

City of Oakland – Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
EVALUATION SHEET FOR LANDMARKS ELIGIBILITY
 (City Landmark – Heritage Property – S-7 – S-20)

Address: 5837-39 Ayala Avenue
Name: Vaughn (M.C.)-Wilson (Caroline) house

A. ARCHITECTURE

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| 1. | Exterior/Design: <u>complex intersecting rooflines; deep wraparound porch with cast /</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 2. | Interior: <u>_____ /stone & elephantine columns - field C2+</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 3. | Construction: <u>wood frame and patterned shingles, cast cement, brackets & eave details</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 4. | Designer/Builder: <u>Merrill C. Vaughn, bldr active in N.Oak; brother of Wiley T Vaughn</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 5. | Style/Type: <u>Craftsman bungalow, esp. fine & elaborate– cluster of 5 by same builder</u> | E | VG | G | FP |

B. HISTORY

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| 6. | Person/Organization: <u>Caroline Wilson 1913, unident.; Arthur Walthew, 1920s-60s,/</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 7. | Event <u>_____</u> / auto rep.mgr, added upper flat | E | VG | G | FP |
| 8. | Patterns: <u>northward expansion to Temescal, annex 1897, transit, 1906 Earthquake boom</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 9. | Age: <u>1911</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 10. | Site: <u>orig. site</u> | E | VG | G | FP |

C. CONTEXT

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| 11. | Continuity: <u>Claremont Avenue Residential ASI, contributor</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 12. | Familiarity: <u>prominent on block: cluster of 5 similar at tip of 5-sided block</u> | E | VG | G | FP |

D. INTEGRITY

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 13. | Condition: <u>typical wear – roof, shingles, foundation, wood window sash</u> | E | G | F | P |
| 14. | Exterior Alterations: <u>attic expanded & side stair for upper flat 1941; some alum. sash</u> | E | G | F | P |

Evaluated by: Betty Marvin 5/10/24

STATUS

City Landmark/Heritage Property Eligibility (this evaluation): **Rating:** B (29/24 points)

X Eligible Not eligible Site of Opportunity

Other:

National/California Register Status: Listed Determined eligible Appears eligible

Local Register: Survey A, B, or API Designated Historic Property _____

This evaluation was accepted by the landmarks Preservation Advisory Board at its meeting of _____ (date). Case File: LM24001

Attest: _____
 Secretary

**City of Oakland – Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
EVALUATION TALLY SHEET FOR LANDMARKS ELIGIBILITY**

Address: 5837-39 Ayala Avenue

Name: Vaughn (M.C.)-Wilson (Caroline) house

12	6	3	0	1. Exterior/Design	
6	3	2	0	2. Interior	
6	3	2	0	3. Construction	
4	2	1	0	4. Designer/Builder	
6	3	2	0	5. Style/Type	
				A. ARCHITECTURE TOTAL (max. 26)	13
30	15		0	6. Person/Organization	
30	15	8	0	7. Event	
18	9	5	0	8. Patterns	
8	4	2	0	9. Age	
4	2	1	0	10. Site	
				B. HISTORY TOTAL (max. 60)	11
4	2	1	0	11. Continuity	
14	7	4	0	12. Familiarity	
				C. CONTEXT TOTAL (max. 14)	5
PRELIMINARY TOTAL (Sum of A, B and C) (max. 100)					29
-0	-3%	-5%	-10%	13. Condition (From A, B, and C total)	-1
-0	-25%	-50%	-75%	14. Exterior Alterations (From A, B and C total excluding 2)	-4
				D. INTEGRITY	-5
ADJUSTED TOTAL (Preliminary total minus Integrity)					24

STATUS/RATING

Present Rating (Adjusted Total): A(35+) B(23-34) C(11-22) D(0-10)

Contingency Rating (Preliminary Total): A(35+) B(23-34) C(11-22) D(0-10)

City Landmark Eligibility: Eligible (Present Rating is A or B) Not eligible

Heritage Property Eligibility: Eligible (Present or Contingency A or B) Not eligible

City of Oakland – Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
EVALUATION SHEET FOR LANDMARKS ELIGIBILITY
 (City Landmark – Heritage Property – S-7 – S-20)

Address: 1311 East 27th Street.
Name: Horton (Johanna) rental house

A. ARCHITECTURE

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| 1. | Exterior/Design: <u>survey C3; symmetrical façade, hip roof w prominent steep gable at /E</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 2. | Interior: _____ / center front, columned porch | E | VG | G | FP |
| 3. | Construction: <u>wood frame, millwork & plaster orn., shingles – standard construc.</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 4. | Designer/Builder: <u>unknown</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 5. | Style/Type: <u>. Colonial Revival house, unusual variant</u> | E | VG | G | FP |

B. HISTORY

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| 6. | Person/Organization: <u>Johanna Horton, dev – seamstress, widow, entrepreneur</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 7. | Event: _____ | E | VG | G | FP |
| 8. | Patterns: <u>19c E.Oak. suburbs, transit, women in business, dev't by n'h residents</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 9. | Age: <u>1905-07</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 10. | Site: <u>original site</u> | E | VG | G | FP |

C. CONTEXT

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| 11. | Continuity: <u>not in an identified district</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 12. | Familiarity: <u>prominent on block but not widely known</u> | E | VG | G | FP |

D. INTEGRITY

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| 13. | Condition: <u>typical exterior wear, foundation work prescribed</u> | E | G | F | P |
| 14. | Exterior Alterations: <u>discreet vinyl windows, door, small rear addition</u> | E | VG | G | FP |

Evaluated by: Betty Marvin 5/10/24

<p>STATUS City Landmark/Heritage Property Eligibility (this evaluation): Rating: <u>B 27/23 points</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eligible <input type="checkbox"/> Not eligible <input type="checkbox"/> Site of Opportunity Other: National/California Register Status: <input type="checkbox"/> Listed <input type="checkbox"/> Determined eligible <u>NR</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Appears eligible Local Register: <input type="checkbox"/> Survey A, B, or <u>API</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Designated Historic Property _____</p>
--

This evaluation was accepted by the landmarks Preservation Advisory Board at its meeting of _____ (date). Case File: LM24002

Attest: _____
 Secretary

**City of Oakland – Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
EVALUATION TALLY SHEET FOR LANDMARKS ELIGIBILITY**

Address: 867 Willow Street

Name: Geiger (Dorothea)-Nisbet (George) house

12	6	3	0	1. Exterior/Design	
6	3	2	0	2. Interior	
6	3	2	0	3. Construction	
4	2	1	0	4. Designer/Builder	
6	3	2	0	5. Style/Type	
				B. ARCHITECTURE TOTAL (max. 26)	11
30	15	8	0	6. Person/Organization	
30	15	8	0	7. Event	
18	9	5	0	8. Patterns	
8	4	2	0	9. Age	
4	2	1	0	10. Site	
				B. HISTORY TOTAL (max. 60)	16
4	2	1	0	11. Continuity	
14	7	4	0	12. Familiarity	
				C. CONTEXT TOTAL (max. 14)	0
PRELIMINARY TOTAL (Sum of A, B and C) (max. 100)					27
-0	-3%	-5%	-10%	13. Condition (From A, B, and C total)	- 1
-0	-25%	-50%	-75%	14. Exterior Alterations (From A, B and C total excluding 2)	- 3
				D. INTEGRITY	-4
ADJUSTED TOTAL (Preliminary total minus Integrity)					23

STATUS/RATING

Present Rating (Adjusted Total): A(35+) B(23-34) C(11-22) D(0-10)

Contingency Rating (Preliminary Total): A(35+) B(23-34) C(11-22) D(0-10)

City Landmark Eligibility: Eligible (Present Rating is A or B) Not eligible

Heritage Property Eligibility: Eligible (Present or Contingency A or B) Not eligible

City of Oakland – Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
EVALUATION SHEET FOR LANDMARKS ELIGIBILITY
 (City Landmark – Heritage Property – S-7 – S-20)

Address: 384 Bellevue Avenue
Name: Young (Eugene A)-Fearn (John Radford) house

A. ARCHITECTURE

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|----|---|----|
| 1. | Exterior/Design: <u>nested roofs, upper story overhang, flamboyant rafters & brackets, half- / ^</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 2. | Interior: _____ / <u>timber pattern, formal bay</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 3. | Construction: <u>woodframe, shingle & bevel siding, rafters, complex roofs & bay</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 4. | Designer/Builder: <u>Charles McCall & Willson Wythe arch., Bolin Anderson Peterson b</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 5. | Style/Type: <u>Craftsman house – fine & imaginative example</u> | E | VG | G | FP |

B. HISTORY

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|----|---|----|
| 6. | Person/Organization: <u>E.A. Young, West Oak. grocer, politician; J.R. Fearn, physician</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 7. | Event: _____ | E | VG | G | FP |
| 8. | Patterns: <u>Adams Pt development - architect-designs, upward mobility; 1906 EQ boom</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 9. | Age: <u>1908</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 10. | Site: <u>original site</u> | E | VG | G | FP |

C. CONTEXT

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|----|---|----|
| 11. | Continuity: <u>Bellevue-Euclid API, anchor (“establishes character”)</u> | E | VG | G | FP |
| 12. | Familiarity: <u>prominent on block, not widely known; twins scattered elsewhere</u> | E | VG | G | FP |

D. INTEGRITY

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 13. | Condition: <u>normal wear</u> | E | G | F | P |
| 14. | Exterior Alterations: <u>early side & rear, minor & away from front view - character intact</u> | E | G | F | P |

Evaluated by: Betty Marvin 5/11/24, based on OCHS 8/26/1985

STATUS

City Landmark/Heritage Property Eligibility (this evaluation): **Rating:** Ba (39/33 points)

Eligible Not eligible Site of Opportunity

Other:

National/California Register Status: Listed Determined eligible Appears eligible

Local Register: Survey A, B, or API Designated Historic Property Preservation Study List

This evaluation was accepted by the landmarks Preservation Advisory Board at its meeting of _____ (date).

Case File: LM24003

Attest: _____

Secretary

**City of Oakland – Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
EVALUATION TALLY SHEET FOR LANDMARKS ELIGIBILITY**

Address: 384 Bellevue Avenue

Name: Young (Eugene A)-Fearn (John Radford) house

12	6	3	0	1. Exterior/Design	
6	3	2	0	2. Interior	
6	3	2	0	3. Construction	
4	2	1	0	4. Designer/Builder	
6	3	2	0	5. Style/Type	
				C. ARCHITECTURE TOTAL (max. 26)	14
30	15	8	0	6. Person/Organization	
30	15	8	0	7. Event	
18	9	5	0	8. Patterns	
8	4	2	0	9. Age	
4	2	1	0	10. Site	
				B. HISTORY TOTAL (max. 60)	19
4	2	1	0	11. Continuity	
14	7	4	0	12. Familiarity	
				C. CONTEXT TOTAL (max. 14)	6
PRELIMINARY TOTAL (Sum of A, B and C) (max. 100)					39
-0	-3%	-5%	-10%	13. Condition (From A, B, and C total)	-1
-0	-25%	-50%	-75%	14. Exterior Alterations (From A, B and C total excluding 2)	-5
				D. INTEGRITY	-6
ADJUSTED TOTAL (Preliminary total minus Integrity)					33

STATUS/RATING

Present Rating (Adjusted Total): A(35+) B(23-34) C(11-22) D(0-10)

Contingency Rating (Preliminary Total): A(35+) B(23-34) C(11-22) D(0-10)

City Landmark Eligibility: Eligible (Present Rating is A or B) Not eligible

Heritage Property Eligibility: Eligible (Present or Contingency A or B) Not eligible

EVALUATION SHEET FOR LANDMARKS ELIGIBILITY

(City Landmark – Heritage Property – S-7 – S-20)

Address: 323-325 24th Street.

Name: Newsom (Sidney B.) flats

A. ARCHITECTURE

- 1. Exterior/Design: symmetrical hip-roofed box with imaginative detailing: prominent / E VG G FP
2. Interior: / entry hoods, elongated brackets E VG G FP
3. Construction: wood frame, shingles, mix of wood and plaster ornament E VG G FP
4. Designer/Builder: Sidney B Newsom arch (N.& N. w Samuel),S.A.Norman bldr E VG G FP
5. Style/Type: Colonial/Arts & Crafts flats, imaginative mix of vocabularies E VG G FP

B. HISTORY

- 6. Person/Organization: Sidney B. Newsom, arch. & .resid; 3-blg. Newsom family compound E VG G FP
7. Event: E VG G FP
8. Patterns: 1906 EQ boom, arch't-developers, evolution of Valdez area N of lake E VG G FP
9. Age: 1907-08 E VG G FP
10. Site: on original site, not moved E VG G FP

C. CONTEXT

- 11. Continuity: Waverly ASI & Newsom group, contributor E VG G FP
12. Familiarity: "conspicuous and familiar in n'h" by contrast with new development E VG G FP

D. INTEGRITY

- 13. Condition: normal wear, damage to some corbels and rear shingles E G F P
14. Exterior Alterations: porch stair wall siding, fairly discreet vinyl windows E G F P

Evaluated by: Betty Marvin 5/11/24, C.Buckley 7/20/84

STATUS
City Landmark/Heritage Property Eligibility (this evaluation): Rating: B (37/32 points)
X Eligible [] Not eligible [] Site of Opportunity
Other:
National/California Register Status: [] Listed [] Determined eligible [] Appears eligible
Local Register: [] Survey A, B, or API [] Designated Historic Property

This evaluation was accepted by the landmarks Preservation Advisory Board at its meeting of (date). Case File: LM24004

Attest: Secretary

**City of Oakland – Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
EVALUATION TALLY SHEET FOR LANDMARKS ELIGIBILITY**

Address: 323-325 24th Street.

Name: Newsom (Sidney B.) flats

12	6	3	0	1. Exterior/Design	
6	3	2	0	2. Interior	
6	3	2	0	3. Construction	
4	2	1	0	4. Designer/Builder	
6	3	2	0	5. Style/Type	
				D. ARCHITECTURE TOTAL (max. 26)	13
30	15	8	0	6. Person/Organization	
30	15	8	0	7. Event	
18	9	5	0	8. Patterns	
8	4	2	0	9. Age	
4	2	1	0	10. Site	
				B. HISTORY TOTAL (max. 60)	15
4	2	1	0	11. Continuity	
14	7	4	0	12. Familiarity	
				C. CONTEXT TOTAL (max. 14)	4
PRELIMINARY TOTAL (Sum of A, B and C) (max. 100)					32
-0	-3%	-5%	-10%	13. Condition (From A, B, and C total)	-1
-0	-25%	-50%	-75%	14. Exterior Alterations (From A, B and C total excluding 2)	-4
				D. INTEGRITY	-5
ADJUSTED TOTAL (Preliminary total minus Integrity)					27

STATUS/RATING

Present Rating (Adjusted Total): A(35+) B(23-34) C(11-22) D(0-10)

Contingency Rating (Preliminary Total): A(35+) B(23-34) C(11-22) D(0-10)

City Landmark Eligibility: Eligible (Present Rating is A or B) Not eligible

Heritage Property Eligibility: Eligible (Present or Contingency A or B) Not eligible

CITY OF OAKLAND—LANDMARKS PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD
EVALUATION CRITERIA AND RATINGS
FOR LANDMARK ELIGIBILITY

GENERAL NOTE: IF A PROPERTY HAS EXPERIENCED KNOWN LOSSES OF INTEGRITY (CRITERIA GROUP D), CRITERIA GROUPS A, B AND C SHOULD NORMALLY BE APPLIED TO THE PROPERTY AS IT EXISTED BEFORE THESE LOSSES WERE SUSTAINED. CRITERIA GROUP D SHOULD THEN BE APPLIED TO THE PROPERTY.

CRITERION	RATINGS	COMMENTS AND GUIDELINES
A. ARCHITECTURE		
1. EXTERIOR/DESIGN QUALITY OF FORM, COMPOSITIONAL DETAILING, AND ORNAMENT MEASURED IN PART OR ORIGINALITY, ARTISTIC MERIT, CRAFTSMANSHIP, SENSITIVITY TO SURROUNDINGS AND OVERALL VISUAL QUALITY.	E EXCELLENT VS VERY GOOD G GOOD FP UNDISTURBED	APPLIES TO NATURAL FEATURES AS WELL AS TO MAN-MADE FEATURES. A "G" RATING IS APPROPRIATE FOR PROPERTIES WHICH HAVE ANY CLEARLY IDENTIFIABLE VISUAL OR DESIGN VALUE. AN "E" RATING IS APPROPRIATE FOR PROPERTIES WHICH BASED ON EXTERIOR VISUAL QUALITY ALONE APPEAR ELIGIBLE FOR OAKLAND LANDMARK DESIGNATIONS. IN MOST USES, THIS CRITERION WILL BE APPLICABLE ONLY TO INTERIORS WHICH ARE ACCESSIBLE TO THE PUBLIC. UNLIKE THE CASE OF EXTERIORS, THIS CRITERION SHOULD BE APPLIED TO INTERIORS AS THEY PRESENTLY EXIST, REGARDLESS OF ALTERATIONS.
2. INTERIOR DESIGN QUALITY OF INTERIOR ARRANGEMENT, FINISH, CRAFTSMANSHIP AND/OR DETAIL OR ASSOCIATION WITH A PERSON, GROUP, ORGANIZATION OR INSTITUTION USING THE	E EXCELLENT VS VERY GOOD G GOOD FP UNDISTURBED	EXAMPLES OF "ESPECIALLY FINE" CONSTRUCTION METHODS OR STRUCTURAL MATERIALS INCLUDE THOSE WHICH SUCCESSFULLY ADDRESS CHALLENGING STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS, OR WHICH ARE TREATED AS VISIBLE DESIGN ELEMENTS THAT CONTRIBUTE SIGNIFICANTLY TO THE FEATURE'S OVERALL DESIGN QUALITY, OR WHICH EXHIBIT FINE CRAFTSMANSHIP. SURFACE MATERIALS SHOULD BE TREATED UNDER THIS CRITERION ONLY ACCORDING TO THEIR TYPE AND ACCORDING TO THE LEVEL OF CRAFTSMANSHIP WHICH THEY REPRESENT. THE CONTRIBUTION OF SURFACE MATERIALS TO A FEATURE'S DESIGN QUALITY SHOULD BE TREATED IN CRITERION 3. (INTERIOR/DESIGN)
3. CONSTRUCTION SIGNIFICANCE AS EXAMPLE OF A PARTICULAR STRUCTURAL MATERIAL, SURFACE MATERIAL OR METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION.	E ESPECIALLY FINE OR VERY EARLY EXAMPLE IF FUR SURVIVE VS ESPECIALLY FINE OR VERY EARLY EXAMPLE IF MANY SURVIVE; G GOOD EXAMPLE IF FUR SURVIVE. G GOOD EXAMPLE IF MANY SURVIVE OF ANY MATERIAL OR METHOD NOT GENERALLY IN CURRENT USE (SUCH AS BRICK MASONRY OR BALLOON FRAMING) OR OF A HIGHLY DURABLE METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION (DURABLE METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION) FP NO PARTICULAR INTEREST.	EXAMPLES OF "ESPECIALLY FINE" SURFACE MATERIALS INCLUDE STONE (GRANITE, MARBLE) AND POLYMOOR TERRA COTTA. EXAMPLES OF "ESPECIALLY FINE" SURFACE MATERIALS INCLUDE STONE (GRANITE, MARBLE) AND POLYMOOR TERRA COTTA.

CRITERION	DESIGNER/BUILDER	STYLE/TYPE	RATINGS	COMMENTS AND GUIDELINES
4. DESIGNER/BUILDER DESIGNED OR BUILT BY AN ARCHITECT, ENGINEER, BUILDER, ARTIST, OR OTHER DESIGNER WHO HAS MADE A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO THE COMMUNITY, STATE, OR NATION.	E DESIGNER OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE. M DESIGNER OF SECONDARY IMPORTANCE. G DESIGNER OF TERTIARY IMPORTANCE. FP DESIGNER UNKNOWN OR OF NO PARTICULAR INTEREST.	E ESPECIALLY FINE OR VERY EARLY EXAMPLE IF FBM SURVIVE. M ESPECIALLY FINE OR VERY EARLY EXAMPLE IF FBM SURVIVE; GOOD EXAMPLE IF FBM SURVIVE. G GOOD EXAMPLE OF ANY TYPE, STYLE OR RECENT USE. FP OF NO PARTICULAR INTEREST.	NORMALLY, AN ESPECIALLY ACTIVE DESIGNER WILL BE RATED AT LEAST "G".	A "GOOD EXAMPLE" SHOULD GENERALLY EXHIBIT MOST OF THE ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TYPE, STYLE OR CONVENTION THE EXAMPLE IS INTENDED TO REPRESENT.
5. STYLE/TYPE SIGNIFICANCE AS AN EXAMPLE OF A PARTICULAR TYPE, STYLE OR CONVENTION.				
HISTORY/ASSOCIATION	6. PERSON/ORGANIZATION ASSOCIATED WITH THE LIFE OR ACTIVITIES OF A PERSON, GROUP, ORGANIZATION, OR INSTITUTION THAT HAS MADE A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO THE COMMUNITY, STATE OR NATION.	E PERSON/ORGANIZATION OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE. INTIMATELY CONNECTED WITH THE PROPERTY. M PERSON/ORGANIZATION OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE LOOSELY CONNECTED, OR PERSON/ORGANIZATION OF SECONDARY IMPORTANCE. INTIMATELY CONNECTED. G PERSON/ORGANIZATION OF SECONDARY IMPORTANCE LOOSELY CONNECTED, OR PERSON/ORGANIZATION OF TERTIARY IMPORTANCE. INTIMATELY CONNECTED. FP PERSON/ORGANIZATION OF TERTIARY IMPORTANCE LOOSELY CONNECTED OR NO CONNECTION WITH PERSON/ORGANIZATION OF IMPORTANCE.	THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PERSON, GROUP, ORGANIZATION OR INSTITUTION MUST ITSELF BE ESTABLISHED BEFORE THIS CRITERION IS APPLIED. SUCH SIGNIFICANCE MAY BE AT EITHER THE LOCAL, STATE OR NATIONAL/INTERNATIONAL LEVELS. "INTIMATELY CONNECTED" WILL OFTEN MEAN THAT THE FEATURE WAS INTIMATELY ASSOCIATED WITH AN IMPORTANT PERIOD IN THE LIFE OR ACTIVITIES OF THE PERSON, GROUP, ORGANIZATION OR INSTITUTION. A PERSON/ORGANIZATION OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE AT THE LOCAL LEVEL WILL HAVE PLAYED A DECISIVE AND FAR REACHING ROLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF OAKLAND AS A COMMUNITY (EXAMPLES: MAYOR FRANK MOTT, CENTRAL PACIFIC RAILROAD.) A PERSON/ORGANIZATION OF SECONDARY IMPORTANCE AT THE LOCAL LEVEL WILL HAVE PLAYED A MAJOR OR LEADING (BUT NOT DECISIVE) ROLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF OAKLAND AS A COMMUNITY OR A DECISIVE ROLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PARTICULAR NEIGHBORHOOD OR OF A PARTICULAR ETHNIC GROUP OR SEGMENT OF THE COMMUNITY (EXAMPLES: M.C. CARMELL, JAMES LARUE, LEW HING, HEALTY SYNDICATE). A PERSON/ORGANIZATION OF TERTIARY IMPORTANCE AT THE LOCAL LEVEL WILL HAVE PLAYED A PROMINENT ROLE (BUT NOT A REAL LEADERSHIP ROLE) IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PARTICULAR NEIGHBORHOOD OR OF A PARTICULAR ETHNIC GROUP OR SEGMENT OF THE COMMUNITY (EXAMPLES: JOHN NICHOLL, CHARLES HESSINGHAM). THE STATE AND NATIONAL/INTERNATIONAL LEVELS ARE TREATED SIMILARLY.	IF THE PROPERTY HAS BEEN SIGNIFICANTLY ALTERED SINCE THE TIME OF ITS ASSOCIATION WITH THE PERSON/ORGANIZATION AND IF SUCH ALTERATION IS NOT REFLECTED IN CRITERIA GROUP D, THEN THE PERSON/ORGANIZATION WILL BE CONSIDERED TO BE ONLY "LOOSELY CONNECTED" WITH THE PROPERTY.

CRITERION

7. EVENT ASSOCIATED WITH AN EVENT THAT HAS MADE A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO THE COMMUNITY, STATE OR NATION.

E EVENT OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE INTIMATELY CONNECTED WITH THE PROPERTY.
WG EVENT OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE LOOSELY CONNECTED, OR EVENT OF SECONDARY IMPORTANCE INTIMATELY CONNECTED.
G EVENT OF SECONDARY IMPORTANCE LOOSELY CONNECTED, OR EVENT OF TERTIARY IMPORTANCE INTIMATELY CONNECTED.
FP EVENT OF TERTIARY IMPORTANCE LOOSELY CONNECTED OR NO CONNECTIONS WITH EVENT OF IMPORTANCE.

SEE COMMENTS FOR CRITERION 6 (PERSON/ORGANIZATION).

PATTERNS AND GUIDELINES

8. PATTERNS ASSOCIATED WITH AND EFFECTIVELY ILLUSTRATIVE OF BROAD PATTERNS OF CULTURAL, SOCIAL, POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, OR INDUSTRIAL HISTORY, OR OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY, OR OF DISTINCT GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS OR ETHNIC GROUPS, OR OF A PARTICULAR WELL-DEFINED ERA.

E PATTERNS OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE INTIMATELY CONNECTED WITH THE PROPERTY.
WG PATTERNS OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE LOOSELY CONNECTED, OR PATTERNS OF SECONDARY IMPORTANCE INTIMATELY CONNECTED.
G PATTERNS OF SECONDARY IMPORTANCE LOOSELY CONNECTED, OR PATTERNS OF TERTIARY IMPORTANCE INTIMATELY CONNECTED.
FP PATTERNS OF TERTIARY IMPORTANCE LOOSELY CONNECTED OR NO CONNECTION WITH PATTERNS OF IMPORTANCE.

A HELPFUL MEASURE OF THIS CRITERION IS TO CONSIDER HOW USEFUL THE PROPERTY WOULD BE FOR THE TEACHING OF CULTURAL HISTORY.

A PROPERTY IS NORMALLY "INTIMATELY CONNECTED" WITH A PATTERN IF THE PROPERTY EXHIBITS THE ESSENCE OF THE PATTERN. A PROPERTY IS NORMALLY "LOOSELY CONNECTED" WITH A PATTERN IF THE PROPERTY ONLY EXHIBITS THE INFLUENCE OF THE PATTERN. A PATTERN WILL NORMALLY BE CONSIDERED "INTIMATELY CONNECTED" WITH THE PROPERTY IF ONLY A FEW EXAMPLES ASSOCIATED WITH THE PATTERN SURVIVE.

9. AGE COMPARATIVELY OLD IN RELATION TO DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY.

E ESTABLISHED PRIOR TO 1869.
WG ESTABLISHED BETWEEN 1869 AND APRIL 1906.
G ESTABLISHED BETWEEN MAY 1906 AND 1945.
FP ESTABLISHED SINCE 1945.

"INTIMATE" AND "LOOSE" CONNECTIONS FOR SIGNIFICANTLY ALTERED PROPERTIES ARE TREATED THE SAME WAY AS FOR CRITERION 6 (PERSON/ORGANIZATION).

SEE ALSO OTHER COMMENTS FOR CRITERION 6 (PERSON/ORGANIZATION).

THE WESTERN TERMINUS OF THE TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILROAD WAS COMPLETED IN OAKLAND IN 1869, INAUGURATING AN IMPORTANT PERIOD OF RAPID URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

THE 1906 EARTHQUAKE HELPED STIMULATE ANOTHER IMPORTANT PERIOD OF RAPID DEVELOPMENT IN OAKLAND.

AT THE END OF WORLD WAR II, URBAN DEVELOPMENT BEGAN TO SHIFT FROM CENTRAL CITIES LIKE OAKLAND TO THE SUBURBS.

IF THE PROPERTY HAS BEEN SIGNIFICANTLY ALTERED SINCE THE TIME OF ITS ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION OR ESTABLISHMENT, USE THE ORIGINAL DATE IF THE NATURE OF THE ORIGINAL DESIGN IS STILL RECOGNIZABLE (E.G. ROOF SHAPE OR AT LEAST SOME ELEMENTS OF THE ORIGINAL FACADE COMPOSITION); USE THE DATE OF THE ALTERATION IF THE NATURE OF THE ORIGINAL DESIGN IS NOT RECOGNIZABLE.

CRITERION

RATINGS

COMMENTS AND GUIDELINES

18. SITE RELATION OF FEATURE TO ITS ORIGINAL SITE AND NEIGHBORHOOD.

- E HAS NOT BEEN MOVED.
- G HAS BEEN MOVED WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF ITS ORIGINAL SITE.
- F HAS BEEN RELOCATED TO A NEW SITE IN THE SAME NEIGHBORHOOD AS THE ORIGINAL SITE.
- P HAS BEEN RELOCATED TO A NEW SITE IN A DIFFERENT NEIGHBORHOOD.

*"ORIGINAL SITE" MEANS THE SITE OCCUPIED BY THE FEATURE AT THE TIME THE FEATURE ACHIEVED SIGNIFICANCE, WHICH IN SOME CASES MAY HAVE BEEN AFTER THE FEATURE WAS CONSTRUCTED OR ESTABLISHED.

C. CONTEXT

11. CONTINUITY CONTRIBUTES TO THE VISUAL, HISTORIC OR OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONTINUITY OR CHARACTER OF THE STREET OR AREA.

- E HELPS ESTABLISH THE CHARACTER OF AN AREA OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE OR CONSTITUTES A DISTRICT.
- MG MAINTAINS THE CHARACTER OF AN AREA OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE OR HELPS ESTABLISH THE CHARACTER OF AN AREA OF SECONDARY IMPORTANCE OR CONSTITUTES A FEATURE GROUP.
- G COMPATIBLE WITH THE CHARACTER OF AN AREA OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE OR MAINTAINS THE CHARACTER OF AN AREA OF SECONDARY IMPORTANCE.
- FP INCOMPATIBLE WITH AN AREA OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE OR NOT LOCATED IN AN AREA OF PRIMARY OR SECONDARY IMPORTANCE.

"AREA OF PRIMARY OR SECONDARY IMPORTANCE" GENERALLY MEANS A DISTRICT, GROUP OF PROPERTIES, OR OTHER AREA NOTABLE ENOUGH TO WARRANT SPECIAL RECOGNITION, SUCH AS INCLUSION IN THE CITY'S S-J PRESERVATION COMBINING ZONE. AREAS OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE ARE LIMITED TO POTENTIAL NATIONAL REGISTER DISTRICTS.

IF THE FEATURE HAS BEEN REMOVED (I.E., GIVEN A "P" RATING UNDER CRITERION 1A), AND THE PROPERTY HAS THEREFORE BECOME ONLY A "SITE", CONTINUITY SHOULD BE EVALUATED BY IMAGINING THE FEATURE RE-STORED TO ITS SITE, BUT IN THE EXISTING SURROUNDINGS.

12. FAMILIARITY PROMINENCE OR FAMILIARITY WITHIN THE NEIGHBORHOOD, CITY OR REGION.

- E A FEATURE WHICH MAY BE TAKEN AS SYMBOL FOR THE CITY OR REGION AS A WHOLE.
- MG A CONSPICUOUS AND FAMILIAR FEATURE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CITY OR REGION.
- G A CONSPICUOUS AND FAMILIAR FEATURE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.
- FP NOT PARTICULARLY CONSPICUOUS OR FAMILIAR.

A HELPFUL MEASURE OF THIS CRITERION IS TO CONSIDER WHETHER A TYPICAL RESIDENT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD, CITY OR REGION WOULD NOTICE THE FEATURE AND REMEMBER IT.

IF THE FEATURE HAS BEEN REMOVED, THIS CRITERION SHOULD BE EVALUATED BY CONSIDERING THE FEATURE'S ROLE (IF ANY) AS A "LANDMARK" PRIOR TO ITS REMOVAL.

D. INTEGRITY

13. CONDITION EXTENT TO WHICH THE FEATURE HAS EXPERIENCED DETERIORATION.

- E NO APPARENT SURFACE WEAR OR STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS.
- G EXHIBITS ONLY MINOR SURFACE WEAR.
- F EXHIBITS CONSIDERABLE SURFACE WEAR OR SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS.
- P EXHIBITS CONSIDERABLE SURFACE WEAR AND SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS.

"MINOR SURFACE WEAR" GENERALLY MEANS THAT NO REPLACEMENT OF DESIGN ELEMENTS DUE TO DETERIORATION IS REQUIRED.

"CONSIDERABLE SURFACE WEAR" GENERALLY MEANS THAT SOME DESIGN ELEMENTS HAVE DETERIORATED TO SUCH AN EXTENT THAT THEY MUST BE REPLACED.

"SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS" WILL GENERALLY BE ASSOCIATED WITH SAGGING FLOOR LINES, OUT-OF-PLUMB WALLS AND FINE DRIBBLE.

CRITERION	RATINGS	COMMENTS AND GUIDELINES
M. EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS DEGREE OF ALTERATION TO IMPORTANT EXTERIOR MATERIALS AND DESIGN FEATURES.	E NO CHANGES OR VERY MINOR ALTERATIONS WHICH DO NOT CHANGE THE OVERALL CHARACTER. G MINOR CHANGES TO OVERALL CHARACTER. F MAJOR CHANGES TO OVERALL CHARACTER. P FEATURE HAS BEEN REMOVED OR DEMOLISHED.	

F- TEWLURTE.CB
AUGUST 6, 1987