Appendix D:

Historic Resources Technical Report

CAREY & CO. INC.
ARCHITECTURE

California Nursery Master Plan

Fremont, California

Draft Historic Resources Technical Report

April 24, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Purpose

II. Methodology

III. Summary of Findings

IV. Historic Resources in the Project Area

V. Regulatory Framework

VI. Proposed Project

VII. Project Evaluation

VIII. References

I. PURPOSE

Lamphier-Gregory has requested Carey & Co.'s assistance in evaluating the Draft Master Plan for the California Nursery in Fremont, California. The 20.1 acre site is what remains of a historic nursery established here in 1884 and now owned by the City of Fremont. Of the several structures on the site, one, the Vallejo Adobe, is already listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and several more have been evaluated as eligible for the National and California Registers as contributors to a historic District, under Criteria A/1, B/2, and D/4.[1] This Technical Report focuses on the buildings and structures; a separate Report focuses on the landscape.

This Technical Report provides Lamphier-Gregory with descriptions and evaluations of the historic buildings and structures within the Draft Master Plan area, as well as any impacts and mitigation measures pertaining to the Draft Master Plan's potential effects on those resources.

Proposed Project

The Draft Master Plan outlines two schemes for the site. Both schemes would retain all historic buildings and structures except for one, the Garden Store. The condition of the store is such that the cost of

[1] Ward Hill, Woodruff Minor, and Michael Corbett, California Department of Parks and Recreation, Building, Structure and Object Record, December 2001.

rehabilitating it would likely far exceed the cost of building a new building; therefore the Garden Store would be demolished and a replacement building constructed. All of the other buildings would be retained, rehabilitated and adapted for new uses. The two schemes differ somewhat in the uses proposed for these buildings, and the number and size of the proposed new buildings. The two schemes will be described in greater detail, and evaluated per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, in a later section of this report.

II. METHODOLOGY

Carey & Co. was involved in the preparation of the Draft Master Plan. In the process of contributing to that effort, Carey & Co. made several visits to the site and physically surveyed all of the buildings and structures. Carey & Co. also reviewed previous documents relating to the property, and conducted archival research on the California Nursery.

III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Master Plan area includes five primary historic structures, three ancillary historic structures, and two structures that postdate the period of significance and are therefore non-contributing. The Period of Significance has also been reevaluated, and extends from 1884 to 1968, when the Roeding family sold the Nursery. A discussion of the Period of Significance appears later in this report. The contributing buildings, along with associated landscape features, form a historic district.

The project has minor impacts to the historic district, primarily through the demolition of one of the contributing buildings, the Garden Store. The rehabilitation of the other buildings, following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, could be considered a partial mitigation for this impact. The new buildings would be carefully situated and designed to be compatible with the remaining historic buildings, and the site as a whole.

IV. HISTORIC RESOURCES IN THE PROJECT AREA

Below is a listing of all buildings constructed within the period of significance:
Primary Historic Structures

- Garden Store
- Office Building
- President's House
- Packing Shed
- Adobe

Secondary or Ancillary Structures

- Changing Room
- Tank House Support Structure
- Windmill

The following structures post-date the period of significance, and therefore are not considered contributing to the historic district.

- ROP Building
- Public Restroom and Storage Building

CA Nursery Context

The following context statement for the California Nursery is taken from the DPR form prepared by Ward Hill, Woodruff Minor, and Michael Corbett, and completed in December 2001. A separate Technical Report Prepared by William Self Associates, Inc. contains a detailed context statement pertaining to the site's prehistory and pre-Nursery occupations.

> "John Rock (1836-1904) immigrated to the United States from Germany in 1852, finding work in New York as a nurseryman. In 1863, after serving in the Union Army, he came to California and settled in Santa Clara County. He established his first nursery in San Jose in 1865, opening a larger nursery near Milpitas in 1879. Rock garnered a statewide reputation selling a wide variety of fruit and ornamental trees. As horticulture spread throughout California in the 1880s, rock quickly outgrew his property in Santa Clara County. In partnership with nurseryman Richard D. Fox – nephew and heir of pioneer Santa Clara County Horticulturist B.S. Fox – Rock moved his operations to the much larger site near Niles in 1884 (though he always cited 1865 as the founding date of the new nursery).
>
> "The California Nursery Company, as the new facility was called, 'became a great experimental farm, where all varieties of plants, secured from various countries, were tested and those suited to the climate and soil conditions of California were distributed throughout the state" (Duval). Rock's 1888 catalogue listed 700 types of ornamental plants, 500 varieties of fruit trees, and 273 varieties of roses. At the 1893 Columbian Exposition, the nursery took a first prize for its exhibit of roses; the same year, the nursery donated 600 deciduous trees and shrubs to Golden Gate Park. In 1898, the *Washington Press* commented on the nursery's "immense variety of trees, plants, shrubs, flowers, etc., that can be grown in the climate of California. There is a greater variety of these under cultivation…than at any other [nursery] in the United States." They included "all northern deciduous fruits as well as those grown in semitropical climates [including] oranges, lemons, limes, figs, etc., and over fifty varieties of olives, imported at great expense from France, Spain, and Italy." The nursery set aside 18 acres for the cultivation of over 400 varieties of roses; 10 acres for experimental purposes, such as growing new varieties of fruit; and 10 acres for ornamental and decorative plants and trees, such as magnolias and palms, "specimens of which can be furnished from one to ten feet in height." The nursery's work force in 1898 consisted of 100 to 220 employees (and 32 horses) during busy seasons. Most of the employees resided in Niles, Decoto, and Centerville; around 12 families lived on the premises.
>
> "On August 17, 1899, John rock sold the California Nursery to William J. Landers, who paid $51,534 for the 463-acre property. Rock continued to serve as the nursery's manager until shortly before his death in August 1904. Landers then took on William V. Eberly as his manager (when the Western Pacific Railroad laid its tracks through the nursery in 1910, a stop called "Eberly" was established on the grounds). Among the nursery's large commissions during these years was supplying the palm trees for the "Avenue of Palms" at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco, which opened in 1915 (the California Nursery celebrated its fiftieth anniversary at the fair, based on John rock's founding date of 1865). In 1917, the landers consortium sold the nursery to the George C. Roeding Company.
>
> "Based in Fresno, the Roeding Company was a prominent nursery business that operated the Fancher Creek Nurseries and Fresno Nursery in that city with sales outlets in Modesto and Sacramento. Fancher Creek Nurseries was founded in 1883 by Frederick Roeding, a German immigrant who came

to California during the Gold Rush (Roeding Park in Fresno was developed on a portion of the nursery). Frederick's son, George Christian Roeding Sr. (1868-1928), began working at Fancher Creek Nurseries at the age of 17. In 1905, he organized the Roeding Fig and Olive Company, and in 1916 acquired the Fresno Nursery Company. The George C. Roeding Company, which oversaw these enterprises, became the largest nursery business in the state, supplying millions of fruit trees for farms and ornamentals for landscaping. George Roeding experimented with the development of grapes, figs, olives, persimmons, citrus, nectarines, and walnuts, and he wrote *The Fruit Grower's Guide* (1919), a standard reference book for farmers of the era. He served as a state agricultural commissioner for most major expositions in the United States prior to World War I, and as the first president of the California Association of Nurserymen. Following his death, the Association memorialized him in a book entitled *George Christian Roeding: The Story of California's Leading Nurseryman and Fruit Grower* (1930).

"When George C. Roeding Sr. acquired the California Nursery Company in 1917, he adopted this corporate name as an umbrella for his various businesses, and the California Nursery became the headquarters of a regional chain of wholesale nurseries in Northern and Central California specializing in fruit and ornamental trees. His son, George Jr., became manager of the California Nursery in 1926, assuming ownership in 1928 after his father's death. Born in 1901, George C. Roeding Jr. settled in Niles where he and his family became active in community affairs. In the early 1930s, at the outset of the depression, he shifted the emphasis of the nursery to the retail production of bulbs and roses. Retail outlets were opened in Walnut Creek, Menlo Park, and Sacramento. A mail-order service and a landscaping department augmented the business. The nursery supplied all the plant materials for the 1939-40 Golden Gate International Exposition on Treasure Island, and it enjoyed continued prosperity through the 1940s with wartime demand for fruit trees in home orchards and wartime contracts for landscaping military bases, factories, and housing projects. In 1950, the nursery had 50,000 retail customers and 150 employees with an annual payroll of $250,000. Declining business in the 1950s and 1960s – due in part to competition from nurseries established after the war to meet the demand for garden supply and landscaping services – ended with bankruptcy proceedings in 1968.

"Under the ownership of the Roeding family, the California Nursery lost most of its acreage to development. Around 1900, County Road No. 2735 (present-day Niles Boulevard) was cut through a portion of the property, isolating a narrow triangle of land between the road and the Central/Southern Pacific Railroad tracks. Beginning around 1918, this tract was subdivided for residential and industrial development. In 1923, Kraftile acquired a large parcel at the western end of the tract, adjoined on the east several years later by Adobe Acres, a residential subdivision developed by the Roedings. By 1930, additional subdivision activity of the west had reduced the nursery grounds to about 227 acres. Postwar residential developments such as Hacienda Gardens, and gravel quarrying at the southern edge of the property, further reduced the grounds. By the late 1960s, the California Nursery had lost about 86 percent of its acreage, the original 463 acres having been reduced to 63 acres. (The water-filled quarries now form part of the Alameda Creek Quarries Regional Recreation Area, under the management of the East Bay Regional park District.)

"After the Roedings closed the nursery in 1968, ownership passed to the Lowell Berry Foundation, The Roeding family was allowed to operate the nursery until 1972. A citizen's group called Committee to Conserve Adobe and Nursery (CAN), advocated preservation of the site; at the same

time, a developer acquired an option to purchase the property. The conflict ended with most of the nursery site approved for development as the Rancho Arroyo subdivision.

"The remnant of the nursery –20.1 acres fronting on Niles Boulevard, including the Vallejo Adobe and other buildings – comprises around 4 percent of the original property. It was acquired by the City of Fremont in 1972 and designated as the California Nursery Company Historic Park. The City leas[ed] the grounds to the Mission Adobe Nursery (retail) and Naka Nursery (wholesale). The Vallejo Adobe is operated as a rental facility for weddings and other events."

Period of Significance

The period of significance begins in 1884, when John Rock began the nursery at this location.[2] The period of significance ends when the Roeding family sold the property in 1968.[3] Since 1968 is 47 years from the present, with this period of significance the property will become eligible for the National Register in 2018.

This period of significance captures both the period of site acquisition and expansion, as well as the period of contraction. This allows the current site, which is much smaller than it was at one time, to retain sufficient integrity for eligibility.

Existing Buildings on the Project Site

Garden Store
Constructed 1931, expanded 1946. Modern Ranch Style, attributed to Frederick H. Reimers (1889-1961)

The one-story wood-frame building has two shed roofed sections linked by a covered breezeway (figures 1 and 2). Walls are clad in board and batten. The building is long and narrow, running in the north-south direction. The building has a deep, covered area on its west (front side). This covered area is formed by corrugated plastic roofing, sloping in the direction opposite the building roof, and supported at its west end by barked logs and beams. Concrete pavers form the floor of this area as well as the central breezeway. The building roof also extends out over the east side of the building. The wood ceiling opens here to create areas of corrugated-plastic-clad skylight; and a wall with large openings forms the eastern boundary of the space, supporting the roof.

The square footage of the larger, northern portion of the building is 1,752 square feet, while the smaller, southern portion encloses 716 square feet. This does not include the roof overhang or breezeway.

---

[2] Although the Adobe was constructed prior to 1884, it is already individually listed on the National Register for a different context, beginning with its own c. 1842 date of construction. As a contributor of the California Nursery Historic District, and as an expression of the Nursery context, it would share the same period of significance as the Nursery as a whole, i.e. 1884-1968.
[3] The DPR form suggests an end date of 1952, but does not provide an argument supporting that end date. Since the form was completed at the end of 2001, it is likely that the authors selected an end date that was 50 years prior to the date of their evaluation. (Hill, Minor and Corbett, 12/2001)

Figures 1 and 2: The Garden Store, exterior and interior.

Condition
The Garden Store is in poor condition. The barked columns are termite infested, and some have completely lost their connection to the ground for this reason. Wooden elements supporting the roof are also generally in poor condition, with rotting ends often pulling away from each other. The building is enclosed in chain-link fencing as a precaution to keep the public away. While imminent collapse is not anticipated, it is not out of the questions, so the fenced enclosure seems prudent until corrective actions can be taken.

Integrity
The Garden Store generally retains its original character from the front, but there have been several additions and alternations. Architectural Historian Michael Corbett prepared a DPR form for the building in 2013, which includes a detailed evaluation of integrity. He found the building to have sufficient character to remain a district contributor. We have summarized his evaluation here.

Constructed in 1931, the rear loggia was rebuilt in 1948, still within the period of significance, but then removed after 1973. Work documented as being performed in 1973 include the installation of new hanging light fixtures in both buildings, the construction of the breezeway, and the "repair and replace[ment of] wall and roof materials as necessary, workmanship and materials to match existing…new adobe color slabs throughout…[and] new mudsills."[4] Also in 1973, a new structure, called the Lanai, was constructed behind the building. It consisted of a pergola and octagonal structure; the octagonal structure does not survive.

Since 1973, the rear loggia was removed, and the space at the east side behind the sales room enclosed beneath a new roof. The space once occupied by the loggia behind the breezeway, office and restroom is occupied by a covered porch. Also since 1973, the open areas of the slab at the breezeway and loggia were covered in black tile pavers, and three ornamental garden structures built – a fountain at the center of the breezeway, a smaller fountain, and a gazebo.[5]

Despite these alterations, Corbett finds the structure to retain integrity, stating that it maintains integrity across all seven aspects, including location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. While we believe that integrity of design, materials and feeling is somewhat compromised

[4] Michael Corbett, Garden Store DPR, 2013; quoting from Triangle Associates, 1970.
[5] Corbett, Garden Store DPR, 2013

because of the changes described above, we agree that the building retains sufficient integrity to be a district contributor.

Office Building
The Office Building was constructed c. 1907, with alterations c. 1940 by Oakland architect Edward T. Foulkes. The building originally housed the California Nursery office. The Interior was remodeled in 1987 and 2014 (figures 7 and 8).

Figures 3 and 4. Nursery Office, front and rear elevations.

Originally, the building featured a standing seam metal roof and an open-arched veranda at its front.[6] In 1940, the building was remodeled by Edward Foulkes. At this time, the arches were enclosed to create more interior space. The exterior of the building was also restyled – the roof was reclad with terra cotta tiles, and the walls received a veneer of rough stucco, creating a Spanish Colonial Revival appearance.[7]

Description
The building is a one story nearly-square footprint building with a side-gable roof. It is of reinforced concrete construction with concrete foundations (figures 3 and 4). The square footprint is broken at the rear by a small, non-original, central projection which currently contains toilet rooms. The building features five glazed arches on its primary, north-facing façade, stucco cladding and a clay tile roof.

This building encloses 1,972 square feet.

Condition: The building appears to be in good condition.

[6] This original building has been ascribed to Bernard Maybeck, although this has not been substantiated by documentary evidence.
[7] Woodruff Minor, DPR from, June 2002, page 3

Integrity
While the building was heavily altered in 1940, this was done within the period of significance. And although the interior was remodeled recently, the building's exterior appearance is more significant for achieving district contributor status.

President's House (1907).
This Craftsman-style bungalow was built as a summer residence for the president of the board of directors, William Landers. George "Sandy" Roeding lived in this house with his family in the early 1960s.[8]

Figures 5 and 6: the President's House

Description:
The President's house is rectangular with a front gable, low pitched roof (figures 5 and 6). The asphalt shingle-clad roof, with typical craftsman-style knee braces beneath its wide eaves, also has a central, low-pitched shed-roofed dormer. The wood-framed house is clad with horizontal wood cladding. The eastern, front elevation features a wide front porch, currently enclosed with corrugated plastic. North of this porch, brick stairs lead to the entry door. Windows are currently boarded over. The rear features two shed-roofed additions. Plumbing, potentially indicating bathroom locations, was observed in three locations. The interior has been vandalized, but retains early 20th century kitchen casework (fugure 7), and a brick fireplace. Notably, the interior is entirely clad in "Beaver Board" (figure 8). Beaver Board was a fiberboard material, made with compressed wood fibers or pulp. It began production in 1906, so was a very new material at the time the house was built.

[8] Like the Office Building, this modest Craftsman bungalow has been ascribed to Bernard Maybeck. This is not supported by documentary evidence, and seems stylistically unlikely.

Figures 7 and 8. Kitchen casework, and Beaver Board.

Condition:
The building is in fair condition. The exterior wood cladding typically is in contact with the ground, which can encourage termite infestation and wood rot. Termite damage was, in fact, identified in several locations at the building. We also noted some missing knee braces, and a missing roof rafter over the porch. Most windows are covered over on both the exterior and the interior, so were not available for evaluation. A few were visible on the interior; the wood elements appeared sound, but most of the glass has been broken.

Integrity:
The President's House retains a very high level of integrity.

Packing Shed (c. 1910)
Description
"This gabled wood-frame structure is composed of two sections: a higher section at the buildings west end, and a long low section to the east (figures 9 and 10). The higher section, with partial upper floor, is open at the front where the roof extends forward in cantilevered fashion. Wall cladding consists of vertical wood siding and corrugated metal. The low section is sheathed on the front with wood siding (vertical and horizontal) and at the side and rear with corrugated metal; doors and windows have been cut into the walls. Both sections have corrugated metal roofs. There are shed additions at both ends of the building." (Minor, page 3) The building has an earthen floor, and a truss-supported roof (figures 17 and 18)

Figures 9 and 10: The Packing Shed, south and north sides.

Condition:
The building displays termite damage and wood rot. The roof sags in several areas, and the walls deviate from vertical in some locations, perhaps because the building lacks a proper foundation. The corrugated metal roofing is rusted. At the west end, portions of the roof are missing.

An open wood shed stands a few feet to the east of the main packing shed. This ancillary building is in extremely poor condition, and may be a hazard.

Integrity:
While the building's condition is poor, its integrity is high, as few apparent alterations have been made since the period of significance ended.

Vallejo Adobe 1842 or 1843

Figure 11: The Vallejo Adobe

Jose de Jesus Vallejo (1797-1882), formerly the administrator of the old Mission San Jose, was granted the 17,205 acre rancho in August, 1842, and was required to build a house and inhabit it within one year. When John Rock attained the property in 1884, the adobe was likely used as a squatter's residence. From 1884 until around 1930, the building was used primarily as a storehouse. In 1931, under George C. Roeding, Jr., the adobe was rebuilt for use as a reception room, guest cottage and logo for the California Nursery. Frederick Reimers, who also designed the Garden Store, was the architect for the reconstruction. Since the site's acquisition by the City of Fremont in the early 1970s, the Adobe has served as a venue for weddings and public events. [9]

Description: The adobe is a one-story rectangular-plan building with a gabled, clay tile roof (figure 11). The building is approximately 25 feet wide by 44 feet long, with walls that are nearly three feet thick. These uneven adobe walls are plastered and painted white. Multi light wood sash windows are located on the north, south and west walls. Plank doors with iron hinges are located on the south and west walls.

Condition: The adobe is in excellent condition. Some minor spalls and cracks were noticed on the exterior.

Integrity: The Vallejo Adobe was extensively altered in a major reconstruction in 1931, and rehabilitated in 1999-2000. With the exception of the four adobe walls (which have been patched in places) and two roof beams, the structure has been totally rebuilt. It originally had one door, no windows, and a dirt floor. New construction includes the buttresses on the south wall; most of the roof framing and all of the roof tiling; the chimney; the south doorway, both wood doors, and all four windows; adobe infill and exterior plaster; and all interior work. The setting has been altered by the addition of a parking lot with planting strips (probably dating from the 1930s) and a modern restroom building with white-painted stucco walls and red-tile gable roof resembling the adobe.[10]

However the building has been listed individually on the National Register of Historic Places since 1971.

Secondary Historic Structures

Changing Room (C. 1907)
Description: This small rectangular building, set behind the Office, has stucco cladding and a standing seam metal roof. It has an earthen floor, and no apparent foundation. It has wood double hung windows and a wood door. The interior is clad with bead board (figures 12 and 13).

---

[9] Ward Hill, Woodruff Minor and Michael Corbett, Vallejo Adobe, Building Structure and Object Record, December 2001.
[10] Ward Hill, et. Al., Vallejo Adobe, 2001.

Figures 12 and 13: Changing Room, exterior and interior views.

Condition
The lack of foundation has caused the mud sill to deteriorate. The wood to earth contact has also resulted in termite damage.

Integrity
This small structure reveals very few apparent changes, and therefore maintains a high level or integrity.

Windmill
Description: This small wood-framed structure is hexagonal in plan, with battered wood board and batten walls and a wood shingle roof. Windmill blades attach to one side, and a wood door accesses the interior, which is used for storage (figure 14).

Figure 14: Windmill

Condition: Minor rot was observed at the rear of the structure

Integrity: While this small structure post-dates the period of significance, it replaces in kind a similar structure from the Nursery period. Therefore, the Windmill is a district contributor.

Water Tank Remnant (C. 1890)
Description: 13 wood posts, 12" X 12", are arranged in a rectangular grid (figure 15). Diagonal braces and horizontal beams tie the posts together and support a wooden platform which once held a water tank. The entire structure is overgrown by a climbing rose bush.

Figure 15: Water tank support structure (beneath vines)

Condition: One of the posts has become loose at the top and is leaning precariously

Integrity: While the tank itself is missing, the structure retains sufficient integrity as a feature to be considered a district contributor.

Non-Contributing Buildings and Structures

ROP Building, c.1970
This is a rectangular-footprint, one story gable roofed structure (figure 16). The walls are clad with T-111 plywood, and the roof with vinyl shingles. There is only one window – a small aluminum slider window on the north elevation. Instead, overhead garage doors open at the center of each of the long elevations. In addition, both long elevations feature sliding, barn-type doors. Natural light enters the building through skylights.. While not historic, this building is not offensive, is in reasonable condition, and is potentially useful for a number of activities.

Figure 16: The ROP Building

Public Restroom and Storage Building, c. 1970
The existing public restroom building is located near the adobe, and constructed in a style to blend with that structure. Its rectangular walls are stuccoed and painted white, and it has a clay tile gabled roof (figure 17). Wood plank doors, and multi-lite wood windows further the comparison. The building contains a men's and women's restroom, as well as a storage/maintenance room at the western end.

Figure 17: the Public Restroom and Storage Building.

V. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The regulatory background provided below offers an overview of federal, state and local criteria used to assess historic significance. As mentioned above, there is only one additional building within the immediate vicinity of the project site that may satisfy the criteria for historic significance at the local level, but not at the state or national levels.

Federal Criteria
National Register Bulletin Number 15, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, describes the Criteria for Evaluation as being composed of two factors. First, the property must be "associated with an important historic context."[11] The National Register identifies four possible context types, of which at least one must be applicable at the national, state, or local level. As listed under Section 8, "Statement of Significance," of the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, these are:

A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

[11] National Park Service, National Register Bulletin 15, 3.

C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history.[12]

Second, for a property to qualify under the National Register's Criteria for Evaluation, it must also retain "historic integrity of those features necessary to convey its significance."[13] While a property's significance relates to its role within a specific historic context, its integrity refers to "a property's physical features and how they relate to its significance."[14] To determine if a property retains the physical characteristics corresponding to its historic context, the National Register has identified seven aspects of integrity:

> Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred…
>
> Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property…
>
> Setting is the physical environment of a historic property…
>
> Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property…
>
> Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory…
> Feeling is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time…
>
> Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.[15]

Since integrity is based on a property's significance within a specific historic context, an evaluation of a property's integrity can only occur after historic significance has been established.[16]

State Criteria

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

---

[12] National Park Service, National Register Bulletin 16A, 75
[13] National Park Service, National Register Bulletin 15, 3.
[14] Ibid, 44.
[15] Ibid, 44-45.
[16] Ibid, 45.

1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States; or

2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history; or

3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values; or

4. It has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.[17]

Like the NRHP, evaluation for eligibility to the California Register requires an establishment of historic significance before integrity is considered. California's integrity threshold is slightly lower than the federal level. As a result, some resources that are historically significant but do not meet NRHP integrity standards may be eligible for listing on the California Register.[18]

California's list of special considerations is shorter and more lenient than the NRHP. It includes some allowances for moved buildings, structures, or objects, as well as lower requirements for proving the significance of resources that are less than 50 years old and a more elaborate discussion of the eligibility of reconstructed buildings.[19]

In addition to separate evaluations for eligibility to the California Register, the state will automatically list resources if they are listed or determined eligible for the NRHP through a complete evaluation process.[20]

California Historical Resource Status Codes

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

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

---

[17] California Office of Historic Preservation, Technical Assistance Series 6, 1.
[18] Ibid, 1.
[19] Ibid, 2.
[20] All State Historical Landmarks from number 770 onward are also automatically listed on the California Register. (California Office of Historic Preservation, Technical Assistance Series 5, 1.)

City of Fremont Criteria
The City of Fremont maintains a Fremont register of historic resources. This register consists of (2) those historic resources which were listed in Appendix 1 to the general plan on January 1, 2007; and (B) those additional historic resources designated for listing by resolution of the city council…

The criteria for listing a resource onto the Fremont Register are similar to those used for the National and State Registers. In addition, Fremont has added Criterion E "its unique location of singular physical characteristic(s) represents an established and familiar visual feature or landmark of a neighborhood, settlement or district, or the city.[21]

Historic Resource Evaluation
The following buildings or structures appear to be District Contributors for both the California Register of Historical Resources, and the National Register of Historic Places:
Primary Historic Structures

- Garden Store
- Office Building
- President's House
- Packing Shed
- Adobe (already individually listed on the National Register)

Secondary or Ancillary Structures

- Changing Room
- Tank House Support Structure
- Windmill

The District formed appears to qualify for both Historic Registers under Criterion A/1, Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. The property is the last remnant of the once-extensive and famous horticultural economy in Washington Township. It also was one of the first experimental farms in the state, developing new varieties of fruits and nuts for California's nascent horticultural and agricultural industry. It is also significantly associated with the evolution of the nursery industry on a statewide level.

The site is likely also eligible for both registers under criterion B/2, for its association with significant individuals, in this case John Rock and George C. Roeding, who were considered the leading nurserymen of their generation in California. Finally, under Criterion C3, the property includes many noteworthy landscape features, including many mature specimens of trees.

VI. PROPOSED PROJECT

The Draft Master Plan outlines two schemes for the site. Both schemes would retain all historic buildings and structures except for the Garden Store. The condition of the store is such that the cost of rehabilitating it would likely exceed the cost of building a new building; therefore the Garden Store would be demolished and a replacement building would be constructed. All of the other buildings would

[21] Fremont Municipal Code Section 18.175.

be retained, rehabilitated and adapted for new uses. The two schemes differ somewhat in the uses proposed for these buildings. The second scheme also proposes more new buildings.

Historic and Proposed Buildings and Structures: Option 1

The following table shows the disposition of all of the existing buildings and structures in Option 1:

Resource	Contributing?	Use	Treatment
Garden Store	Yes	N/A	Demolition
Office Building	Yes	Museum	Rehabilitation
President's House	Yes	Office	Rehabilitation
Packing Shed	Yes	Museum/Classroom	Rehabilitation
Adobe	Yes	Museum/Events	Preservation
Changing Room	Yes	Storage/Display	Rehabilitation
Tank Supports	Yes	Interpretive Object	Restoration
High Water Tower	Yes	Interpretive Object	Reconstruction
Windmill	Yes	Storage	Preservation
ROP Building	No		
Restroom	No	Restroom/Storage	Preservation

Option 1 also proposed the following new buildings:

1. Visitor's Center/Retail Shop: an 1800 square foot building at the present location of the Garden Store.
2. Café: A new café in a reconstruction of the earlier Octagonal Building, near the Visitor's Center.
3. Multipurpose/Classroom Building: This would be located between the President's House and the Adobe.
4. Roofed Vehicle Display Building – South of the Packing Shed.

Historic and Proposed Buildings and Structures: Option 2

The following table shows the disposition of all of the buildings and structures in Option 2:

Resource	Contributing?	Use	Treatment
Garden Store	Yes	N/A	Demolition
Office Building	Yes	Events	Rehabilitation
President's House	Yes	Events	Rehabilitation
Packing Shed	Yes	Events	Rehabilitation
Adobe	Yes	Events	Preservation
Changing Room	Yes	Storage/Display	Rehabilitation
Tank Supports	Yes	Interpretive Object	Restoration
High Water Tower	Yes	Office for Park Manager	Reconstruction/ Addition (enclosure)
Windmill	Yes	Storage	Preservation
ROP Building	No		
Restroom	No	Restroom/Storage	Preservation

Option 2 also proposed the following new buildings:

1. A 9,000 square foot state-of-the-art history museum at park entrance
2. A Café located near the site of the existing Garden Store
3. A Multipurpose/Classroom building: 2,400 square feet

VII PROJECT EVALUATION

Historical resources include properties eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or a local register of historical resources (as defined at Public Resources Code §5020.1(k)). According to Public Resources Code §15064.5(b), a project would have a significant effect on an historic resource if it would "cause a substantial adverse change in the significance" of that resource. Specifically, "[s]ubstantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired."

The proposed project entails demolition of a contributing building, the rehabilitation, preservation, restoration or reconstruction of the remainder of contributing building, and the construction of three or four new buildings. While the demolition of a district contributor would, according to the definition above, result in an adverse effect, its loss would not compromise the district overall.

Since neither the work proposed for the remainder of the historic resources, nor the proposed new buildings, have yet been designed, they cannot be fully evaluated at this time. In general, however, the proposed locations and scales of these new structures appear to be compatible with the scale and feeling of the site as a whole. In addition, the uses and treatments proposed for the existing buildings appear to be compatible.

Impacts

Because the project is not yet fully formed, the only identifiable impact is the demolition of the Garden Store. Other potential impacts could arise if the remaining historic buildings are not rehabilitated following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, or if the proposed new buildings are not designed in a compatible manner so as to be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Mitigations

The following mitigations are proposed:

Mitigation 1: Document the Garden Store prior to its demolition.

The project sponsor shall conduct Level II HABS documentation of the Garden Store prior to demolition. Level II documentation consists of select existing drawings, photographs with large-format negatives, and a written history and description. The documentation shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian or historical architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. Following review and approval by the City of Fremont, the documentation shall be offered to the following repositories: Fremont Branch, Alameda County Library and the

Washington Township Museum of Local History or its founding organizations: Mission Peak Heritage Foundation and Washington Township Historical Society.

Mitigation 2: Create an interpretive program about the history of the California Nursery.
The project sponsor shall create an interpretive program that shall include interpretive signage or display at the location of the Garden Store, including a historic photograph of the Garden Store and data about its history and use. Interpretive displays or other exhibits at other locations shall be incorporated into the Master Plan.

Mitigation 3: Retain the existing buildings in their current locations and rehabilitate them in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.
The existing buildings shall be retained in their current locations and follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the appropriate proposed Treatment: Rehabilitation, Preservation, Restoration or Reconstruction. An historical architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards shall prepare the treatment plans and follow the recommendations presented in the Building Existing Conditions report (October 14, 2014) prepared by Carey & Co., Inc. for the California Nursery Master Plan.

Mitigation 4: Design the new buildings to be compatible with the historic district.
The new buildings shall be designed by an architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards to be compatible with the remaining contributing buildings that comprise the district by following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

VIII. REFERENCES

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

California Office of Historic Preservation, *California Register of Historical Resources: The Listing Process*, Technical Assistance Series 5, Sacramento, CA: California Department of Parks and Recreation, n.d.

City of Fremont
2014 Request for Proposals for: RFP#14-008, Master Plan for California Nursery Historical Park. January 16, 2014.

Corbett, Michael
2012 Garden Store (California Nursery) Department of Parks and Recreation Primary Record. (Data on file – City of Fremont Development and Environmental Service Department).

Hill, Ward; Minor, Woodruff; and Corbett Michael
California Nursery, Building, Structure and Object Record, December, 2001.

Matzen, Charles E.,
California Nursery Guest House, Jose de Jesus Vallejo Adobe, National Register of Historic Places Nomination, July 6, 1970.

Minor, Woodruff and Jill Singleton
California Nursery, Primary Record Form, June 2002. City of Fremont, Historic Resources Inventory, Phase II by Basin Research Associates

Minor, Woodruff and Jill Singleton
2002 Vallejo Adobe. Department of Parks and Recreation Form. Report Citation: *City of Fremont, Historic Resource Inventory, Phase II* by Basin Research Associates..

National Park Service, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, National Register Bulletin 15, Washington, DC: United States Department of the Interior, 1997.

PGAdesign
City of Fremont California Nursery Historical Park, Draft Phase 1 Master Plan Report, November 2014.

U.S. Department of the Interior, *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*, Washington, DC: United States Department of the Interior, 1995.