BMPs). (A SWPP is not required for sites of less than one acre.) Compliance with the NPDES requirements must be achieved before the City of Pomona will issue an environmental clearance before issuance of a grading permit for the project. Implementation of the proposed project will not result in an increase in impervious surface that could increase stormwater runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Compliance with the NPDES requirements and the City’s Municipal Code requirements would result in construction of the project having a less than significant impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**IX. f) No Impact:** The proposed project does not include construction of new housing. Therefore, placement of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area is not applicable in this case and the project would have no related impacts.

**IX. g) No Impact:** As shown on the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA’s) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Community Panel Number 06037C1750F (effective 9/26/2008), the project site lies within Zone X, which is outside of the 100-year flood hazard area. More specifically, Zone X designates land that is outside of the “Special Flood Hazard Areas Subject to Inundation by the 1% Annual Chance of Flood” (100 year floodplain) and no floodplain management regulations are required. Therefore, the proposed project would not place structures within the 100-year flood hazard area and would have no related impacts.

**IX. h) Less than Significant Impact:** As described above in Section IX.g), the project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. However, the project site, along with a large portion of the City of Pomona, is located within the inundation limits from failure of the San Antonio Dam, which is located approximately six miles northeast of the City of Pomona (see the City of Pomona General Plan Update...
Draft EIR, March 2007.) In the unexpected case of failure of the San Antonio Dam, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has developed an Emergency Action and Notification Plan to protect residents within the potential dam inundation area (City of Pomona General Plan Update Draft EIR, March 2007). In this case, since the proposed project involves the demolition of a single-family residential structure, the project would not result in the placement of additional people within an area that would experience inundation from failure of the San Antonio Dam. Given the type of proposed use and the emergency planning procedures that are currently in place, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact due to exposure of people or structures to risks from dam failure.

**IX. i) Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

- **No Impact:**

  IX. i) No Impact: The project site is located approximately 30 miles from the Pacific Ocean, which is well outside of the area susceptible to tsunamis. Since the project site is located on a relatively flat area of the City and not within a hillside area, it would not be subject to mudflows. The City’s location also precludes exposure to seiche. Therefore the proposed project would cause no impacts related to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:**

**a) Physically divide an established community?**

- **No Impact:**

  X. a) No Impact: The demolition of four residential structures will not divide an established community. Access to commercial and residential buildings and adjacent communities will not be restricted. Therefore, the project would not divide an established community and no impact would occur.

**b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

- **No Impact:**

  X. b) No Impact: The proposed project will not impact any land use plan or policy.

**c) Conflict with any applicable habitat**

- **No Impact:**

  X. c) No Impact: The proposed project will not impact any habitat.
X. c) No Impact: Currently, there is no adopted Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans within the City of Pomona. There are also no approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans that would be applicable to the project site.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

XI. a-b) No Impact: There are no mineral resources known to exist on the project site or in the area that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State. As such, no impact to mineral resources of importance is anticipated based on project implementation.

XII. NOISE. Would the project:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

XII. a) Less Than Significant Impact: The project would generate short-term noise due to construction. However, the project will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction (PMC § 18.305(3)) and noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment (PMC § 18.305(4)). In accordance with these regulations, noise sources associated with or vibration created by construction of the facility will not take place between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays, including Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a federal holiday. Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards during construction. Since there is no new development proposed after demolition, post construction would not result in the generation of additional noise on the project site. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact relating to noise levels.
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

XII b) Less Than Significant Impact: Section 18-305 of the Pomona Municipal Code exempts construction activities from standards for groundborne vibration provided construction does not take place between 8 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays and Saturdays, and during anytime on Sundays or federal holidays and provided the vibration does not endanger the public health, safety or welfare. The proposed project is expected to result in some minor short-term groundborne vibration due to operation of construction equipment. After construction activities are completed, the proposed project will not involve generation of excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any long-term impacts from new vibration sources. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact resulting from exposure of people or structures to groundborne vibration and groundborne noise.

\[\text{\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet}\]

XII. c) Less Than Significant Impact: See response to XII a), above. The project will generate a permanent increase in ambient noise levels above levels without the project as a result of activities by the proposed new single-family residential structure. However, this increase will not be substantial relative to the existing ambient noise of the surrounding residential neighborhood since the majority of activities will occur indoors. Furthermore, noise generation must comply with standards established in the Pomona General Plan and the Pomona Municipal Code. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in any impact due to a permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

\[\text{\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet}\]

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

XII. d) Less Than Significant Impact: The project would generate short-term noise due to construction activities. However, the project will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction (PMC § 18.305(3)) and noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment (PMC § 18.305(3)). In accordance with these regulations, noise sources associated with or vibration created by construction of the facility will not take place between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays, including
Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a federal holiday. Compliance with these existing regulations ensures that the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in noise levels. Overall, the proposed project will result in a less than significant impact resulting from an increase in ambient noise levels.

| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the Project Area to excessive noise levels? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the Project Area to excessive noise levels? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |

XII. e-f) No Impact: There are no airports or airport land-use plans in the City of Pomona. The project site is approximately 8.5 miles west of the Ontario International Airport, a civil aviation/schedule air transport airport located in the City of Ontario; approximately 2 miles southeast of Brackett Field Airport, a general aviation facility located in the City of La Verne; and approximately 11.8 miles northwest of the Chino Airport, a general aviation facility in Chino, California. The project site is not within the airport land use plans for any of these airports and there are no airports or private airstrips within two miles of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people to excessive airport or airstrip related noise and would have no associated impacts.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |

XII. a) Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project involves the demolition of four residential structures. Therefore, the project would not result in any substantial impacts relating to population growth either directly or indirectly.
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XII. b) No Impact: The project site is currently improved with a public assembly use and the residential structures proposed for demolition are currently vacant. Therefore, the project would not result in any impact from displacement of existing housing that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere as the demolished residential structure will be replaced on-site.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XII. c) No Impact. The project site is currently improved with a public assembly use and the residential structures proposed for demolition are currently vacant. Therefore, the project would not result in any impact from displacement of existing people that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere as the demolished residential structure will be replaced on-site.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project: result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire protection?

XIV. a) Less Than Significant Impact: Fire protection services to the project site are provided by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. Future uses may create the potential for a slight increase in demand for services, which can be accommodated by the existing fire personnel and resources.

b) Police protection?

XIV. b) Less Than Significant Impact: Police protection services to the project site are provided by the City of Pomona Police Department. Future uses may create the potential for a slight increase in demand for services, which can be accommodated by existing police personnel and resources.
### XIV. c) **Less Than Significant Impact:**

Public schools are provided by the Pomona Unified School District. Future uses may create the potential for a slight increase in demand for public school services, which can be accommodated by exiting school district personnel and resources.

### XIV. d) **Less Than Significant Impact:**

Parks are maintained by the City of Pomona Community Services Department and regional parks are maintained by the Los Angeles County Parks and Recreation Department. Future uses may create the potential for a slight increase in demand for parks, which can be accommodated by existing parks.

### XIV. e) **Less Than Significant Impact:**

Other public facilities, such as libraries, are provided by the City of Pomona. Future uses may create the potential for a slight increase in demand for services, which can be accommodated by existing personnel and resources.

### XV. **RECREATION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### XV. a-b) **Less Significant Impact.**

The project may increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities to serve the needs of the residents. However, the slight increase is not such that substantial physical deterioration of the parks and recreational facilities would occur or be accelerated by the project.

### XVI. **TRANSPORTATION/ TRAFFIC.** Would the project:
### XVI. a) Less than Significant Impact:
The proposed project involves the demolition of four residential structures. During demolition, increased traffic will result from construction equipment trucks, and personnel traveling to and from the project site. However, the additional traffic generated during demolition will be minor and temporary in nature. Surrounding public streets will provide alternated routes for traffic during project demolition. After the demolition, no new development is proposed. Therefore, the project would not result in any increase in traffic over existing traffic. Overall, the project would result in a less than significant impact on the traffic load and capacity of the street system.

### XVI. b) Less than Significant Impact:
The Congestion Management Plan (CMP) for Los Angeles County designated two arterial roadways in the City as CMP facilities; Foothill Boulevard and Arrow Highway. Arrow Highway is the nearest CMP facility, located approximately 2 miles north of the project site. The proposed project would result in a minor increase in traffic during the construction phase due to trucks traveling to and from the project site and worker trips. However, the traffic increase would be temporary in nature. Once the construction phase has been completed, the site is anticipated to generate a slight increase in daily vehicle trips. The existing roadway system has been determined to be capable of handling the anticipated traffic generated by the project. As a result, the project would have a less than significant impact on CMP designated roads and highways.

### XVI. c) No Impact:
There are no airports within the project vicinity and the proposed project would have no impact on air traffic patterns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d)</th>
<th>Result in inadequate parking capacity?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XVI d) No Impact:** The proposed project is designed in compliance with the City of Pomona Zoning Ordinance Section .503-H (Off-Street Parking). Therefore, the proposed project will not result in any impacts on parking capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e)</th>
<th>Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XVI e) No Impact:** The proposed project will utilize automobile access from an existing streets. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f)</th>
<th>Result in inadequate emergency access?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XVI. f) Less than Significant Impact:** The proposed project involves the demolition of four residential structures. Construction activities that may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic will be required to implement adequate and appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures. The City also requires contractors to obtain approval from the City Engineer before closing a street for construction and notification in advance sent to all emergency services as to the time and date of the closures. The construction of the project is also required to comply with all applicable local, regional, State, and/or Federal requirements related to emergency access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g)</th>
<th>Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XVI. g) No Impact:** Demolition of the structures will not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. The project is intended to remove the existing single-family residential structure on the site and does not involve any new development. Therefore, the project...
would not result in any conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

**XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project site will result in an increase in the generation of wastewater at the project site. The increase is not considered significant, and the project will conform to the wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles County Regional Water Quality Control Board.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XVII. a) Less than Significant Impact:** The project site will result in an increase in the generation of wastewater at the project site. The increase is not considered significant, and the project will conform to the wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles County Regional Water Quality Control Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b)</th>
<th>Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project as projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project will generate only a slight increase in demands for wastewater treatment. The wastewater treatment provider, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, has adequate capacity to serve projected demand generated by the project in addition to the existing commitments of the provider.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XVII. b) Less than Significant Impact:** The project will generate only a slight increase in demands for wastewater treatment. The wastewater treatment provider, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, has adequate capacity to serve projected demand generated by the project in addition to the existing commitments of the provider.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c)</th>
<th>Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During construction, a small amount of wastewater may be generated that would be temporary in nature. Operation of the proposed project would not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the need for the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XVII. c) No Impact:** During construction, a small amount of wastewater may be generated that would be temporary in nature. Operation of the proposed project would not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the need for the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d)</th>
<th>Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources,</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XVII. d) Less than Significant Impact:** The project site will connect to the existing water supply system, operated by the City of Pomona, which has sufficient capacity to accommodate the needs of the project upon completion. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on water supply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e)</th>
<th>Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**XVII. e) Less than Significant Impact:** Several landfills serve the City including the Puente Hills landfill; Olinda Alpha Landfill; El Sobrante Landfill; Azusa Land Reclamation Co. Landfill; and Fontana refuse disposal site. The existing landfills have sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the solid waste disposal needs of the project. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on landfill capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f)</th>
<th>Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**XVII. f) Less Than Significant Impact:** The City has adopted provisions in its municipal code (Chapter 62, Article VI) to comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This Act requires that jurisdictions maintain a 50% or better diversion rate for solid waste. The City implements this requirement through implementation of Sections 62.581 through 62.595 of the Pomona Municipal Code, which establishes the City’s “Solid Waste Collection Franchise System.” As described in Section 62.586, each franchisee is responsible for meeting the minimum recycling diversion rate of 50% on both a monthly basis and annual basis. The proposed project is required to comply with the applicable solid waste franchise’s recycling system and, thus, would meet Pomona’s and California’s solid waste diversion regulations. Therefore, the project would not cause any significant impacts from conflicting with statutes or regulations related to solid waste.
### XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

| a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or an endangered threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |
|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation | No Impact |

**XVIII. a) Less Than Significant Impact:** As discussed in Sections I and III of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts on aesthetics or air quality. Also, as discussed in Section IV of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to special status species, stream habitat, and wildlife dispersal and migration. Furthermore, the proposed project would not affect the local, regional, or national populations or ranges of any plant or animal species and would not threaten any plant communities. Similarly, as discussed in Section V of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources and, thus, would not eliminate any important examples of California history or prehistory. As discussed in Sections IX and XI of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to water quality or mineral resources. Therefore, the project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, including the quality of the land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.

| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (Are the incremental effects of the project considerable when viewed in connection with those of past projects, those of other current projects, and those of probable future projects) |
|---|---|---|---|

**XVIII. b) Less Than Significant Impact:** Based on the analyses contained in this Initial Study checklist, the project’s land uses are consistent with the City’s General Plan land use projections. Implementation of
the proposed project will not create an increase in traffic, noise, or lead to detrimental changes in air quality, etc. The analysis in the Initial Study demonstrated that the proposed project is in compliance with all applicable mitigation plans including water quality control, air quality, waste management and plans or regulations for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, the project would not produce impacts that considered with the effects of other past, present and probable future projects, would be cumulatively considerable because potentially adverse environmental impacts were determined to be less than significant without mitigation.

The proposed project would contribute air emissions and noise within the project area during construction activities of the proposed project. However, the proposed project air emissions are well below the SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project will not generate additional impacts to noise and air quality that would be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to cumulative impacts.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

XVIII. c) **Less Than Significant Impact**: Based on the analysis in the preceding sections, the proposed project will not result in adverse impacts that would directly or indirectly affect human beings. The proposed project will generate limited air emissions, noise and other effects on human beings during construction and operation that are considered less than significant. However, as demonstrated in the previous analysis, the proposed project will not result in substantial adverse impacts in future conditions after construction activities are completed. Therefore, the proposed project will result in less than significant impact to human beings either directly or indirectly. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on humans.
SOURCES CITED IN EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Section 15150 of the State CEQA Guidelines permits an environmental document to incorporate by reference other documents that provide relevant data. The documents outlined below are hereby incorporated by reference, and the pertinent material is summarized throughout this Initial Study where that information is relevant to the analysis of impacts of the proposed project. All documents incorporated by reference are available for review at the City of Pomona Planning Division, 505 S. Garey Avenue, Pomona, California 91767 during office hours Monday through Thursday 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

A. California Air Resources Board website: http://www.arb.ca.gov.


C. California Department of Toxic Substance Control EnviroStor website: http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public


E. City of Pomona Municipal Code


G. EPA website: www.epa.gov/climatechange.basicinfo.html


J. Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Waste Discharge Requirements for Municipal Storm Water and Urban Runoff Discharges within the County of Los Angeles, and Incorporated Cities Therein, Except the City of Long Beach, Order No. 01-182, NPDES Permit No. CAS004001. December 13, 2001, amended on September 14, 2006, by Order R4-2006-0074 and August 9, 2007, by Order R4-2007-0042.


L. South Coast Air Quality Management District. Air Quality Management Plan.

M. South Coast Air Quality Management District. CEQA Air Quality Handbook.

N. South Coast Air Quality Management District. Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology.

O. South Coast Air Quality Management District. Final – Methodology to Calculate Particulate Matter (PM)2.5 and PM2.5 Significance Thresholds.

P. South Coast Air Quality Management District website: http://www.aqmd.gov.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This assessment report documents and evaluates the federal, state, and local significance and eligibility of a residential property located at the address of 985 South Hamilton Boulevard, Pomona, Los Angeles County, California. The report includes a discussion of the survey methodology used, a brief historic context of the property and surrounding area, and the identification and formal evaluation of the subject property.

The subject parcel features a site with built environment resources over 50 years of age situated on the west side of South Hamilton Boulevard to the southwest of Pomona’s civic center, in a densely-settled residential area. (See Figures 1, and 2; Photograph 1)
Figure 2: Project Location
U.S.G.S. San Dimas Quad Map, 1:24,000
B. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property at 985 South Hamilton Boulevard was included in a city wide survey performed in 1993. The purpose of the survey was to form a base inventory of buildings and structures in the city over 50 years old. The house at 985 South Hamilton Boulevard was given a “C” rating on the Historic Resources Inventory (Short Form Exterior) to note that it could be eligible to be determined a historic resource in the city, but that a formal evaluation would be needed. The property has not been formally evaluated for eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), or for designation as a Historic Landmark under Pomona City Code.
C. METHODOLOGY

This historic resource assessment and evaluation was conducted by Pamela Daly, M.S.H.P. Pamela Daly is a 36 CFR 61 qualified Architectural Historian and exceeds the Secretary of the Interiors Professional Standards for Architectural Historians and Historians.

In order to identify and evaluate the subject property as a potential historic resource, a multi-step methodology was utilized. An inspection of the site and the existing building, combined with a review of the building data from the Los Angeles County Assessor’s Office for this parcel, was performed to document existing conditions and assist in assessing and evaluating the property for significance. Photographs were taken of the building, including photographs of architectural details, surrounding buildings, or other points of interest, during the intensive-level survey.

The National Register and the California Register criteria were employed to evaluate the significance of the property. In addition, the following tasks were performed for the study:

- The National Register and California Register inventories were searched.
- Site-specific research was conducted on the subject property utilizing maps, city directories, newspaper articles, historical photographs, and other published sources, if available.
- Background research was performed at local and regional historic archives, and through internet resources.
- Ordinances, statutes, regulations, bulletins, and technical materials relating to federal and state historic preservation, designation assessment processes, and related programs were reviewed and analyzed.
II. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Historic resources fall within the jurisdiction of several levels of government. Federal laws provide the framework for the identification, and in certain instances, protection of historic resources. Additionally, states and local jurisdictions play active roles in the identification, documentation, and protection of such resources within their communities. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), of 1966 as amended, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as amended 1970, and the City of Pomona Municipal Code Section 5809-13, are the primary federal, state, and local laws and regulations governing the evaluation and significance of historic resources of national, state, regional, and local importance. A description of these relevant laws and regulations are presented below.

In analyzing the historic significance of the subject property, criteria for designation under federal, State, and local landmark programs were considered. Additionally, the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) survey methodology was used to survey and rate the relative significance of the property.

A. FEDERAL LEVEL

1. National Register of Historic Places

First authorized by the Historic Sites Act of 1935, the National Register was established by the NHPA as “an authoritative guide to be used by Federal, State, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation’s cultural resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment.”1 The National Register recognizes properties that are significant at the national, state and local levels.

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture must be in a district, site, building, structure, or object that possesses integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and:2

A. is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B. is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
C. embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represents the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that

---

1 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 36 § 60.2.
A property eligible for listing in the National Register must meet one or more of the four criteria (A-D) defined above. In addition, unless the property possesses exceptional significance, it must be at least 50 years old to be eligible for National Register listing.

In addition to meeting the criteria of significance, a property must have integrity. “Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance.” According to National Register Bulletin 15, within the concept of integrity, the National Register criteria recognize seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity. To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of these seven aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance. The seven factors that define integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The following is excerpted from National Register Bulletin 15, which provides guidance on the interpretation and application of these factors.

- 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 the property.
- Setting is the physical environment of a historic property.
- 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.

---

3 National Register Bulletin 15, page 44.
4 Ibid.
5 “The relationship between the property and its location is often important to understanding why the property was created or why something happened. The actual location of historic property, complemented by its setting is particularly important in recapturing the sense of historic events and persons. Except in rare cases, the relationship between a property and its historic associations is destroyed if the property is moved.” Ibid.
6 “A property’s design reflects historic functions and technologies as well as aesthetics. It includes such considerations as the structural system; massing; arrangement of spaces; pattern of fenestration; textures and colors of surface materials; type, amount, and style of ornamental detailing; and arrangement and type of plantings in a designed landscape.” Ibid.
7 National Register Bulletin 15, page 45.
8 “The choice and combination of materials reveals the preferences of those who created the property and indicated the availability of particular types of materials and technologies. Indigenous materials are often the focus of regional building traditions and thereby help define an area’s sense of time and place.” Ibid.
9 “Workmanship can apply to the property as a whole or to its individual components. It can be expressed in vernacular methods of construction and plain finishes or in highly sophisticated configurations and ornamental detailing. It can be based on common traditions or innovative period techniques.” Ibid.
• Feeling is 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.

In assessing a property’s integrity, the National Register criteria recognize that properties change over time; therefore, it is not necessary for a property to retain all its historic physical features or characteristics. The property must, however, retain the essential physical features that enable it to convey its historic identity.

For properties that are considered significant under National Register criteria A and B, National Register Bulletin 15 states that a property that is significant for its historic association is eligible if it retains the essential physical features that made up its character or appearance during the period of its association with the important event, historical pattern, or person(s).

In assessing the integrity of properties that are considered significant under National Register criterion C, National Register Bulletin 15 provides that a property important for illustrating a particular architectural style or construction technique must retain most of the physical features that constitute that style or technique.

The primary effects of listing in the National Register on private property owners of historic buildings is the availability of financial and tax incentives. In addition, for projects that receive federal funding, the Section 106 clearance process must be completed. State and local laws and regulations may apply to properties listed in the National Register. For example, demolition or inappropriate alteration of National Register eligible or listed properties may be subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

B. STATE LEVEL

The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), as an office of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, implements the policies of the NHPA on a statewide level. The OHP also carries out the duties as set forth in the Public Resources Code (PRC) and

---

10 “It results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the property’s historic character.” Ibid.

11 “A property retains association if it is the place where the event or activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to the observer. Like feeling, associations require the presence of physical features that convey a property’s historic character...Because feeling and association depend on individual perceptions, their retention alone is never sufficient to support eligibility of a property for the National Register.” Ibid.


13 Ibid.

14 “A property that has lost some historic materials or details can be eligible if it retains the majority of the features that illustrate its style in terms of the massing, spatial relationships, proportion, pattern of windows and doors, texture of materials, and ornamentation. The property is not eligible, however, if it retains some basic features conveying massing but has lost the majority of features that once characterized its style.” Ibid.

15 See 36 CFR 60.2(b) (c).
maintains the California Historic Resources Inventory. The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) is an appointed official who implements historic preservation programs within the state’s jurisdictions.

1. **California Register of Historical Resources**

Created by Assembly Bill 2881, which was signed into law on September 27, 1992, the CRHR is “an authoritative listing and guide to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens in identifying the existing historical resources of the state and to indicate which resources deserve to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change.” The criteria for eligibility for the California Register are based upon National Register criteria. Certain resources are determined by the statute to be automatically included in the California Register, including California properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register.

The California Register consists of resources that are listed automatically and those that must be nominated through an application and public hearing process. The California Register automatically includes the following:

- California properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places and those formally Determined Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places;
- California Registered Historical Landmarks from No. 770 onward;
- Those California Points of Historical Interest that have been evaluated by the OHP and have been recommended to the State Historical Commission for inclusion on the California Register.

Other resources which may be nominated to the California Register include:

- Individual historical resources;
- Historical resources contributing to historic districts;
- Historical resources identified as significant in historical resources surveys with significance ratings of Category 1 through 5;
- Historical resources designated or listed as local landmarks, or designated under any local ordinance, such as a historic preservation overlay zone.

To be eligible for the California Register, a historic resource must be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the following four criteria:

---

17 California Public Resources Code § 5024.1(b).
18 California Public Resources Code § 5024.1(d).
19 California Public Resources Code § 5024.1(d).
20 California Public Resources Code § 5024.1(e).
1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Additionally, a historic resource eligible for listing in the California Register must meet one or more of the criteria of significance described above and retain enough of its historic character or appearance to be recognizable as a historic resource and to convey the reasons for its significance. Historical resources that have been rehabilitated or restored may be evaluated for listing.\(^{21}\)

Integrity under the California Register is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The resource must also be judged with reference to the particular criteria under which it is proposed for eligibility. It is possible that a historic resource may not retain sufficient integrity to meet criteria for listing in the National Register, but it may still be eligible for listing in the California Register.\(^{22}\)

2. California Office of Historical Preservation Survey Methodology

The evaluation instructions and classification system prescribed by the OHP in its Instructions for Recording Historical Resources provide a three-digit evaluation rating code for use in classifying potential historic resources. The first digit indicates one of the following general evaluation categories for use in conducting cultural resources surveys:

1. Listed on the National Register or the California Register;
2. Determined eligible for listing in the National Register or the California Register;
3. Appears eligible for the National Register or the California Register through survey evaluation;
4. Appears eligible for the National Register or the California Register through other evaluation;
5. Recognized as Historically Significant by Local Government;
6. Not eligible for any Listing or Designation; and
7. Not evaluated for the National Register or California Register or needs re-evaluation.

The second digit of the evaluation status code is a letter code indicating whether the resource is separately eligible (S), eligible as part of a district (D), or both (B). The third digit is a

\(^{21}\) California Code of Regulations, California Register of Historical Resources (Title 14, Chapter11.5), Section 4852(c).

\(^{22}\) Ibid.
number that is used to further specify significance and refine the relationship of the property to the National Register and/or California Register. Under this evaluation system, categories 1 through 4 pertain to various levels of National Register eligibility. The California Register, however, may include surveyed resources with evaluation rating codes through level 5. In addition, properties found ineligible for listing in the National Register, California Register, or for designation under a local ordinance are given an evaluation status code of 6.

C. LOCAL LEVEL

1. City of Pomona

The City of Pomona, through provisions in the City of Pomona Zoning Ordinance, has established processes to preserve its designated historic resources. The provisions of the City of Pomona’s Municipal Code relative to historic preservation (Section .5809-13 Historic Preservation), presents a planning tool to “preserve the city of Pomona’s cultural, historical, and architectural heritage and resources as living parts of community life which will benefit and enrich the lives of its present and future residents.” The regulation serves as a means of recognizing and documenting historic resources of cultural or aesthetic importance, while integrating the process with public and private land management.

Section .5809-13, D. of the Zoning Ordinance uses the following criteria to define a local landmark:

1. It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the city of Pomona’s cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, architectural, or natural history;
2. It is identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history;
3. It embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;
4. It contributes to the significance of an historic area, being a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic or scenic properties or thematically related grouping of properties which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan or physical development;
5. It is the work of a notable builder, designer, landscape designer or architect;
6. It has a unique location or singular physical characteristics or is a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the city of Pomona;
7. It embodies elements of architectural design, detail materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation;
8. It is similar to other distinctive properties, sites areas, or objects based on an historic, cultural, or architectural motif;

21 City of Pomona Municipal Code; Section .5809-13, A.
9. It reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth, particular transportation modes, or distinctive examples of park or community planning;

10. It is one of the few remaining examples in the city of Pomona, region, state, or nation possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural or historical type or specimen.
III. EVALUATION

A. HISTORIC CONTEXT

1. Rancho San Jose

In 1837, Ignacio Palomares and Ricardo Vejar petitioned the Mexican Governor of Alta California for the lands that had been controlled by the Mission San Gabriel located between the Asistencia San Bernardino and Mission San Gabriel. The rancho in its entirety was known as San Jose, and it was roughly located in what is now called the Pomona Valley.

Ricardo Vejar was the son of Salvador and Maria Vejar, a Spanish family who had come from Mexico to San Diego in 1792. Ricardo Vejar had been born in San Diego in 1811, and in 1833 was serving as a county judge (Juez de Campo) in the new settlement known as El Pueblo de los Reyna de los Angeles. Ignacio Palomares was the son of Cristobal Palomares, a Spaniard who had traveled through Mexico, into Alta California, where he had settled in Los Angeles with his family. Ignacio Palomares grew up in the young settlement of Los Angeles, and by the 1830s was well entrenched in community politics. Like Ricardo Vejar, Palomares also served as a county judge in 1834. Both Vejar and Palomares had both the family and political connections to be awarded a land grant by Governor Alvarado.

Upon receiving the grant of almost 22,000 acres, Vejar and Palomares split the Rancho San Jose into two separate ranchos. Palomares took the northern rancho and called it San Jose de Arriba. Vejar’s southern rancho came to be known as San Jose de Abajo. Both ranchos were well stocked with beef cattle and sheep which were under great demand by the influx of new settlers into California in the late 1840s.

Then in the 1860s, disaster struck in the form of floods and drought. The drought was so bad that the number of cattle on the hoof in Los Angeles County fell by more than 70%. Ranchers lost roughly three out of four animals from their herds. In the early days of the drought, rancho owners like Vejar mortgaged their property in an attempt to make it through the bad times. But the drought lasted too long, and Vejar had to sell his land of 12,000 acres in 1864 to two investors from Los Angeles by the names of Isaac Schlesinger and Hyman Tischler.

Schlesinger and Tischler hired Louis Phillips to run the ranch for them, and paid him with the profits he produced from his management. Phillips did so well that he was able to buy the entire ranch from Schlesinger and Tischler in 1866.

2. Pomona

Shortly after Phillips got control of the land, he sold 100 acres to William Rubottom. Rubottom built a hotel, and established a popular stage stop in the late 1860s calling the Pomona valley...
settlement Spadra after his hometown in Spadra, Arkansas. (Spadra was located just to the south and west of present day Pomona). Rubottom had started the development of his town soon after the Southern Pacific Railroad Company (SPRR) had begun plans to construct a railroad line from Sacramento to Los Angeles, and was hoping that he could convince the railroad to make Spadra a major terminal on the line. Unfortunately for Rubottom and the town of Spadra, the SPRR decided to make the town of Colton the main connector.

Meanwhile, a small new settlement by the name of Pomona had been started up in the 1870s by a partnership of investors. They located the new settlement next to the SPRR lines that ran through the Pomona Valley, and used one-square mile of their land for the site of a town. Outside of town thousands of acres of land were planted with orange trees and other citrus fruit. With the easy accessibility of the railroad, citrus farmers were able to easily ship their produce across the United States. Luther Holt was one of these first orange growers, with 40 acres of groves north of the railroad line, and 120 acres south of it.

For the second time in the short history of the settlement of the Pomona Valley, disaster struck again in the late 1870s with a terrible fire that wiped out most of downtown, and the failure of most of the artesian wells that supplied water to the extensive citrus groves. The wells went dry as the water table dropped from the unregulated use of the available resources. The town of Pomona went bankrupt and ownership of the buildings and land returned to Louis Phillips.

In 1882, investors from Northern California with money to build an irrigation system, bought 12,000 acres from Phillips, and established the Pomona Land and Water Company (PLWC). The new company constructed a concrete pipeline from San Antonio Canyon to Pomona to serve the water needs of the town and orchards. Similar to what A.B. Miller and the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company did for the settlement of a town in Fontana, and William Spurgeon did to establish Santa Ana, the PLWC had to quickly sell their land holdings if they were to be successful and repay their investment in a reliable water supply.

Aiding the PLWC in selling off the thousands of acres they held was a railroad rate war between the Southern Pacific Railroad and the Santa Fe Railroad in the mid-1880s. Where the price of a ticket from New York to California had been $45 for a single fare, it dropped to as low as $1 before settling at a price of $25 for a one-way ticket. The combination of cheap fares and inexpensive land lured entire families to start new lives in the west. Thousands of Americans came to California in the 1880s and 1890s, and Pomona itself grew ten-fold from 300 inhabitants to 3,000 in a few short years. New houses were going up in Pomona at the rate of fifty a month, and a beautiful new hotel had been built. Telegraph service was established, and even an opera house was constructed for social outings. A packing house and a cannery were constructed next to the railroad tracks in the center of town.
3. **985 South Hamilton Boulevard**

The property at 985 South Hamilton Boulevard is located towards the western boundary of the city of Pomona. This area of the city appears to have remained fairly rural and agrarian in nature until after World War II. Because of its distance from the city and lack of urban density, the subject parcel is not included in any of the Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps that were produced in 1885 and updated to 1950.²⁴

City directories on-file in the Special Collections of Pomona Library date from 1909-1910. The directories up to 1948 were reviewed to identify the residents of the property at 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard. The results per directory are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1909-1910</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>L. J. Stevens, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>George Heckthorne, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>George Heckthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>J. C. Mathews, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>E. E. Wayman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-1923</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>J. C. Mathews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>Reverend A.L. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>J. C. Mathews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>915 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>Reverend A.L. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>905 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>J. C. Langston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>W. F. Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>W. H. Gibson, owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>W. H. Gibson, rancher, owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>William H. Gibson, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td>C. J. and Freda Fast, rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>No listing for 985 S. Hamilton Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁴ The Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps only cover down to 899 South Hamilton Boulevard, and no further.
The building permits and records at the City of Pomona for the property date back to only 1930. The earliest permits were filed starting in 1930 by E. H. Gibson. In 1930 and 1931, Gibson filed permits for additions to existing chicken houses. Gibson re-shingled the house on the property in 1937, and in 1938 added a basin to the house. In 1940, Gibson added two more poultry houses, and a “20 foot by 40 foot alteration to existing buildings”. The last permit filed by Gibson was in 1942, and it was also for the construction of a poultry house. Charles Fast filed a permit for a poultry house in 1945. Property owner Erik Molin filed permits for various small improvements to the house dating from 1951 to 1967.

It appears that the property was utilized as a chicken/poultry ranch up to the 1950s. No further permits were requested for the repair, maintenance, or construction of poultry ranching-related structures after 1945. The general purpose barn currently on the subject property may have been related to the poultry raising operation.

A historic aerial photograph from 1938 shows the rural nature of the area surrounding the subject property. (Photograph 2)

---

B. HISTORIC RESOURCES IDENTIFIED

A site visit and inspection of the historic resource on the property at 985 South Hamilton Boulevard was performed by Pamela Daly on July 10, 2014. Present in the parcel are a one-story, Queen Anne style cottage, and a barn used for general purposes. From the data available on-line from the Los Angeles Tax Assessor Property Information for APN 8349-017-026, the date of construction of the houses is estimated to have been constructed in 1908, and altered
in 1929. According to City of Pomona building permits, the exterior of the house has not been substantially altered since that time.

The house was designed to be a single-family Queen Anne style cottage, and it is set back from the roadway, on a corner lot at the intersection of South Hamilton Boulevard and West 10th Street. The house has a rectangular mass and measures approximately 32 feet wide by 48 feet long, not including the rear addition that measures approximately 5 feet wide by 18 feet long. The house has approximately 1,398 square feet of living space.

The one-story building is of wood frame construction and is clad on the exterior with narrow shiplap boards, with the corners of the house trimmed with plain flat boards set vertically. The foundation of the house is comprised of poured concrete walls that raise the building approximately 18 inches above ground level. The roof is hipped, clad with composition shingles, and has wide overhanging eaves that contribute to the Edwardian-era Queen Anne architectural style. A hipped roof dormer is set in the middle of the front (east) roof plane over the front entrance of the building. (Photograph 3)

The front (east) façade exhibits the Queen Anne style of influence with its asymmetrical design in the recessed porch area and location of the front door. The main entrance to the house is located within the porch area on the north facing façade. A set of three poured concrete steps, with low side walls, lead to the wood floor of the front porch. On the front façade facing east, the original window unit has been removed. The porch roof is supported by two turned posts that sit on a kneewall railing clad with the same narrow siding as the house. It appears that the window that would have been situated in the roof dormer has been removed and replaced with a plywood panel with vents.

On the north and south elevations of the house there still remain paired, one-over-one wood sash double hung window units. The windows are framed and have a protruding sill. A shed roof addition was added to the rear elevation of the building. (Photograph 4) It appears this addition was made in 1929 and provided space for bath and laundry facilities. The addition was clad with the same style siding as the main block.

The general purpose barn/garage appears to date from the 1930s. It is a one-story, wood frame building with a gable roof that measures approximately 36 feet long by 20 feet wide. (Photograph 5) The roof is set on a north/south axis and large hinged doors span the south gable end of the barn that face 10th Street, and a single entrance door is located on the north elevation. The building sits on the concrete pad of the driveway. The building was most probably constructed and used for the operation of the chicken ranch that was located on the property up to the 1950s.

---

26 Residential Building Record file for APN 8349-017-026.
Photograph 3: 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard, front (east) elevation. View looking west.

Photograph 4: West (rear) and south elevation. View looking east.
C. SIGNIFICANCE

The subject property at 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard consists of a small, single-family residence and a general purpose barn. The house is believed to have been built in 1908, and was constructed during the early years of the settlement of the town called Pomona. The house was designed as a Queen Anne style cottage, which was a popular style of residential architecture in the late-Victorian Era and early-Edwardian Era. The Queen Anne style of architecture is usually identified with large, ornately decorated houses, but the smaller, cottage type houses were equally as representative of the times, particularly in a rural or working class environment. Because of the lack of building records for the property, it is possible that the house may have been originally constructed in another location in the area and moved to this site between its presumed date of construction in 1908 and when it first appears in local directories in 1926.

The house at 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard is the type of building that would have been constructed by someone of limited means who had migrated to the area for inexpensive land and a new lifestyle. The citrus industry was the foundation of the growth of Pomona into the twentieth century. Yet, as the history of the ownership and building permits of the subject property has shown, there were also many other types of small enterprises which supported the local and regional economy with small livestock or poultry operations. The house has
retained the elements of integrity exhibited by its design and materials. The aspects of workmanship have been lost with the removal of original wood sash window units in the house and in the dormer. As the Queen Anne style of cottage could be found as readily in an urban setting as that of a rural setting, the subject property’s loss of association with a small agriculture does not detract from the residence’s history. The style of house at 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard is found in abundance throughout both northern and southern California in communities that were settled before 1910. The Craftsman style bungalow replaced the Queen Anne style cottage in popularity in the early 1900s.

The area surrounding the subject property, which was originally agricultural land, has been replaced by residential and small commercial/retail buildings. The original setting of the property, in an area that was almost completely covered with citrus trees, has been compromised. The streetscape of South Hamilton Boulevard in this area of Pomona used to be of the occasional small house interspersed with citrus orchards and small ranching operations. Over the years, the city of Pomona grew and the urban center expanded outward with the construction of residential units and the commercialization of the major streets such as Mission Boulevard and Phillips Boulevard. Residential housing units replaced the orchards and small ranches in this area of Pomona. The house at 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard appears to have remained in the same location for over 100 years, but the use of the land surrounding the house has changed dramatically.

In assessing the subject property’s historical significance federal, state, and local criteria were applied. The subject property is not currently listed in the National Register, the California Register, nor has it been listed as a Historic Landmark building in the City of Pomona.

The property at 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard does not appear to meet National Register or California Register Criteria A/1 for significance as a historic resource. The property has not been found to be associated with significant aspects of chicken ranching or other broad events that have shaped the nation or state. It does not reflect special elements of the City of Pomona’s cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, or engineering history.

The property at 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard does not appear to meet the National Register, California Register, or local criteria for significance as a historic resource under Criteria B/2. The property has not been found to be directly associated with the lives of persons important to local, regional, or national history.

The house at 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard does not appear to have been constructed by a notable builder, designer or architect important on a national, state, or local level. The area surrounding the subject property has not been identified as having significance to the city, and the house is not located in a unique or integral part of its neighborhood or community. The house does not exemplify or reflect special elements of the city of Pomona’s architectural history as it cannot be directly associated with elements relegated solely to the city, nor does it embody elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant architectural achievement. A windshield survey of the built environment dating
from 1870 to 1910 found in the western half city of Pomona, provided evidence that the house at 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard is not one of the few remaining examples of this historical type of architecture.27

In summation, based on the findings of this assessment, the property at 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard does not appear to meet the criteria for listing on the National Register, California Register or as a City of Pomona Historic Landmark. It does not qualify as a historically significant resource.

27 A windshield survey was performed by Pamela Daly in 2009 in order to ascertain the quantity and quality of Queen Anne style cottages located in the northwest and southwest quadrants of the city for the evaluation of the property at 942 W. Holt Avenue.
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ATTACHMENT 5
HISTORIC RESOURCES INVENTORY FORM, 1993
CITY OF POMONA
Historic Resources Inventory
(Short Form - Exterior)

(1) Address: 985 S. HAMILTON BL (2) Neighborhood: _____________________________

(3) Property Category:

- Single Family Residential [X]
- Multi-Family Residential ___
- Commercial ___
- Industrial ___
- Other ___

(4) Architectural Style (see attached sheet): COLONIAL REVIVAL

(5) Estimated Construction Date(s): 1908  (6) Condition of Structure: GOOD

(7) Additions or Alterations: Major Moderate Few None

Description: ________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

(8) Other comments or observations: __________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

(9) Rating: "C" "CM" "N" "NA" "R"  

(10) Evaluator: D. MARSH  

Date of Evaluation: MAY 1993

- (Place Picture Here) -
ATTACHMENT 6
PHOTOGRAPHS TAKEN BY STAFF
Residential Structure 1 – 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard

Front (east) Elevation

Side (south) Elevation

Side (north) Elevation

Rear (west) Elevation
Residential Structure 1 – 985 S. Hamilton Blvd. Boulevard

Living Room

Dining Room

Bedroom 1

Bedroom 2
Residential Structure 1 – 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard

Bathroom

Kitchen

Kitchen

Service Porch
Residential Structure 3 – 1145 W. Tenth Street

Front (south) Elevation

Side (east) Elevation

Rear (north) Elevation

Side (west) Elevation
ATTACHMENT 7
PUBLIC HEARING NOTICES
NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF THREE SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AND ONE ACCESSORY BUILDING (STRUCTURE ONLY: NOT REAL ESTATE) FOR RELOCATION, AND NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON AN APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (COA 14-013) FOR THE DEMOLITION OF FOUR RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS ON PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 963 & 985 S. HAMILTON BOULEVARD AND 1145 W. TENTH STREET

The City of Pomona has received an application to demolish four residential buildings (COA 14-013). This notice concerns the physical structures at the above-referenced location only and does not concern the availability of land or real estate for purchase or dedication. Notice is further given that the Historic Preservation Commission will hold a public hearing on June 1, 2016, at 6:30 p.m. in the Pomona City Council Chambers located at 505 South Garey Avenue in the City of Pomona.

Project Description: The petitioner, The Cambodian Buddhist Society of Pomona, requests a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA 14-013) to allow the demolition of four residential structures constructed between 1908 and 1953. Under Section .5809-13 of the Pomona City Zoning Ordinance, the City of Pomona Historic Preservation Commission must review all applications for permission to demolish structures built prior to 1945 in order to protect the City’s historical resources and maintain the architectural cohesiveness of its neighborhoods. The neighborhood in which the building is located is not identified in the Inventory as being a Potential Historic District.

Environmental Determination: In compliance with Article 6, Section 15074 of CEQA, the Historic Preservation Commission will consider adoption of a Negative Declaration. A copy of the Initial Study/Negative Declaration will be available on the City of Pomona’s website, www.ci.pomona.ca.us and at the Planning Division, 505 South Garey Avenue in the City of Pomona for a 20-day public review, which begins on Monday, May 9, 2016.

Availability of a Structure for Relocation: Any interested party may submit a Letter of Intent demonstrating the party’s willingness to relocate the buildings from their current location to another suitable location. Letters of Intent must be submitted in writing to the City of Pomona Planning Division, 505 South Garey Avenue, Pomona, CA 91769. Letters of Intent will be accepted from May 2, 2016 through May 31, 2016. Letters of Intent received after 6:00 p.m., on Tuesday, May 31, 2016, will not be considered.

Interested parties wishing to relocate the structures shall be required to first obtain a conditional use permit in compliance with the City’s Zoning Ordinance within four months of acceptance. The relocation, transportation, rehabilitation, or use of the building also constitutes a “project” under the CEQA Guidelines. Compliance with CEQA as part of the conditional use permit process shall be the sole responsibility of the party who acquires the building.

Neither the City of Pomona Planning Division, the City of Pomona nor any related public entity, or subdivision make any representation, warranty, or guaranty, express or implied, as to the structural integrity, safety, quality or condition of said property or of its suitability for relocation or transportation or of fitness for use.

If you challenge this matter in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the City of Pomona, Planning Division at, or prior to, the public hearing. If you have any questions, please contact Leonard Bechet, Associate Planner, at 909-620-2191.

Date: April 28, 2016

Publication Date: May 2, 2016

Brad Johnson, Planning Manager

EVA BUICE
CITY CLERK

Para información en Español, llame (909) 620-2191
NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

SAID NOTICES are hereby given that there has been filed with the Historic Preservation and Planning Commissions of the City of Pomona as follows:

Project Title: Major Certificate of Appropriateness (COA 14-013)

Applicant: The Cambodian Buddhist Society of Pomona

Location: 963 & 985 S. Hamilton Boulevard and 1145 W. Tenth Street

Project Description: The proposed project consists of the demolition of four residential structures built between 1908 and 1953.

Meeting Date: Wednesday, June 1, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.

Location & Time: Pomona City Council Chambers located at 505 South Garey Avenue in the City of Pomona, California.

Environmental Review
An Initial Study has been prepared for COA 14-013 in compliance with Section 15063 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines. After completion of the Initial Study, the City has determined that with the Negative Declaration there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record, that the Certificate of Appropriateness for a major alteration will cause a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, in compliance with Section 15070 of CEQA, the Historic Preservation Commission will consider adoption of a Negative Declaration for COA 14-013. A copy of the Initial Study/Negative Declaration will be available for a 20-day public review which begins on Monday, May 9, 2016 and concludes on Tuesday, May 31, 2016. A copy of the Initial Study/Negative Declaration can be obtained from the Planning Division, 505 South Garey Avenue in the City of Pomona, or by calling the Planning Division at (909) 620-2191.

PLEASE NOTE: If you challenge this matter in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the City of Pomona, Planning Division at, or prior to, the public hearing.

Para Informacion en Espanol llame (909) 620-2191.

Date: May 5, 2016

Publication Date: May 9, 2016

Brad Johnson
Development Services Manager

Eva Buice
City Clerk, City of Pomona
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**MEMORANDUM**

TO:  HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
FROM:  BRAD JOHNSON, DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER  
SUBJECT:  CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPROVALS FOR MINOR ALTERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE ADDRESS</th>
<th>APPLICANT NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT</th>
<th>DATE APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1503 Ganesha Place</td>
<td>Cathy Bray</td>
<td>To trim Camphor, Eastern Redbud, and two Lemon trees</td>
<td>3/31/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470 Kenoak Place</td>
<td>Kim Stagg</td>
<td>To allow replacement comp shingle – like for like.</td>
<td>5/4/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1421 S. Garey Avenue</td>
<td>Robert Hull</td>
<td>Replacement of existing doors with electric sliding doors at main entrance.</td>
<td>5/16/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>