MONDAY, JULY 22, 2013, 2:00 P.M.

1. **ROLL CALL**  – Vartan Gharpetian, Mike Morgan, Desiree Shier, Lorna Vartanian, Arlene Vidor

2. **REPORT REGARDING POSTING OF AGENDA**
   The agenda for this meeting was posted on or before Wednesday, July 17, 2013 on the bulletin board outside City Hall.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   May 29, 2013 (Special Meeting)

4. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**
   Discussion is limited to items not a part of this agenda. Each speaker is limited to 5 minutes. The Commission may question the speaker, but there will be no debate or decision.

5. **COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS**

6. **OLD BUSINESS**
   a. Review of revised window design for Masonic Temple (GR No. 15) rehabilitation project, 245 S. Brand Blvd.

7. **NEW BUSINESS**
   a. Proposed Niodrara Drive Historic District: Preliminary Review of Nomination

8. **PLANNING DIVISION UPDATES and INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS**
   a. Review of 2012 Mills Act conditions and comprehensive Mills Act condition list
   b. Update on unpermitted demolition of driveway arch at Edmonstone (GR No. 39), 1134 E. Lexington Drive
   c. Update on historic district gateway signs
   d. Update on HPC meeting schedule change

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
June 21, 2013

Former Masonic Temple Building, Registered City of Glendale Historic Resource No. 15

234-238 South Brand Boulevard, Glendale California 91204

Request to modify the design of new windows previously approved by the Glendale Historic Preservation Commission:

Part of the voluntary structural enhancement of the former Masonic Temple Building includes the addition of six large windows, three facing north and three facing south, on the Seventh Floor of the building. These windows are meant to provided light and ventilation to the former lodge room on that floor. These six windows were approved by the City of Glendale’s Historic Preservation Commission to be arches sympathetic to the interior plaster arches affixed to the interior of the exterior walls (Please see sheet A.1.3 attached: North Interior Elevation/Approved by Historic Preservation Commission). At the time of the request, City Staff, Commissioners and Frank De Pietro and Sons were concerned about the relationship of arched windows on these two elevations because all of the other windows were rectangular. However, because the interior plaster arches created such a significant form in the former lodge room, a suitable arch form was accepted.

The project is currently in the early modification phase. It is clear that the interior plaster arches are an impediment to the wall strengthening proposed and approved by the Glendale Building Department. Some are also in poor condition. It is the opinion of Frank De Pietro and Sons that their removal would not detract from the other architectural elements of the space, primarily the hammerhead wood trusses.

Frank De Pietro and Sons therefore is requesting that the City of Glendale’s Historic Preservation Commission approve the revised design of these six windows as shown on the attached sheets A.1.1, A.1.2 and A.1.3. Window design is an enlargement of the already approved Fifth Floor windows on the north elevation which are developed from the size, proportion and divisions contained in the original north and south windows. Frank De Pietro and Sons believes that this requested window re-design is a more appropriate form for the north and south elevations of the building. The removal of the interior arches is needed to better provide for the voluntary structural enhancement and eliminates the need to introduce another shape to the exterior. This redesign also permits a rectangular window form to be used that will be appropriate to the modified former lodge room.
SEVENTH FLOOR WINDOW OPENINGS

NORTH INTERIOR ELEVATION

FRANK DE PIETRO AND SONS

SEVENTH FLOOR WINDOW OPENINGS

FORMER MASONIC TEMPLE BUILDING STRUCTURAL ENHANCEMENT

PHASES III

2343 S. BRAND BOULEVARD, GLendale CALIFORNIA 91204

A.1.3
INTRODUCTION
The Planning Division of the Community Development Department has received an application for a historic district overlay zone comprised of 32 single-family homes in the Verdugo Woodlands neighborhood. The proposed Niodrara Drive district consists of a portion of the land allotted to Teodoro and Catalina Verdugo, grand-nephew and daughter of the ranchero José María Verdugo, in the Great Partition of 1871. The area containing the proposed district was subdivided beginning in 1909, first by the Verdugo Canyon Land Company and then by the F.P. Newport Company in 1917. The lots were further subdivided in the post-World War II era.

The proposed district is strongly defined by its landscape and streetscape features, including a flowing stream that once ran along Niodrara. The various bridges that criss-cross the dry stream bed, along with other natural and man-made elements, define and give the district its unique rustic character. Though its homes were built over the course of several decades, the stream and lush, tree-filled landscape tie them together as a highly picturesque and cohesive district.

The boundary proposed by the applicants contains properties with the following addresses or address ranges (see map attached as Exhibit B):

- 1800 – 2011 Niodrara Dr.
- 1630 – 1647 Fernbrook Pl.
- 1620 – 1645 Hillside Dr.
- 1616 and 1630 Wabasso Way
- 1619 Colina Dr.

The district designation process outlined in the City’s Historic District Ordinance requires that the Historic Preservation Commission review the application and make a preliminary determination regarding the area’s eligibility as a historic district. This is not a final determination or recommendation. It is only a judgment that the area appears to
meet at least one of the criteria established by the ordinance in a meaningful manner that warrants further investigation. If the Commission makes an affirmative determination, it then authorizes district proponents to circulate a petition among property owners within the proposed boundary requesting that the City conduct a historic resources survey for the proposed historic district. The process beyond that point includes the retention of a consultant to conduct the survey, further public meetings and hearings, and a final petition from the proponents containing signatures of owners requesting that the district be designated. Ultimately, City Council must vote in favor of the designation for the zone change to be made.

Although Planning staff considers the application to be complete, as the designation process proceeds, the components of the application may change due to new information supplied by the applicants, City staff, the project consultant and/or the public. Any changes to the application, such as adjustment of the boundaries or supplements to the Historic District Design Guidelines, must be made and approved by the Commission prior to its final review and approval of the historic resources survey.

HISTORIC BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

The application provides an overview of the Niodrara Drive area’s history and development. The historic context statement was prepared by the applicants based on their own independent research. Staff believes that the research is adequate for the purpose of the present nomination and provides a clear picture regarding the importance area’s development and the persons associated with its inception. If the Commission finds merit in the present nomination and the designation process moves forward, existing information will be supplemented by a professional historic resource survey, which will include further research focusing on Niodrara Drive’s distinctive landscape and streetscape features.

The proposed historic district comprises a portion of the residential Verdugo Woodlands neighborhood, originally subdivided in 1909 as the Verdugo Canyon Tract. The land had been previously allocated to Teodoro and Catalina Verdugo in the Great Partition of 1871. After Teodoro Verdugo’s death in 1904, the land changed hands several times before being subdivided into twelve large “villa” lots by the Verdugo Canyon Land Company. The company released a promotional booklet beautifully illustrated with photographs of the tract’s rolling grounds, mature trees, and streams to entice potential homebuyers. The stream along Niodrara Drive was a ubiquitous talking point in all press coverage relating to Verdugo Woodlands, and the proposed district’s physical and historical development was strongly influenced by it. For decades, it provided Glendale with much of its domestic water supply and was the focal point of many controversies over its regulation. The stream is visually significant in the way it defined the streetscape and continues to relate properties to one another.

The land continued to be developed after its initial subdivision. A Southern California developer named Frederick Pennington Newport acquired the land in 1917, and its grand re-opening was celebrated with a fiesta featuring Spanish music and dancing, as well as lectures on California history by Charles F. Lummis. Newport called the development
Selvas de Verdugo. Promotional materials referred to the subdivision’s history as the “estate of the distinguished Verdugo family” and the area’s “early hacienda days,” while simultaneously drawing comparisons with “the Riviera, Switzerland, and the rustic lanes of the English countryside.” Its natural and man-made landscape features, including the stream on Niodrara, river rock details along Fernbrook, Niodrara, and Hillside, and the lush landscape exemplified the qualities for which Newport celebrated the Verdugo Woodlands. F.P. Newport was also one of the forces behind the creation of the Oakmont Country Club, which opened in 1924.

Newport’s company went bankrupt during the Great Depression, and the land was subsequently re-subdivided through simple lot splits. Many of the thirty-two houses in the proposed district occupy property divided in this fashion. It is a significant aspect of the history of the development, particularly in the construction of houses after World War II.

The houses in the proposed district represent fifty years of development activity (1912 – 1962). Collectively, they reflect strong architectural continuity from Period Revival through the Ranch style, as well as demonstrate changing tastes and trends in regional residential architecture. The oldest house in the district is a Prairie-style influenced Foursquare residence built in 1912.

The Period Revival styles are well represented, with Tudor Revival, French Revival, and Spanish Colonial Revival houses scattered among the newer post-World War II houses. The presence of only one Spanish Colonial Revival house in the proposed district is unusual, given their great abundance in other Glendale subdivisions developed in the 1920s. The district also features several Minimal Traditional houses, which were built from the late 1930s, on into the 1940s.

Almost half of the houses were built after World War II, when the Ranch style prevailed. “Modern,” “rustic,” and “East Asian-influenced” variants of the Ranch style are represented within the proposed district. A few Modern-style houses complete the architectural eclecticism of the proposed Niodrara Drive district, including Rudolf Schindler’s 1941 Rodriguez House (GR No. 24).

**PRELIMINARY STAFF DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY**

In addition to assessing the nomination with regard to the eligibility criteria established by the Historic District Ordinance, Planning staff also considers the apparent appropriateness of the district boundary, period of significance, and name proposed by the applicants. Staff also visits the proposed district to make a preliminary visual estimation of the level of alterations to properties that could affect a potential district’s eligibility based on the ordinance’s requirement that a minimum of 60% of a district’s properties be considered “contributors.” Contributing structures are those that were built within the period of significance and maintain enough physical integrity to continue to convey their historic associations and original architectural design.
Proposed Boundary
The boundary proposed by the applicants falls within Tract 250, a subdivision of a portion of the land allotted to Teodoro and Catalina Verdugo in the Great Partition of 1871. The houses within the district share certain characteristics with the larger Verdugo Woodlands neighborhood, namely the prevalence of the Period Revival and Ranch style homes and their multi-decade period of development. The area is also known for the density of mature trees found on its properties and along its streets. The proposed district, however, is distinguished by a signature feature: the natural stream that ran south along Niodrara Drive from Wabasso Way into Verdugo Park. It visually unifies the area along and around Niodrara Drive, not only in the remaining evidence of its course on individual properties and in the curving contours of the primary street, but in the local river rock accents that characterize the proposed district’s streetscape.

Staff believes the proposed boundary is appropriate.

Proposed Name
Niodrara Drive is physically linked to the stream bed that historically ran its length and continues to provide it with its unique rustic character. The proposed district’s linearity is indicative of its having been “built up” around this particular natural feature. The east side of Niodrara features ponds and a few stone bridges over the stream bed, including some designed to evoke traditional Japanese styles. Because the entirety of the historic watercourse and all of its remaining features run along the Niodrara Drive, it appears appropriate to use the name for the proposed district.

Staff believes the proposed name is appropriate.

Proposed Period of Significance
The applicants have proposed a period of significance of 1912 to 1962. The initial date is appropriate because it represents the year in which the first house in the district, the Prairie-style influenced Foursquare house at 1616 Wabasso Way, was built. This house was prominently featured in promotional advertising for the Verdugo Woodlands well into the 1920s, as it showcased the sort of ambitious gentility F.P. Newport hoped to attract and cultivate in his subdivision. For this reason, the applicants believe it is an important element of the Niodrara Drive district.

As if often the case at the initial stages of a district nomination, the end date for the period of significance is not as readily apparent. The application suggests 1962 as the terminal date and staff believes that this is appropriate as the outside limit at this point in the designation process. Research and analysis conducted for the historic resource survey will definitively establish the end date. Finalizing this date is not a requirement for considering the district’s eligibility for designation.

Staff believes that 1912-1962 appears to be an appropriate period of significance pending further information provided by the historic resource survey.

Contributing Structures
Staff has spent time within the proposed district and believes that it is likely that at least 60% of the properties would be considered contributors to the historic district (20 out of
32 properties within the proposed boundary). A quantitative assessment can only be made through a parcel-by-parcel survey, and the percentage of contributors will be affected by the final determination regarding the period of significance. 

Staff believes it is likely that the proposed district will meet the 60% threshold.

Eligibility Criteria
A proposed district must meet at least one of the nine criteria established by the historic district ordinance in order to be considered for designation. The following analyses are preliminary. If a historic resource survey is authorized for the proposed district a more detailed analysis of the area’s eligibility under each criterion will be provided.

Staff believes that the proposed Niodrara Drive Historic District appears to meet at least five of the nine criteria, which are discussed individually:

A. Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City’s cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, architectural, or natural history.

The proposed district contains excellent examples of homes built between the 1910s and the 1960s, reflecting the changing tastes and trends in regional residential architecture. The character and quality of its homes reflect the cultural aspirations of Glendale’s citizens over the course of several decades. The area also appears significant for its incorporation of the natural setting into the development. By maintaining and enhancing the native vegetation historic stream, the developers provided residents with unique amenities not encountered in many neighborhoods in Glendale. The area appears to reflect significant aspects of the city’s cultural, aesthetic, natural, and architectural history. 

Staff believes the proposed district appears to meet Criterion A.

B. Is identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history.

Frederick Pennington Newport, the developer of the Verdugo Woodlands, appears to be a figure of some historical interest. John A. Pirtle, the area’s original subdivider may also be of interest. Further research into his lives and careers – particularly as they relate to the development history of Glendale – will be required to make a final determination regarding this criterion.

Staff believes that further research is required to determine if the proposed district meets Criterion B.

C. Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.

The proposed historic district contains homes reflecting a range of styles found in Glendale between the 1910s and 1960s. The stylistic mix is different than is typical in the city’s neighborhoods at the base of the Verdugo Mountains. Many
of the homes built before World War II are in the Tudor Revival style, while there is only one example of the Spanish Colonial Revival, the style that dominates other neighborhoods developed at that time. As in other historic districts, postwar Ranch-style houses blend well with the earlier Period Revival houses. In general, the homes embody the distinctive features and character associated with the various architectural styles found along Niodrara Drive.

*Staff believes the proposed district appears to meet Criterion C.*

**D. Represents the work of notable builders, designers, or architects.**

Most of Glendale’s designated historic districts were developed over a span of several decades and reflect the work of numerous builders and designers. Because of this, it is hard to meet Criterion D. This may also be the case for the proposed district. While the Glendale Register-listed Rodriguez House by Rudolf Schindler is within the proposed boundary, his influence does not extend beyond the property. Research should be conducted to determine if the designer(s) of the picturesque treatment of the stream might qualify under this criterion.

*Staff believes that further research is required to determine if the proposed district meets Criterion D.*

**E. Has a unique location or is a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood community or of the city.**

The proposed district’s setting in the heavily wooded Verdugo Woodlands neighborhood gives it a character not found in most parts of Glendale. The developers choice to harness the natural stream to picturesque effect is completely unique and truly sets the neighborhood apart even though many waterway features are now lost. These features suggest that the proposed district meets this criterion.

*Staff believes that the proposed district appears to meet Criterion E.*

**F. Embodies a collection of elements of architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation.**

While there are many fine homes in a variety of historic styles in the Niodrara Drive area, their designs, details, materials, and craftsmanship is not strikingly different from that of other neighborhoods. The overall collection of homes cannot be seen as a significant architectural achievement or innovation when viewed as a totality. If future research finds significant achievement or innovation in the engineering or design associated with channeling the stream, the district may qualify under this criterion.

*Staff believes that further research is required to determine if the proposed district meets Criterion E.*
G. Reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth, transportation modes, or distinctive examples of park or community planning.

The proposed district is in an area that reflects the early subdivision and annexation history of Glendale. Though it was developed over the course of five decades, its early homes reflect the city’s early growth, as residents sought to live in the more rural outskirts of the rapidly changing city. The development of Niodrara Drive, in particular, is a distinctive example of subdivision planning. The conversion of the natural stream into a picturesque feature reflects the zeal with which developers sought to distinguish one subdivision from another. The overall landscape of the proposed district, especially its impressive collection of mature trees, continues to reflect the intent of the early promoters and enhances the area’s aesthetics and livability. 

Staff believes that the proposed district appears to meet Criterion G.

H. Conveys a sense of historic and architectural cohesiveness through its design, setting, materials, workmanship or association.

Niodrara Drive does not possess the uniformity seen in many of Glendale’s designated historic districts. While its houses are complementary in terms of their scale and massing, different site conditions on various lots result in differing site plans and architectural solutions. These leads to a variety of set backs that enhance the rural feel of the street and avoid the more suburban feel of other developments from the period. Ultimately, the stream and the trees are what give the area its greatest cohesiveness and help it solidly meet this criterion. 

Staff believes that the proposed district appears to meet Criterion H.

I. Has been designated a historic district in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources.

The area has not been previously designated or determined eligible for the National or California Registers.

The proposed district does not meet Criterion I.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Based on the information submitted with the nomination and the assessment above, staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission preliminarily find that the proposed Niodrara Drive Historic District is eligible as an historic district overlay zone and authorize the circulation of a petition among property owners within the proposed boundary requesting a historic resources survey.

EXHIBITS
Exhibit A: Historic District Application
Exhibit B: Map of Proposed Historic District
Historic District

Historic districts are designated geographical areas defined by either a significant concentration of properties representing a collection of one or more historic architectural styles or a noteworthy historic development pattern. Historic districts are officially "overlay zones" requiring a zone change that must be approved by the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Commission and City Council. More information can be found at: http://www.ci.glendale.ca.us/planning/HPHistoricDistricts.asp

Case No. __________________

The city's Historic Preservation Planner is available to meet with you to discuss the historic district process prior to your submission of an application. We strongly encourage you to call (818) 548-2140 to arrange a preliminary meeting.

Please submit $2000.00 zone change application fee, payable to "City of Glendale," with this application.

Please PRINT or TYPE all information

1. Application date: May 28, 2013

2. Proposed historic district name (optional; final name may differ from that proposed):

   Niodrala Drive Historic District

3. Describe boundary of proposed Historic District Study Area (attach map – see 7a):

   The proposed boundaries are the parcels associated with the following thirty-two addresses:
   1800 – 2011 Niodrala Dr.; 1635 – 1646 Fembrook Place; 1620 – 1645 Hillside Dr.;
   1616 and 1630 Wabasso Way; 1619 Colina Dr.

4. Contact Info

   (If you wish to keep phone and/or e-mail information private, please mark as "private" and submit on separate sheet for staff use)

   Primary Contact Person (must be a property owner within the proposed District):
   Name: Catherine Jurca
   Address: 1845 Niodrala Dr.
   Phone: private
   Email: cjurca@hss.caltech.edu

   Second Contact Person (if applicable; must be a property owner within the proposed District):
   Name: Catherine Flicat
   Address: 1900 Niodrala Dr.
   Phone: private
   Email: private

   Third Contact Person (if applicable; must be a property owner within the proposed District):
   Name: Cat Paulk
   Address: 1909 Niodrala Dr.
   Phone: private
   Email: private
5. Briefly summarize the attached draft historic context statement (see 7b) to describe the historic significance of the proposed study area:

The proposed historic district forms part of the residential Verdugo Woodlands neighborhood, originally subdivided in 1909 as the Verdugo Canyon Tract from land allocated to Teodoro and Catalina Verdugo in the Great Partition of 1871. The houses in the proposed district represent fifty years of significant building (1912 - 1962) that demonstrate both changing tastes and trends in regional residential architecture and strong architectural continuity from Period Revival through the Ranch style. Its physical and historical development was strongly influenced by the natural stream that ran through the district, an omnipresent feature of subdivision promotion and press coverage. The stream is both historically significant—for decades it provided the city of Glendale with much of its domestic water supply and was the subject of many controversies over its regulation—and visually important in the way it defined the streetscape and continues to relate properties to each other.

6. Explain how the initial proposed boundaries of the study area were selected:

The proposed boundaries fall within Tract 250, a subdivision of a portion of the land allotted to Teodoro and Catalina Verdugo in the Great Partition of 1871. The houses within the district share certain characteristics with the larger Verdugo Woodlands neighborhood in the preponderance of the Period Revival and Ranch styles, but the proposed district is distinguished from neighboring streets and properties due to a signature feature: the natural stream that ran south along Niodrara Dr. from Wabasso Way into Verdugo Park. It visually unifies the area along and around Niodrara Drive, not only in the remaining evidence of its course on individual properties and in the curving contours of the primary street, but in the local river rock accents that characterize the proposed district's streetscape.

7. Attach the following supporting materials as part of the application package:

a) Map of proposed district
b) Initial “Historic District Context Statement”, to include:
   • Development history
   • Relationship of district to Glendale development patterns, events, and persons
   • Periods of significance
   • Profile of historic resource types
c) A general written description of the architectural styles found within the proposed district
d) Photographs representing the architectural styles and features within the proposed district
e) Submit any supplements to the Historic District Design Guidelines (e.g. special features or architectural styles not included in the design guidelines)
f) Submit proposed design guidelines for any non-residential buildings located within the proposed study area
g) Any additional material that supports the nomination of a historic district

8. All Applicants MUST Sign This Application:

1. Catherine Jurca
   Name – Please Print
   Signature
2. Catherine Float
   Property Owner(s) Name – Please Print
   Catherine Float
   Property Owner Signature(s)
   5/24/13
   Date

3. Catherine Paulk
   Property Owner(s) Name – Please Print
   Ceit Paulk
   Property Owner’s Signature(s)
   5/23/13
   Date

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Date received in Permit Services Center ________ Received by ________ Date Stamp ________
Fee paid ________ Receipt No. ________
May 22, 2013

To Whom It May Concern:

We are honored to support the application submitted by homeowners of the proposed Niodrara Drive Historic District.

We believe you will find the overall uniqueness of this area to be worthy of Historic District designation, thereby ensuring preservation of the qualities that make the proposed district so special. We applaud the homeowners who have demonstrated a commitment to recognize and preserve the integrity and uniqueness of this area of the Selvas de Verdugo. Catalina Verdugo would be proud!

Sincerely,

Mirna Stanley
President
Supporting Materials

Proposed Niodrara Drive Historic District

May 28, 2013
Figure 1. Map of boundaries of proposed Niodrara Drive Historic District.
Figure 2. Sketch map of proposed Niodrara Drive Historic District. Property numbers, assigned by primary applicant, are used throughout the application.
Table 1. A complete list of properties in the proposed Niodrara Dr. Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Assessor No.</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Contributor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1800 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-019-033</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1808 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-019-041</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1812 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-019-035</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>English/Tudor Revival</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1630 Fernbrook</td>
<td>5614-019-036</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>French Revival</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1640 Fernbrook</td>
<td>5614-019-037</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1646 Fernbrook</td>
<td>5614-019-038</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>English/Tudor Revival</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1647 Fernbrook</td>
<td>5614-019-040</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>English/Tudor Revival</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1641 Fernbrook</td>
<td>5614-019-016</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Modern Ranch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1635 Fernbrook</td>
<td>5614-019-017</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1840 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-019-018</td>
<td>1955/1990</td>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1900 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-019-019</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Rustic Ranch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1910 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-019-020</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>English/Tudor Revival</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1916 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-019-039</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1920 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-019-022</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1926 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-019-025</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1644 Hillside</td>
<td>5614-019-024</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1645 Hillside</td>
<td>5614-018-027</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>English/Tudor Revival</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1635 Hillside</td>
<td>5614-018-022</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Tudor Rev/Farmhouse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1616 Wabasso</td>
<td>5614-018-008</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Prairie Style/Foursquare</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1630 Wabasso</td>
<td>5614-018-009</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2011 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-018-023</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Spanish Revival</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2001 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-018-005</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1620 Hillside</td>
<td>5614-018-036</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>English/Tudor Revival</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1915 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-020-013</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1909 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-020-014</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Modern Ranch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1845 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-020-015</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1839 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-020-016</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Minimal Traditional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1833 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-020-041</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1825 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-020-021</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1819 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-020-044</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1811 Niodrara</td>
<td>5614-020-019</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Modern Ranch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1619 Colina</td>
<td>5614-020-018</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Ranch</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Niodrara = Niodrara Way; Fernbrook = Fernbrook Place; Hillside = Hillside Dr.; Wabasso = Wabasso Way; Colina = Colina Dr.

Building year is from the Los Angeles County Assessor’s Office website.

Status of contributors is provisional only.
Historic District Context Statement

Development History

The proposed Niodrara Drive Historic District comprises part of Tract 250, a subdivision of a portion of the 2,629.01 acres allotted to Teodoro and Catalina Verdugo, the grand-nephew and the daughter of the original owner of the vast Rancho San Rafael, in the Great Partition of 1871 (figure 3). Following the death of Teodoro in 1904, the land in Tract 250 changed hands three times within two years before coming into the possession of the Forest Grove Land Company in 1906.1 According to articles in the Glendale News, there were plans to subdivide the land for residences; these failed, the News darkly hinted, because “certain high railway officials” did not fulfill a promise to develop an electric railway to the area from Los Angeles.2 Until 1910, the only public transportation to the property was by the Salt Lake Railway, which served it only infrequently.

In 1909 the land was acquired by the Verdugo Canyon Land Company.3 Verdugo Park, a favorite picnicking spot for southern Californians since at least the 1890s, lies immediately south of the proposed district and was a part of tract 250 as well, but it remained open space before the city began acquiring land for an official city park in 1944.4 Subdivision of the rest of the tract began in 1909. It was facilitated by the extension of the Glendale-Eagle Rock Railway line (a private line, opened in 1909) into the Verdugo Canyon in July 1910. The president of the Verdugo Canyon Land Company, John A. Pirtle, provided the necessary right-of-

---

1 References to the appropriate deed books are given in “A Historical and Architectural Assessment of the Verdugo Adobe,” Glendale, California, Prepared by Chambers Group, Inc. (August 1993), 5, Glendale Public Library, Special Collections (hereafter GPL-SC), Verdugo Adobe/Verdugo Family binder.
3 See also “Verdugo Park to Be Cut Up,” Los Angeles Times, August 28, 1906, proquest.
way through the company’s property and subscribed $20,000 to guarantee construction.\(^5\)

Originally the proposed district comprised twelve large lots, which varied significantly in shape and size, especially along Niodrara, and illustrated the lofty goals of the developer (figure 4). Pirtle, whose name dominated Verdugo Canyon Tract advertising, was called “the moving spirit” of the project, and he aimed for a high-class clientele. (figure 5).\(^6\) John McLaren, “the father of Golden Gate Park” in San Francisco, was reported to have laid out the streets in keeping with the natural contours of the land.\(^7\) An ad in the *Los Angeles Times* described

---


\(^7\) See ibid.
lots “one-half acre to three acres, rolling grounds, live oaks, sycamore trees, running water and parks.”8 In May 1910 the company likewise advertised the creation of “the most beautiful and artistic illustrated booklet of its kind ever published in Los Angeles,” for which interested parties could write.9 This expensive brochure touted “large villa lots, trees, running water” but primarily told its story in pictures, including photographs of Verdugo Park, a wonderful asset to potential homeowners, and the lot on which Pirtle himself was to build a house (figures 6 and 7).10 Two of the oldest houses in the entire Woodlands

---

8 Ad for Verdugo Canyon Tract, Los Angeles Time, October 27, 1909, proquest.
9 Ad for Verdugo Canyon Tract, Los Angeles Times, May 12, 1910, proquest.
10 “Verdugo Canyon Tract,” n.d. (circa 1910), Huntington Library. It is not clear that Pirtle ever did build a house there; he is first listed as a resident of Glendale in the 1917 City Directory, on “Wabassa Way” (no address), but gone by 1919, the next year the Directory is available.
neighborhood, a 1912 Prairie Style with Foursquare elements on Wabasso Way (property 19) and a 1918 English/Tudor Revival on Hillside Dr. (property 23), both included in the proposed district, illustrate the original villa-like quality Pirtle promoted, as well as the lush landscaping, river rock elements, and running water that still characterize it (figures 8 and 9).
The tract continued to change hands, and the proposed district exemplifies the vagaries—the unevenness and unpredictability—of residential development in an era when houses were built one at a time, often by the people who planned to live in them. Large lots were purchased but not built on and later resubdivided. In some cases, lots were built on but a portion was later divided and sold as a separate property. Bena Way was renamed Hillside, and a new street, Fernbrook Place, was mapped in 1924, as part of the new Fernbrook Place Tract between Niodrara, Hillside, Cañada Blvd., and Colina Dr (figure 10).
The nine lots originally laid out in this section of Tract 250 became thirty-nine lots in Fernbrook Place, including twenty that fall within the proposed district. In addition, in 1925 lot 23 of Tract 250 (properties 17 and 18 in the proposed district) became lots 6 and 7 in a new tract, 9151, the boundaries between them defined by the course of the stream (figure 11). (The remaining lots are now property of the First Congregational Church of Glendale.)

Figure 11. Reconfigured lots in Tract 9151. The red lines outline the portion of the tract included within the proposed historic district and the boundary between properties 17 and 18. Map Book 1238, p. 18, Los Angeles County Assessor’s Office, Archives.

Frederick Pennington Newport was a southern California developer and the most important figure in the Woodlands’s development from 1917. A brief biography of Newport in John Steven McGroarty’s *Los Angeles from the Mountains to the Sea* (1921) specifically mentioned his “pioneering” development of “surpassingly beautiful home sites” in the “fertile foothill and valley lands in historic Verdugo Canyon.”11 It was the F. P. Newport Company that gave the entire neighborhood its current name. After acquiring land in the canyon (which he continued to do well into the 1920s), Newport formally reopened the development as Selvas de Verdugo, later Verdugo Woodlands, in June 1917, with a fiesta featuring Spanish music and dancing as well as lectures on California history by Charles F. Lummis (whose former home and collection are now the Southwest Museum of Los Angeles) and former State Senator Reginaldo Francisco del Valle.12

A hallmark of the Woodlands was the creation of the Fernbrook Place Tract in January 1924, before Newport had even finished acquiring all the property, which he did in 1925.13 Its unique, and uniquely lovely, visual coherence

---

12 “Grand Spanish Fiesta Program is Announced,” *Glendale News*, June 7, 1917, GPL-SC, Verdugo Woodlands folders. Similar articles/promotions ran on June 8 and June 9 as well.
13 See Map Book 308, 1921-1928, p. 69, Los Angeles County Assessor’s Office, Archives.
continues to the present day. With the stream running along Niodrara, the river rock details along Fernbrook, Niodrara, and Hillside, and lush landscape, the new tract exemplified the qualities for which Newport celebrated the Woodlands. As with Pirtle’s efforts to interest buyers in the Verdugo Canyon Tract, references to mature trees and the flowing stream were ubiquitous in later advertisements, which perfectly illustrate the riotous hyperbole endemic to real estate promotion in this era. An ad put out by the F. P. Newport Co. in 1924, for example, refers simultaneously to the subdivision’s history as the “estate of the distinguished Verdugo family” and the area’s “early hacienda days,” while also claiming its affinities with “the Riviera, Switzerland, and the rustic lanes of the English countryside” (figure 12).

The Woodlands could be whatever the buyer wanted it to be. The ad bids the reader “to see ‘Fernbrook’—a bit of rural England in sunny California.”14 An article in the same issue of the Glendale Evening News described Fernbrook as “stream-coursed and heavily-wooded,” where “a large force of men” had “constructed lakes, waterfalls, roads, rustic and stone bridges.”15 Newport created an extravagant pamphlet of his own, which urged that “Verdugo Woodlands is like a touch of old Switzerland,” with “[c]hattering brooks of sparkling mountain water—clear vistas of rugged mountains...laurel-covered foothills—great gnarled sycamores—evergreen live-oaks, clusters of alders.”16

Pre-development oaks and especially sycamores, which thrive in wet areas near streams, are still a prominent feature of properties in the proposed district. He also promised potential buyers a “high class” environment of single-family homes: “Restrictions on the property protect it against the encroachment of commercial, tenement, apartment house, bungalow court” and other “undesirable feature[s].” The F. P. Newport Company offered more tangible benefits as well: Newport, an avid golfer, was one of the forces behind the creation of the Oakmont Country Club, which opened in 1924, and in 1926 the elementary school opened in close proximity to the proposed district, on Colina Dr. across Cañada Blvd.

In 1934 Security First National Bank came to own twelve of Newport’s lots in Fernbrook Place. One of many developers undone by the Depression, his company declared bankruptcy in 1935. The final major act of subdivision in the proposed district took place two years later, when lots 13, 14, and 15 in the original Tract 250 (see figure 4) were resurveyed as lots 8–18 of Tract 11424, which included an existing house from 1918 on lot 12 (figure 13). The owner was the Kohler & Chase Company, a celebrated music store in San Francisco that began in 1850. 102 years later the company would open an office and store in

![Figure 13. Reconfigured lots in the new Tract 11424. The red lines outline the portion of the tract (roughly) included within the proposed historic district. Tract Map Book 208, p. 8, http://dpw.lacounty.gov/sur/nas/landrecords/tract/MB0208/TR0208-007.pdf.](image-url)
downtown Los Angeles, but what brought it into the Glendale real estate market fifteen years prior is not known. In addition to these changes, parts of individual lots, with or without houses on them, were resubdivided. Lot 22, Block A, of Fernbrook Place and lot 22 of Tract 250 each became two building sites; lots 10, 11, and 12 of the original Tract 250, which originally ran street to street from Niodrara to Colina, became nine separate properties. Five of them are located on Niodrara Drive and are included in the district (compare figures 2 and 4). Even the 1912 mansion on Wabasso eventually sold about a third of its property, upon which another house was built in 1951. The owner of lots 14 and 15, Block A, of the Fernbrook Place Tract, who built the first house there in 1925, similarly sold a portion of one lot; a house was built on it in 1952. The last division of a lot took place in 1983, for a house built two years later. Many of the thirty-two houses in the proposed district occupy property divided in this fashion. It is a significant aspect of the history of the development, particularly in the construction of houses after World War II.

Period of Significance

The suggested Period of Significance for the proposed district comprises fifty years of building and dates from 1912, with the Prairie Style/Foursquare house, through 1962, with the completion of the last of ten contributing Ranch houses. The district comprises thirty-two houses in all. Six are likely non-contributors: two were built more than twenty years after the period of significance (properties 2 and 30); the others, built between 1942 and 1955, have been extensively remodeled (properties 10, 14, 22, 32). The remaining twenty-six houses are highly likely to be contributors and comprise a rich variety of popular buildings styles including, with variations: English/Tudor Revival, Spanish Revival, French Revival, Minimal Traditional, Modern, and Ranch, with the first and last of these predominant.

Of the likely contributors, five houses were constructed between 1918, shortly after Newport reopened “Selvas de Verdugo,” and 1927: all are variations on English/Tudor Revival (properties 6, 7, 17, 18, and 23; number 7 has American Farmhouse thrown in for good measure). The 1930s were slow as in many subdivisions. A Spanish Revival (property 21) was built in 1930; 1938 and 1939 witnessed the construction of two Minimal Traditionals (properties 24 and 27) and a French Revival (property 4). Four houses were built in 1941 and 1942 before wartime restrictions virtually halted residential construction: two English/Tudor Revivals (properties 3 and 12) and two Moderns (properties 13 and 26). Almost half of the likely contributing houses were built after the war, when the Ranch style prevailed. Of the twelve built after 1945, ten are variations on the Ranch theme (properties 1, 9, 15, 16 and 28), including three Modern Ranch (properties 8, 25 and 31), the latter with subtle Japanese touches also found in property 20. There is also what may be a termed a Rustic Ranch by noted southern California architect Robert Byrd (property 11), who is famous for

---

21 See Parcel Map-Glendale, No. 1328, Book 162, p. 78. Information about lots and boundaries is also available with the address on the Los Angeles County Assessor’s website: http://assessor.lacounty.gov/extranet/DataMaps/Pais.aspx
a somewhat higgledy-piggledy style that has led his works to be affectionately known as “Byrd houses.” There is also a Minimal Traditional (property 5) and a Modern Post and Beam (property 29) from this period. The Prairie Style/Foursquare house (property 19) represents an earlier period in the history of the development, but it was a mainstay of advertising into the 1920s, including a prominent position on the cover of a Selvas de Verdugo pamphlet and in “The Story of the Verdugo Woodlands” (figures 14 and 15). The house clearly reflected the kind of tasteful yet ambitious residences Newport wanted to encourage.

Figure 14. The district’s oldest house. Compare with figure 8. “Selvas de Verdugo” pamphlet, n.d., Glendale Public Library, Special Collections, Sparr Heights/Verdugo Woodlands binder.

Figure 15. Front view, house on the left, in “Story of the Verdugo Woodlands,” pamphlet, n.d., Glendale Public Library, Special Collections, Sparr Heights/Verdugo Woodlands binder.
The Landscape

As the Development History section doubtless made clear, advertising for the Verdugo Woodlands area obsessively promoted two features: natural streams and trees. Coast live oaks and California sycamores are the most common native trees in the Verdugo Woodlands, and examples abound in the proposed historic district (figure 16). Coast live oaks are visible in both front and back yards;

Figure 16. Front yard oak along Niodrara Dr. (property 27)

sycamores are especially predominant, including the literal centerpiece of the proposed historic district (figures 17 and 18). The landscaping overall is extremely lush, as befits a riparian environment.

Figure 17. Sycamore cluster in the intersection of Niodrara Dr. and Fernbrook Place. Los Angeles Public Library, Photo Collection, n.d., online.
There is evidence of the water everywhere (figure 19). Niodrara below Hillside curves like a stream, which distinguishes it from linear Bonita Drive, the longer, nearby residential street that also runs north-south. In the Fernbrook Place Tract, properties were divided from the street with a river rock border, most of which is intact, drawing attention to the landscape’s connection with the water. The east side of Niodrara features ponds (figure 20) and a few stone bridges over the stream bed, including one on the northeast side of Hillside. On the west side, traces of the old bed, no longer active, remain as well as a stone bridge and a
Japanese-style bridge (figures 21 and 22). This combination of features is found nowhere else in the Verdugo Woodlands and justify the proposed district boundaries as defined in this proposal.
Because of the alley in the Fernbrook Place Tract, behind properties 7, 10-14, and 16, many of the houses have very deep setbacks, creating an almost rural feel. A lack of city street lighting also contributes to this quality (the proposed boundary on the east side of Wabasso is marked by a contemporary city streetlight adjacent to church property). As does the virtual absence of sidewalks, which are found only on the northeast side of Hillside (in front of properties 17 and 18), and on the southeast half of Wabasso Way, across from the proposed district, where the church property line begins. The First Congregational Church building is located on Cañada Blvd.; landscaping along Niodrara provides a buffer between its parking lot and building and the proposed historic district.

**Relationship of District to Glendale Development Patterns, Events, and Persons**

The development of the proposed district is roughly coincident with some of Glendale’s other identified and proposed historic districts: Cumberland Heights (c. 1900-1950s), Ard Eevin (1903-1955), Rossmoyne (1923-1948), and Brockmont Park (1910-1956). Like these other areas it too comprises a wealth of houses that document historical trends in architectural taste with heavy emphasis on Period Revival and Ranch. The style of architecture is eclectic rather than homogeneous, as to be expected with active development across half a century.\(^\text{22}\)

Glendale’s other identified and proposed historic districts were part of the original Rancho San Rafael like the rest of the city; Niodrara Drive and the surrounding Woodlands area also formed part of the very last parcels of land owned and inhabited by heirs of the original ranchero, Jose Verdugo. The land was sold only with the death of his grandson Teodoro in 1904, after which the

\(^\text{22}\) In this section, as at many other points, the author is indebted to the exemplary application for the proposed Brockmont Park Historic District, written by Francesca Smith and submitted in 2010.
Verdugo Canyon Tract Company eventually subdivided it in 1909, along lines still recognizable today. The Catalina Verdugo adobe (#1 on Glendale’s Register of Historic Resources), at 2211 Bonita Dr., was the last home of Jose Verdugo’s daughter, and developers were committed to its preservation from the subdivision’s inception, as an artifact saturated with historical meaning for the community and region at large.23

The proposed district differs in two significant regards from other historic districts in Glendale. First, there is only one Spanish Revival house (from 1930), fewer than any other district, despite the style’s enormous popularity in subdivisions across Glendale in the 1920s. Of the four houses built in the proposed district during the 1920s, all are versions of English/Tudor Revival, a style that recurs in subsequent building. Given the emphasis on Fernbrook’s English country charm in this decade, the relative absence of the Spanish Revival in the proposed district, in contrast with the rest of the Verdugo Woodlands where it is quite common, is a feature of its distinctive history. Even a house constructed in the proposed district as recently as 1985 (property 30) nodded to this history when adopting a contemporary English/Tudor Revival style.

The second exceptional feature pertains to the stream that flowed through it. The Verdugo Canyon territory was annexed to the city of Glendale in 1912, only the second area to join after incorporation in 1906. As both the Glendale News and Los Angeles Times reported at the time, the annexation had little to do with Verdugo Canyon development and everything to do with its valuable south-flowing water. As the Times put it: “It is a matter of common knowledge on the part of all of the people of Glendale, and that adjoining community [Tropico], that the people of this valley get substantially all the water used for domestic purposes from this canyon.” Annexation was required to regulate water the city depended on but didn’t actually own. The Verdugo Canyon Land Company did not technically own the water either; indeed, in contemporary newspaper articles, ownership of the Verdugo Canyon Tract was frequently attributed to the Glendale Consolidated Water Company: John Pirtle was involved in that as well.24 The water in the canyon had been divvied up in the Great Partition of 1871 as carefully as the land. Teodoro and Catalina Verdugo were awarded access to the East Stream “so far as their necessities require,” but they had to let the surplus water flow south into the West Stream (the one along Niodrara), whose supply belonged proportionately to the various claimants in the Partition, based on the amounts of land they were awarded.25 Over the years various owners consolidated their water interests in the form of companies such as Verdugo Canyon Water, Verdugo Pipe and Reservoir, Verdugo Springs, Miradero, and Glendale Consolidated Water (Leslie Brand was involved in the

24 See “The Verdugo Ranch,” Glendale News, October 2, 1909, GPL-SC, Verdugo Woodlands folders; and “The Beautiful Verdugo Canyon,” Los Angeles Herald, April 17, 1910, California Digital Newspaper Collection. The Herald says that Pirtle was president of both companies.
25 John Calvin Sherer, History of Glendale and Vicinity (Glendale: Glendale History Publishing Company, 1922), 116. Sherer would know: he helped to organize the Verdugo Canyon Water Company and was president, secretary, and treasurer at various times as well as a stockholder. As such he was an internenor in the 1893 lawsuit mentioned below.
latter two). The owners of Glendale Consolidated controlled roughly 13% of the canyon’s water, according to an article in the *Los Angeles Times*.26 For decades, then, the Verdugo streams provided Glendale with much of its water and were controlled by a relatively small group, often prominent figures in the city’s early development. They included Captain C. E. Thom, who purchased 2700 acres from Catalina Verdugo in 1870, before the Great Partition, and his nephew Judge Erskine Ross, who built the original Rossmoyne house on an 1100-acre ranch he in turn purchased from his uncle. Together they owned 20% of the Verdugo Canyon water.28 The water was the subject of numerous disputes, resulting in litigation. There were lawsuits against the Verdugos: in 1893, other water owners including Ross and Thom accused them of obstructing the flow to create new marshes on their property, and in 1904 Thom and Ross were defendants with the Verdugos, when wells dug on their land again jeopardized surface water flow (figure 23).29 But the water companies’ power dissipated

---

26 See Perry and Parcher, *Glendale Area History*, 32; and Sherer, *History of Glendale*, (128). Brand’s involvement with Glendale Consolidated Water was based on his role as founder and president of the Title Guarantee and Trust Company, which was trustee for the bondholders. See “Glendale Con. Water Company Gives Satisfaction,” *American Globe* (November 1916), 5.


28 See “Royal Boulevard Historic Resources Survey,” prepared by Historic Resources Group, City of Glendale, March 2008, 12; and “Vexatious Water Problem.”

after annexation. With the construction of the Owens Valley aqueduct, Los Angeles offered to sell water to Glendale. Thereafter the city was able to purchase some local water rights as their value diminished; Glendale Consolidated sold its pipes, plant, and water rights to the city in 1918.30

That was hardly the end of the controversy over water in Verdugo Canyon, although the controversy shifted from competing claims among owners of the water pertaining to domestic, livestock, and irrigation needs, to a conflict over its utilitarian versus ornamental value. In 1917 F. P. Newport wanted to divert water to ornamental ditches to beautify another part of the subdivision. City Trustees refused to grant him permits to construct pipes, claiming that the water could only be used for the purposes stipulated in the partition agreement; Newport in turn filed an injunction against the city.31 An agreement appears to have been reached in 1919, when stream and water rights were deeded to the city under “the provision the city maintain the flow in the ornamental streams,” an obligation that expired in 1942.32 The water continued to be a valued amenity among property owners. In 1945 the city’s Public Service Department sought to build wells to lower the stream’s water level and maintain the purity of the public’s water, which was otherwise difficult to control; residents of Niodrara Dr., Wabasso Way, and Cañada Blvd. fought the proposal on aesthetic grounds.33 Another proposal for seven wells in Verdugo Park as a water conservation measure was championed in 1983; residents in and outside the proposed district again wanted to save their “picturesque stream” as well as protect the water table in the Woodlands, which they feared would harm trees both in their community and in the park.34 They blamed the wells built near the Glorietta Reservoir for the diminishing volume of the stream, which had already run dry

30 City Council Minutes note an offer from the Title Guaranty & Trust Company, trustee for the Glendale Consolidated Water bondholders, to sell the water company to the city for $55,000, which the Council accepted pending the sale of bonds (vol. 6 [May 2, 1918], p. 417. In Glendale Area History, Perry and Parcher state that a bond measure to buy Glendale Consolidated Water passed, but they give the date as 1915 (60).
32 “City Wants to Pump Ground Water From Park Stream,” Los Angeles Times, October 23, 1983, proquest. City Council Minutes note a contract regarding water rights between the city and George Hanna, the successor to the Newport Company in Verdugo Canyon. Hanna was affiliated with the Verdugo Syndicate, and the lawyer who represented his interests with the city was Newport’s own, Charles Chandler (who purchased a three-acre lot in the Woodlands, east of Cañada Blvd., that was resubdivided in 1958 as Capistrano Circle). Hanna is shown to have purchased lots 1-6 and 8 of the original Tract 250 in 1920; in 1921 Newport began acquiring property in that section of the tract, which became the Fernbrook Place Tract, with the purchase of lot 7 (see Map Book 308, 1913-1921, p. 23). F. P. Newport had acquired the entirety of the Fernbrook Place Tract by 1925. See Glendale City Council Minutes, vol. 7, May 15, 1919, 199, and May 29, 1919, 221-23; and Katherine Yamada, “Chandler Property Gave Way to Capistrano Circle,” Glendale News Press, December 3, 2010, GPL-SC, Verdugo Woodlands folders.
34 “City Wants to Pump Ground Water From Park Stream,” Los Angeles Times, October 23, 1983, proquest.
toward the upper end, and pointed to an inadequate EIR, which the Council did not accept at that time. The proposal was ultimately defeated.

The stream from Wabasso to Verdugo Park went dry anyway in 1986. Plans to revive it on the east side of Niodrara were put in place in 1991 as part of the Verdugo Park Water Treatment Plant project, which included the construction of two wells. Homeowners agreed to line channel bottoms to prevent released water from percolating into the ground and also, much as the Verdugos had been required to do more than a century earlier following the Great Partition, not to obstruct the water as it flowed downstream. The released water was designed to be recovered by the wells and pick-up system at the Plant; the water also protects the park sycamores and other trees by maintaining ground water levels jeopardized by the wells. The stream began flowing again in 1997.

Profile of Historic Resource Types

The district includes the range of architectural styles—and the often dazzling variations within them—that one associates with fifty years of development activities beginning in the early twentieth century. Architectural styles of the twenty-six potentially contributing houses include various examples of Period Revivals, which were popular from the turn of the century until roughly 1940 and in these cases drew on European architectural traditions. They include: one Spanish Revival, one French Revival, and seven English/Tudor Revivals. The last Period Revival house was constructed in 1941. By the late 1930s simpler designs, as exemplified by the Minimal Traditional, had begun to prevail. The Minimal Traditional was popular into the 1940s; three houses in the proposed district fall into this category, with the last constructed in 1946. The Ranch became the ubiquitous symbol of gracious southern California living in the post-World War II period. There are ten potentially contributing Ranch houses within the proposed district, and their influences vary from classic California to modern to rustic to Japanese. Half of these were built on land that was resubdivided after World War II, the last in 1962. In addition, there are three Modern houses from 1941 (two) and 1955 and a single example of a hybrid Prairie Style/Foursquare house. That some examples can be classified as hybrids suggest that the actual houses within the proposed district exhibit a variety that generic stylistic labels scarcely address. That is, the houses demonstrate numerous interpretations of basic styles, as builders loosely borrowed from rather than thoughtlessly imitating architectural precedents.

Architectural Styles within the Proposed District

The following photographs are by no means a comprehensive survey of architectural styles but rather are designed to serve as an introduction to the

---

37 See Memo from Bernard V. Palk, Director of Public Service to David H. Ramsay, City Manager, August 26, 1996, Verdugo Woodlands West Homeowners’ Association, Westside Stream binder. See also “Council Ok's Plan to Tap Verdugo Park Water.”
range of styles. The author is very grateful to Jay Platt and Francesca Smith for their kind assistance with identifications.

Prairie Style/Foursquare

The oldest house in the district is something of a hybrid of two styles popular from about 1900 through the 1920s (property 19). Heavyweight boxing champion Jess Willard owned it from 1924 – 1931. He was perhaps more famously known by an unfortunate nickname, “The Great White Hope.”

English/Tudor Revival (see also figure 9)
This house and the one on the bottom of p. 23 face one another on Fernbrook Place. Note the river rock border that commences along the street at each property. English/Tudor Revival houses are the second most common style after the Ranch, in keeping with the promotion of Fernbrook as a bit of rural England (properties 6 and 7).

Another hybrid, English Revival meets American farmhouse (property 18).
Spanish Revival

Property 21 is the only Spanish Revival in the proposed district; the style predominates elsewhere in the Woodlands.

French Revival

Property 4 is the sole example of this style; the stream runs in front of the river rock wall.
Minimal Traditional

Minimal Traditional with Vernacular Elements (property 27).

Ranch

Built in 1947, this is the district’s first ranch house (property 1).
This pristine 1950 rustic ranch by architect Robert “Byrd” is likely eligible for Glendale’s Register of Historic Resources (property 11).

A modern ranch from 1952 (property 8).
The deep eaves and corner overhang of this 1962 Ranch house are suggestive of a Japanese influence. It has an original stack bond retaining wall (property 31).

Modern

The Rodriguez House, designed by Rudolf Schindler, one of southern California’s most important architects, is #24 on the Glendale Register of Historic Places (property 26).
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## HPC Discussion Items Proposed by Commission Members – May 2013

### Proposed Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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### Agendized Topics for May 29, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>HPC Discussion</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of evening HPC meetings</td>
<td>VM (10/26)</td>
<td>4/25/2011</td>
<td>Returned to active discussion based on public comment at 3/25/13. Staff will present suggested meeting day and time change at 7/22 hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ongoing Topics – pending further research/discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>HPC Discussion</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission meeting protocol discussion</td>
<td>DS (4/22/2013)</td>
<td>5/29/2013</td>
<td>Staff will provide final protocol guide for inclusion in commissioner handbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District fees: refunds and size-based tiers</td>
<td>LV (8/27) / MM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff to research feasibility of change and possible options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide survey</td>
<td>AV (7/26)</td>
<td>4/25/2011</td>
<td>Returned to active discussion at 3/25/13 hearing. Process to get to point of commissioning survey is likely to be slow. Topic will remain as discussion item indefinitely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resolved Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>HPC Discussion</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of Mid-century Multi-family Residence Context</td>
<td>AV (6/25/12) / MM</td>
<td>7/23/12</td>
<td>Context was never completed but contains information that will be included in pending South Glendale Community Plan and future community plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Per HPC policy, discussion items proposed by Commissioners will be placed on a meeting agenda if two or more commissioners vote to do so. An Item will remain on the list until it is either 1) resolved through discussion and/or action or 2) removed by its sponsor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>HPC Discussion</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addition of infill examples to Historic District Design Guidelines</td>
<td>AV (3/26/12)</td>
<td>6/25/12</td>
<td>Staff to compile examples of good infill projects (photos/drawings) to use when reviewing projects with applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of Craftsman survey re: designation, demolition, etc.</td>
<td>AV (7/26)</td>
<td>MM (10/26)</td>
<td>Staff presented information about how survey is used re: demolition permit requests and CEQA and showed examples of approved for demolition and cases where this was avoided. (resolved 3/36/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of evening HPC meetings</td>
<td>VM (10/26)</td>
<td>4/25/2011</td>
<td>Staff scheduling conflict due to limited evening time slots – may revisit based on schedule/room availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of regulation of interior features</td>
<td>AV (7/26/10)</td>
<td>8/22/2011</td>
<td>Commission directed staff to include definitions for public and quasi-public interior spaces in future revision of Historic Preservation Ordinance and indicate that these fall into HPC purview; privately-owned interiors will not be reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar panel installations</td>
<td>VM (9/27)</td>
<td>5/23/2011</td>
<td>State law currently prevents design review of solar installations. Mills Act may allow city to regulate per contract, but other designated properties to be reviewed case-by-case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping that blocks views to historic properties</td>
<td>VM (9/27)</td>
<td>3/28/2011</td>
<td>Future Mills Act contracts will contain provision that landscaping will not block visibility of designated property from public way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naming of GR-designated properties</td>
<td>AV (2/28)</td>
<td>3/28/2011</td>
<td>Naming policy developed. Will be communicated to CC in staff reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex parte communications</td>
<td>VM (2/28)</td>
<td>3/28/2011</td>
<td>Commissioners may individually speak to applicants with pending cases but should disclose conversation topics prior to Commission hearing of case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC review of property permit history</td>
<td>VM (7/26)</td>
<td>9/27/2010</td>
<td>General agreement to require permits on case-by-case basis when doing so will not have potential effect on historic character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of HPC in public outreach/education, incl. commercial property designation, potential districts, owner outreach</td>
<td>AV (7/26)</td>
<td>9/27/2010</td>
<td>Commissioners may represent HPC in public outreach and educational programs organized by non-city groups. Establish annual evening HPC meeting to allow greater participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner consent provision of HP ordinance</td>
<td>AV (7/26)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Removed at request of Commissioner Vidor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>