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ABSTRACT

HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND THE EFFECTS ON REAL ESTATE
IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

By
Myrna Jimenez
Masters of Arts in Geography

Property values and their relationship to historic district designation in ten historic districts within Los Angeles County are studied and discussed. The median housing prices for all ten districts are studied and a comparative analysis is performed to determine any significance between five of the districts listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) to five that only contain local designations. The results indicate higher property values on the five districts containing districts listed on the NRHP compared to the five districts with only local designations.

In addition, the housing price median for ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties for all ten districts are analyzed and findings are then compared to the overall housing price median of each district. The results from the analysis showed the median housing price for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties to be higher than ‘Contributing’ properties in seven of the ten districts. The benefits of ‘Local’ and ‘National’ district designation in communities are studied and findings show dual designations within the districts. The results show additional districts found within five of the ten historic districts that have been officially listed on the NRHP.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The United States is home to some of the most beautiful and exquisite architecture in the world. Over the years, much of this architecture has been saved from demolition and preserved by being designated as a part of a historic district. Many cities across the United States have witnessed the neglect and decay overtaking their key landmarks, and it is only through historic designation that these important places have been saved. Preservationists have advocated for the preservation of architecturally or historically significant buildings and neighborhoods, and therefore play a crucial role in America’s historic preservation. Historic preservation as defined by Collins (1980) is the act of retaining the tangible elements of our national heritage and encompassing all of the resources that contribute to a total living environment. Historic preservation has become a major element in urban planning, urban development and city planning in recent years.

While attention is often paid to the preservation of historic districts, there seems to be a lack of focus on the effects preservation may have on the residents of these neighborhoods. Some argue that designating neighborhoods as historic districts has imperative advantages, such as providing the opportunity for residents to come together and improve their community. Historic district designation as studied by Atwood (2006) typically results in healthy, integrated communities and often increases the neighborhood’s property value while also inspiring a sense of community pride for residents.
Despite this, there are still some that argue historic designation focuses primarily on the new residents entering the community. It is this aspect of preservation that has caused some to equate historic designation with gentrification - the displacement of lower-income residents due to rising property costs. When all of these factors are taken into account, historic preservation has played a key role in both the architecture and community of a historic neighborhood. Historic Preservation is a complicated but beneficial public service, affecting both the aesthetic and civic values of American neighborhoods.

Over the years, government agencies have become involved in the preservation of historic districts through the adoption of local preservation ordinances, creating partnerships with preservation organizations and providing incentives for homeowners of historic homes. Local preservation ordinances as studied by Heuer (2007) found that in 1957, only 11 communities contained a local preservation ordinance whereas by 1975, there were 421 communities and by 1983 there were between 800 and 1,000 communities with a local preservation ordinance. Heuer also found 2,300 communities with local preservation ordinances in 2002 and the interests continues to grow. Though the acceptance of historic preservation ordinances appeared to have a slow start, preservation officials and advocates have created programs and adopted ordinances intended to raise preservation awareness in the community.

1.1 Thesis Statement and Research Questions

Los Angeles County has been designating historic districts and homes for many years, helping to preserve history for future generations. In a 1991 study, only 11 out of 86 cities in Los Angeles County had a preservation ordinance (Grimes 1991). Cities
within Los Angeles County have since adopted their own preservation ordinances and made available a wide range of incentives to homeowners of historic homes. In 2014, thirty communities in Los Angeles County had the ability to designate historic districts, protecting the unique character of historic neighborhoods (Los Angeles Conservancy 2014). I examine the effects historic preservation has on residents of designated historic districts in Los Angeles County with respect to property value and community involvement. My primary interest is to explore how a historic district affects property values in a neighborhood? I will investigate how a ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ property adds integrity to a designated historic district and how a home being registered at a ‘Local’ and/or ‘National’ level benefits the community beyond the effects on its property value?

My study areas consist of a combination of ten designated historic districts registered at both the local and/or national level and located within Los Angeles County. Five of the ten districts are registered on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) with the remaining five located within a City of Los Angeles’s Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ). It is important to note that nine of the ten districts are located within a City of Los Angeles’s HPOZ. The reason for selecting these ten study areas is for their location within Los Angeles County. Each district is located within a relatively different part of the county that allows for a more diverse analysis of housing prices. Historic preservation benefits not just homeowners but helps preserve the architecture of the city and county. Homeowners and community members of these ten districts have managed to preserve these homes therefore protecting a bit of history and architecture within Los Angeles County. To date, these ten districts have served as prime examples of
how historic district designation can benefit residents and their community. Their contribution to the city and county has raised preservation awareness for future generations. The following ten locations will be studied (Figure 1).

**National Register of Historic Places**

- Bungalow Heaven Historic District – Pasadena
- Angelino Heights Historic District – Echo Park
- Whitley Heights Historic District - Hollywood
- 27th & 28th Streets Historic District – South Los Angeles
- Pico-Union Historic District – Los Angeles

**City of Los Angeles’ Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ)**

- University Park Historic District – Los Angeles
- Harvard Heights Historic District – Los Angeles
- Miracle Mile Historic District – Los Angeles
- Balboa Highlands Historic District – Granada Hills
- Stonehurst Historic District – Sun Valley
Figure 1. Study Areas in Los Angeles County
I argue that Los Angeles County has a unique relationship between designated historic districts and property value increase. I also posit that there is a significant relationship between districts listed on a local and/or national register and those that remain unlisted that benefit the community. This significant relationship stems from the role government agencies have played over the years to bring preservation awareness. Lastly, I argue that ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ historic properties do play a significant role in property value. A number of studies have shown that historic homes designated at a local and national level are typically of higher value. I also examine the significance government agencies play in preserving historic districts. This significance stems from incentive programs provided by jurisdictions throughout Los Angeles County that have created a major shift in historic designation in the last few years.

I also investigate the relative change in the median home selling prices in five districts listed on the NRHP and five not listed on the National Register but designated at the local level. The methodology utilized first involves an analysis of property values for each home in each district. This will allow me to determine any relationship between property values for homes listed in both categories. By extending the analysis to include ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ historic homes, I can also determine any changes in property values between the two categories.

1.2 Los Angeles County Housing Market

California and specifically Los Angeles County has seen a tremendous increase in population growth during the last 20 years. This has in turn increased the demand for and thereby increased the housing supply as more people begin looking for homes. Los Angeles County covers 4,084 square miles and includes 88 cities, the largest being the
City of Los Angeles. The population in 2013 was over 10 million, making it the most populous county in California (County of Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation, 2015).

International and national migration (Gabriel 1999) has been the most significant factor in the Los Angeles County housing market. Migration between states to the Los Angeles region within the last 20 years as studied by Hernandez (2011) has fueled a period of dynamic residential real estate growth. Los Angeles County has undergone many population shifts and has experienced numerous economic cycles as the desire to own homes continues to increase. This housing demand increase has in turn created a significant rise in property values.

Los Angeles is one of the most expensive housing markets in the nation. Though Los Angeles has experienced tremendous population growth and an increase in house supply, it has also been victim of recession within the last 20 years. The most recent was the recession of 2007 to 2009 that led to the collapse of the United States housing bubble. California was one of the states most severely impacted by the decrease in home value. The Los Angeles County housing market value between 2006 and 2010 as studied by Myers et al (2012) found the value of homes to have dropped to $291,800 from its high $453,481 in 2007.

The economy of the nation began to slowly recover following the years after the recession. The median home value for the United States between 2010 and 2012 as studied by Flanagan et al (2013) found the value to be $174,600. The authors found the median home value for the state of California during this time frame be at $358,800. As the economy for the nation and the state of California began to recover, the housing
market within the Los Angeles region also began to recover. According to real estate
market research firm DataQuick, the median sales price for all homes in Los Angeles in
July 2013 was $515,000 (Los Angeles Dept. of City Planning 2013). The median home
value in Los Angeles County for the year 2016 is $520,800 (Zillow.com 2016) at an
increase of 6.7% over the past year and Zillow predicts a 1.7% rise within the next year.

Historic preservation in the United States has been transformed over the course of
a few decades. The role of government agencies and community involvement has made a
significant impact in preservation. Historic preservation advocacy has raised awareness
amongst communities therefore, educating the public. Much is associated with historic
district designation and property value. Research and studies have explored and identified
a significant relationship between historic district designations and that proves an
increase in property value.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature relating to historic designation and property value appears to have three recurring themes. Therefore this research is covered by three sections: (1) the role of government legislations, (2) the value of historic preservation on the community and (3) increased property values from historic designation. Research on the role of government legislations includes work from the local and national level agencies. Numerous articles have studied the impact historic designation has had on the community. Previous studies on property value from historic designation varies and explores the relationship between government agencies and the community.

2.1 The Role of Government Legislations

Government agencies have been involved in historic district designation and their involvement varies based on local and national levels. These government agencies’ involvement in the preservation movement has proven valuable to many hoping to protect history and architecture in their communities. The role of the federal government and state government in historic preservation is essentially to establish the framework, including policy, law, and guidelines, under which local communities – that control most land use decisions through local zoning laws – can pursue historic preservation activity (Anderheggen 2010).

2.1.1 National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)

Government agencies have not only adopted ordinances to enforce preservation but have also worked together with state and national organizations to aid in the process.
The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is one of the most important of these organizations. The NRHP is the official Federal list of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture (National Register Bulletin 16B 1991). As a result, the NRHP has done much to aid and expand the preservation movement both on a national and local level and has paved the way for local agencies to work closely with state and national preservation agencies and the community at large.

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-665; 16 U.S.C. 470) (NHPA) as studied by Fisher (1998) found that the NRHP is administered by the National Park Service (NPS) in conjunction with the State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO). Hertfelder (1987) found that the NPS is responsible for setting national quality control and administers the grants program while the SHPOs carry out the work. Murtagh (1976) identified the NHPA responsible for expanding the existing register of nationally significant properties and historic areas administered by the NPS to include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of State and local significance. Murtagh also found the NHPA to have inaugurated a grants program and was responsible for the establishment of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation that advises the President and the Congress on matters relating to historic preservation.

The Council as discussed by Andrus (1992) also administers the Federal historic preservation regulatory process known as the ‘Section 106 Review’. Andrus found the review to ensure historic properties are given due consideration in the planning of Federal projects or actions. To date, the NHPA has been the most effective approach of promoting preservation awareness in the United States. Scarpino (1992) concluded the NHPA requires
states to develop historic preservation plans as a condition for receiving grants from the Department of the Interior. As a result, the NRHP has become an important planning tool for the identification of historic structures and sites at the federal, state and local level.

A property must be nominated and meet specific criteria to be eligible for the National Register. The regulations of the Department of the Interior’s National Register program as studied by Lyon (1982) provide general criteria for evaluating historic and prehistoric resources for listing in the NRHP. Lyon found that the property’s age, integrity and significance are taken into account during the nomination process. Bowers (1998) found that many historic preservation ordinances require a person to obtain approval from either the local commission or the governing body of the city or county to alter a historic property, the exterior of a structure on the property or to place, construct, maintain, expand, or remove a structure on the property. In California, most historic district ordinances prohibit the construction, demolition, or modification of any building within the district without approval of a review board (Smith, 1983).

Hughes (1975) identified zoning ordinances in historic districts to help maintain the uniformity of the area’s historic character by controlling demolition and alterations to existing structures and limiting construction of buildings to those that conform to the present character of the district. Architectural controls are said to promote the general welfare by developing or preserving the ‘character of the district’ and by ‘conserving the value of buildings’ (Rubin, 1975).

The NRHP and Local Historic Landmark and historic district designations are two very different programs that recognize and protect historic properties in the US (Zahirovich-Herbert, 2012). Zahirovich-Herbert identified historic properties and districts
listed on the NRHP to be properties that have been researched and surveyed according to a set of criteria and procedures based on the national level. The author found that historic properties and districts are able to receive both types of designations, national and local, in communities where local historic preservation commissions have been established. According to the NRHP, in 2011 there were some 2,300 ‘local’ historic districts, created and administered by local governments and administrators, in the United States (Heintzelman et al, 2011). Heintzelman identified local landmarks as individual buildings, structures and sites and local districts consist of an entire area such as a neighborhood.

The NHPA defines a historic property as (Luhman et al 2002):

Any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object include in, or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, including artifacts, records, and material remains related to such a property or resource.

The NRHP defines a district as (Murtagh, 1976):

A geographically definable area, urban or rural, possessing a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects that are united by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development. A district may also comprise individual elements that are separated geographically but are linked by association or history.

The planning goal for districts as studied by Netherton (1987) are to preserve neighborhoods with distinctive history or architecture. Netherton identified planning goals as retaining or restoring physical environments that reflect the lifestyle of a particular period. Gilbert (1980) concludes that in the development of local historic preservation programs, the most significant trend appears to be the increase use of landmarks and historic districts in the cities’ plan. As a result, preservation and planning officials actively seek to create a district that allows for future planning.
Seifert (1995) studies the importance of boundary lines within districts and the resources that contribute to the significance of the property. Seifert found that state and local laws that require aid from historic resources may refer to boundaries in the application of implementing regulations or design controls. According to the National Register Bulletin 21 (Seifert 1995):

Select boundaries that encompass the single area of land containing the significance concentration of buildings, sites, structures, or objects making up the district. The district’s significance and historic integrity should help determine the boundaries.

Guidelines for identifying and selecting boundaries in a historic district as studied by Kellogg (1980) vary at the national and local level. Kellogg found the criteria applied in selecting the buildings to be preserved must be based on local traditions, styles and history. In conclusion, both local and national levels seek to achieve the same goal of preserving the original character of the district.

2.1.2 Mills Act Historical Property Contracts Program

Los Angeles County is home to a high volume of historic homes and districts. The Mills Act Historical Property Contract as discussed by Graves et al (2011) was adopted by the state of California as a property tax incentive in 1972. The authors found the Mills Act to be the single most important economic incentive program in California for the restoration and preservation of historic buildings by private owners. The authors identity that each local government has the ability to establish their own criteria and determine how many contract they will allow in their jurisdiction. According to the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (2012):

A ten-year contract is executed between a jurisdiction and a property owner. The property owner agrees to maintain, invest in, and protect the property in accordance with specific preservation standards and conditions of the contract. In
turn, the Mills Act program allows qualifying owners to receive a reduction in property taxes and use the savings to help rehabilitate, restore, and maintain their buildings.

In Los Angeles County, only 25 of the County’s jurisdictions have adopted the Mills Act Program to date (Los Angeles Conservancy, 2014). In 1996, the City of Los Angeles enacted the Mills Act Historic Property Contract, designed as an agreement between the city and the owners of a building designated as either a Historic Cultural Monument (HCMs) or a contributing structure to a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZs) (Getty Conservation Institute, 2004). A survey in 1995 as studied by Narwold (2006) found that 39 cities were writing Mills Act contracts with a total of 119 statewide. Both the city and county of Los Angeles has witnessed a tremendous increase of Mills Act contracts since its inception.

2.1.3 Los Angeles Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ)

A significant amount of historic architecture lies within the city boundaries of Los Angeles and much of it is in excellent condition. Merl (2015) discusses that in 1962, Los Angeles become one of the nation’s first major cities to enact a historic preservation ordinance covering significant buildings and in 1979, the city extended protections to districts with the creation and adoption of the Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs). A HPOZ is a designated historic district within the City of Los Angeles and contains both buildings and structures from a similar time period that still maintain their original design features (Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2015).

In 1983, Angelino Heights became the city’s HPOZ and with its city-designation, owners of homes in the area are assured that the neighborhood’s attractive setting and distinguished architectural characteristics will be preserved (Getty Conservation Institute
To date, the City of Los Angeles has 29 designated HPOZs (Los Angeles Department of City Planning, 2015).

Biederman (2004) discusses how the planners of the city of Los Angeles describe the structures in the HPOZs. Biederman found that planners describe all noncommercial buildings in the area as either ‘contributing structures’, those that reflect the historic period to be preserved and are basically intact or ‘noncontributing structures,’ those built later or that have been altered so significantly that they no longer reflect their historic architecture. The City of Los Angeles’ Office of Historic Resources offers more descriptive definitions for these structures (Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2015):

‘Contributing’ structures are those structures, landscape features, natural features, or sites identified as Contributing in the Historic Resources survey for the HPOZ. Generally, ‘Contributing’ structures will have been built within the historic Period of Significance of the HPOZ, and will retain elements that identify it as belonging to that period. The historic Period of Significance of the HPOZ is usually the time period in which the majority of construction in the area occurred.

‘Contributing Altered’ structures are structures that date from the Period of Significance, built in the same time period as Contributing structures that have retained their historic character in spite of subsequent alterations or additions and are deemed reversible.

‘Non-Contributing’ structures are defined as structures, landscapes, natural features, or sites identified as not retaining their historic character as a result of un-reversible alterations, or as having been built outside of the HPOZ Period of Significance or because they are vacant lots.

The HPOZ process as discussed by Fausset (2001) begins with the Los Angeles City Council who must first agree to commission a survey to determine whether the neighborhood has the true historic value. Faussett found that the six to twelve month process analyzes the significant of the building’s architecture in context of the area’s
history and identified which buildings are eligible. HPOZs are not designated outside of the City of Los Angeles, meaning there are no HPOZs in the rest of Los Angeles County.

2.2 The Value of Historic Preservation on the Community

Historic Preservation is often thought of as merely the conservation of old architecture. Few are aware of the efforts put in by residents and communities to maintain a home or neighborhood registered as a historic district. Preservation as discussed by Morris (2012) has allowed us to retain the best of our shared heritage to preserve sites of unique quality and beauty, revitalize neighborhoods, spur economic revitalization, and, quite simply, create better communities.

2.2.1 The role of Historical Societies and Organizations

The role of historical societies and organizations are often discussed in terms of their effects and relationship with a community. Datel (1985) discusses the importance of these organizations and the role they play in historic designation. Datel found that active organizations are key to why some places are designated and others with similar architectural and historical justification are not. Active historical societies as studied by Waskiewicz (1979) must now involve themselves in real estate, banking, law, politics, and other areas of the community previously ignored. Historical societies play a crucial role after the designation of a historic district. They are responsible for obtaining and maintaining current information for their members and Dees (1979) concludes that a frequent forum to discuss preservation problems helps bring insight and solutions. As a result, historic preservation awareness has been promoted within the Los Angeles County communities and the public at large.
Howe (1985) identified only eight percent of historical organizations to have been founded in 1990 and 53.2 percent had been created between 1960 and 1981. The Los Angeles Conservancy (Moscoso 1978) was formed in 1978 to aid in the preservation process within the city of Los Angeles however the preservation process appeared to have a slow start compared to the rest of the county. Baumann et al. (2008) studied the Old North St. Louis Restoration Group (ONSLRG) in St. Louis, Missouri and its active community involvement in the restoration of the neighborhood after years of neglect. The authors found the ONSLRG to be successful in rehabilitating homes, creating and maintaining community gardens and placing their neighborhood on the NRHP in 1984.

The establishment of historical societies and the aid of government agencies have proven resourceful to the restoration and maintenance of historic districts however, community involvement throughout the process is key as studied by Rose (1981). Rose identifies that preservation laws have the ability to physically rehabilitate homes and aid in creating a sense of community among neighbors since often times members of these organizations are current residents of the community. Waters et al (1999) concludes that the importance of preservation planning and the maintenance of community characters has finally taken its place beside preservation programs that were established through decades of work by neighborhood activists.

2.2.2 Benefits of Heritage Tourism

Studies on heritage tourism have been related to the benefits of preserving history and architecture however, Gruffydd (2002) and Jamieson (1998) study the tremendous impact travel and tourism has on communities. Gruffydd (2002) studied heritage tourism and its connection to the past and Jamieson (1998) identified cultural heritage tourism
and its connection to the practice of marketing, research, product development and promotion. Jamieson found that the practices of site development, design, planning, construction and visitor services all connect to marketing therefore, it has the ability to generate revenue to each city all while promoting history. O’Donovan et al (2011) identified changes initiated by the rise of tourism over the past 150 years and how it has created not just an industry but a culture of tourism within the contexts of global capitalism and consumer society. The authors conclude that heritage tourism is an expanding niche of the tourism market and many states across the country can attest to the positive impact heritage tourism has brought to their economy.

Travel and tourism in the state of California and the effects on the economy has been the subject of numerous studies. In California, works of the past as studied by Bricker (2004) are seen as part of the state’s cultural patrimony, including many of the period’s iconic buildings and landscapes. The state of California has not released any data or report that demonstrates a significant economic impact in regards to preservation-tourism activities. However, heritage tourism in Florida as studied by Rypkema et al (2011) found that heritage tourists spend $4.13 billion in 2007 and 46.7% of all U.S. visitors to Florida reported visiting a historical site during their stay. According to an article published by the Association for Preservation Technology International (APT) (Brink 1998):

Newport, Rhode Island, represents a primer example of how historic sites generate economic benefits. The Preservation Society of Newport County operates eight magnificent historic homes, including The Breakers, which alone attracted 860,000 visitors in 1997. A 1994 economic impact study documented that visitors to historic sites in Newport County spent nearly $70 million annually.
In addition, Johnson (1996) concluded that heritage tourism does not just consist of commercial activities but rather as an ideology of framing history, nature and tradition and the power to reshape culture and nature to its own needs.

### 2.2.3 Job Creation from Historic Preservation

The rehabilitation of older and historic homes especially those located within a historic district have a tremendous impact on job growth and can create new income sources for many community members. The Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) (1997) has found that in California, $1 million dollars in rehabilitation creates five more jobs than $1 million dollars spent on manufacturing electric equipment. Rypkema (2007) studies the impact preservation construction projects has on California’s household incomes. According to the Economic Impact of Historic Resource Preservation report (Rypkema 2007):

In California, a million dollars of manufacturing in output will add on average about $544,000 to local household incomes and a million dollar of new construction will add $753,000 to local household incomes, but the same investment in rehabilitation will yield over $833,000 to local household incomes.

In additions, Farrisee (1999) found that in 1997, $16.5 billion was spent in Georgia by tourists which supported almost 500,000 jobs. Parrish (1999) studied how historic preservation was measured through the Tax Act from 1992 through 1996. Parrish found that 7,550 jobs were created from it, $201 million in earnings were generated and $559 million in total economic impact. In a study of the economic impacts of historic preservation as discussed by Facca et al (2011) found that in 2005, the state of New York reported 9.6 million annual direct investments in preservation which generated over 138,000 jobs. The authors discuss that more than three quarters of the economic benefits related to historic preservation remain in the state of New York.
2.3 Historic Preservation and Property Value

Historic homes and districts are designated each and every year in the Los Angeles County area and the numbers are only increasing as more jurisdictions adopt preservation ordinances. Research has shown an increase in preservation incentives to support historic preservation. Previous studies have shown an increase in property value from historic designation.

2.3.1 Increased Property Values from Historic Designation

Numerous studies have been done on property valuation in historic districts and the positive effects historic preservation can have on communities. In every study on property valuation, there is a uniform pattern of some percentage increase to property values, resulting from rehabilitation efforts. Historic designation seems to have a positive effect on property values of designated properties (Heintzelman 2010). Coffin (1989) found that the creation of a historic district appears to be a valuable tool for helping potential buyers identify an additional portion of the housing stock in which they might be interested. Owners of historic homes often take great satisfaction in rehabilitating their properties, with the added bonus that preservation may increase a property’s value (Getty Conservation Institute 2004).

In recent years, preservation in California has created a tremendous impact in many communities and the state has therefore, adopted the Mills Act program. The Mills Act program as studied by Winson-Geideman (2011) found designated property sale prices to be 16% higher than similar, non-designated properties, and also found that amount to be greater than the capitalized tax benefit, implying value in the designation. While there appears to be no current report on the City of Los Angeles, studies of other
cities have found that homes in designated historic neighborhoods appreciate in value faster than similar homes in undesignated areas ( Getty Conservation Institute 2004). Properties in local historic districts in Louisville, Kentucky as study by Rypkema 2011) are worth between $59,000 and $67,000 more than comparable properties not in non-designated districts. Rypkema found drastic changes in smaller cities where historic districts have been neglected for many years. The study found small districts such as North Little Rock, Arkansas to contain homes worth on average $31,000 more than comparable housing not in the district. In addition, Thompson et al (2011) found that the sale prices of homes in designated neighborhoods rise on average by $5,000 compared to controlled neighborhoods in the years after historic designation.

Historic districts can be designated at both the national and local level. Haughey (2000) identified in dual districts, single-family sales prices to be 23.1% higher than areas outside a historic district. Haughey also discusses how on average, single-family housing sales prices in federal districts are 33.1% higher than in neighborhoods without a historic designation. Gilderbloom et al (2009) found the amount of literature about local and national historic district designation to show that property values rising faster than in unprotected or undesignated neighborhoods. The authors discuss the value of each historic home and how they are protected by controls on the exterior of the house or by mandating that the house be well maintained using historic paint, colors and materials. This ensures that property values are further protected by an assurance that other nearby properties will maintain their historic character and never be demolished and this limits negative externalities. Tappendorf (2002) discusses how architectural design regulations
may have as goals, the prevention of building incongruity, degeneration of property, and inappropriate or poor quality design.

Many studies have been done on the property value increase from designated historic districts and the benefits it brings to homeowners and the community alike. Coulson et al (2001) discusses a number of studies that have demonstrated historically designated properties located within historic districts to typically sell for a premium compared to similar, non-designated properties. Zahirovich-Herbert (2012) studied how properties within historic districts sell at a premium however, that premium can be dependent on the type of designation. Zahirovich-Herbert found that the distribution of price premiums of historic designation has not been closely examined however, an effective method for examining the distribution is quantile regression.

Studies relating to the relationship between local and national designation vary widely. Residential property as studied by Asabere et al (1994) found that federally certified districts carry roughly 26% price premium relative to property located outside of a federally certified district. A study of the Sacramento housing market also found that a house located in a designated district sells for a premium over similar houses outside the district (Clark et al 1997). In a number of recent studies as discussed by Coulson et al (2004) found that despite the cost and restrictions that are associated with historic designation, district designation is in fact linked to the stabilization or increase in housing values.

2.3.2 Issues of Gentrification and Displacement

Making improvements to communities would seem to yield net positive outcomes and great benefits to many homeowners. Studies have shown some residents become
concerned when they become aware their neighborhood may become a historic district. This is due primarily to the fear of displacement among lower income residents. Gentrification and displacement are terms that have been used interchangeably when discussing historic preservation. The term ‘gentrification,’ like urban renewal and neighborhood revitalization, describes a change in neighborhoods that politicians and developers label as ‘blighted’ or ‘impoverished’ to one that is affluent and, in the process, displaces long-time residents (Lawrence 2002). Displacement as discussed by Rose (2002) begins as landlords take advantage of rising market values and evict long-time residents in order to rent or sell to the more affluent. Baumann et al (2008) argues that rising property values in ‘gentrified’ districts have often led to displacement of poorer residents, making historic preservation a divisive issue in many cities. Zukin (1987) however studied gentrification as the restoration of deteriorating housing and the clustering of new cultural amenities in the urban core as it relates to corporate investment rather than gentrification.

Atwood (2006) has studied and traced displacement to Charleston, South Carolina in 1931. Atwood found Charleston to be home to the country’s first historic district and in order to recreate the districts glorious historic past, the historical society and local government relocated many low-income African American and white families to designated public housing. Such actions led people to believe that historic designation is indeed associated with displacement of lower income residents.

Morris (2012) argues that historic designation is an important component of the economic impact of historic preservation because the designation itself can increase property values by setting it apart from ordinary properties therefore, helping the
community and its residents. Leffall et al (2012) discusses redevelopment as being key in funding supportive housing projects for some of the most vulnerable groups. In addition, Freeman et al (2002) found that improving housing and neighborhood conditions appears to encourage the housing stability of low-income households to the degree that they more than offset any dislocation resulting from rising rents.

With these conflicting concerns in mind, government agencies have stepped in to prevent gentrification and displacement caused by historic designation. The National Trust for Historic Preservation began by sponsoring a pilot program in the Springfield historic district of Jacksonville, Florida which attempted to prove preservation could serve the interests of improved affordable housing (Archer 1991). Archer studied the program which was intended to restore the neighborhood, improve the housing stock and provide employment for residents while encouraging preservation and avoiding gentrification and displacement. In addition, as discussed by Archer, the program allowed ownership of rental units to remain in the hands of neighborhood organizations to ensure that affordable housing remained intact even if property appreciation took place.

Many communities have come together to protect their investments by gradually seeking the resources that would allow them to better their homes. Federal tax incentives can help these culturally valuable communities protect their heritage, especially against gentrification (Rikoski 2006). These tax incentives have been linked to the increase in preservation rehabilitation projects in lower income neighborhoods throughout the United States.

Attwood (2006) concludes that historic district designation and preservation efforts do not cause gentrification, the causes of displacement are long-term economic
and market forces exacerbated by the current lack of affordable housing and the failure of housing laws to protect tenants. Affordable housing has often times been associated with historic designation. Affordable housing as studied by Delvac et al (1995) found that the reuse of historic and existing buildings for affordable housing has become an increasingly important strategy for neighborhood conservation and revitalization as it makes more economic sense than new construction. Escherich et al (1996) studied the benefits that resulted from rehabilitating historic structures for affordable housing uses. The authors concluded that the rehabilitation of a building that has been a neighborhood landmark is a gift to the community as well as to the tenants, who often have ties to the buildings themselves.

Many factors are associated with historic preservation and property value. Government agencies play an important role and often determine the preservation outcomes in communities. As preservation awareness has increased throughout both the country and within the Los Angeles County so has the number of historical societies and organizations that have prevented the demolition of many architectural structures. The relationship from historic designation and property value increase has been studied and analyzed in numerous studies and continues to show that a positive outcome stems from historic designation.
CHAPTER THREE

DATA & METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The methodology for this study was chosen to determine any relationship when comparing five of the ten districts listed at the national level on the NRHP to five that are not listed on the National Register. My data consists of historic preservation map data from the City of Los Angeles and housing price data from the Zillow Group website. Housing price data for all ten districts is from the year 2015. A comparative analysis was then used to determine any significance between the five districts listed on the National Register and the five that are not listed on the National Register with respect to the overall median home value.

3.2 Historic Preservation Map Data

The City of Los Angeles’ Planning Department has compiled twenty-nine HPOZ maps that are available to the public. These HPOZ maps demonstrate the boundary lines of the historic district, which are illustrated in gray, as well as what the City of Los Angeles considers to be ‘Contributing’ or ‘Non-Contributing’ structures to the district. On six of the HPOZ maps some properties are labeled as ‘Contributing-Altered’ or ‘Not Available/No Data,’ as they yielded no relevant information. All four categories were shown in different colors on the HPOZ maps to better distinguish their status.

A ‘Bungalow Heaven Boundary of National Register Historic District’ map is provided by both the City of Pasadena and the book, “Images of America: Pasadena’s Bungalow Heaven” (Delgado et al 2012). This map demonstrates, in two colors, the
‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ structures within this district, labeled as ‘Building Footprints in District’ and ‘Non-Contributing Properties.’ The boundary line of the district is represented by a black and white dashed line. Ten of the twenty-nine HPOZ maps in the City of Los Angeles were utilized to allow for more accurate data with regard to the structure’s property lines. I organized the map data for all ten districts utilizing all four categories, if and when available.

3.3 Study Areas

The ten study areas were selected based on location within Los Angeles County. It’s important to note that nine districts selected out of the ten are HPOZs within the City of Los Angeles. This means that the City of Los Angeles has obtained a local preservation ordinance for these nine districts that protects the districts from any alterations and demolitions. Four out of the ten districts have been designated at both the local and national level.

3.3.1 Bungalow Heaven Historic District

Bungalow Heaven is a neighborhood located within the City of Pasadena. It is noted for containing more than 800 small craftsman homes built from 1900 to 1930 and many which still stand. The boundaries of the Bungalow Heaven district consist of Washington Boulevard to the north, Orange Grove Boulevard to the south, Mentor Avenue to the west, and North Chester Avenue to the east (Figure 2).

Many residents of the Bungalow Heaven area recognized the historic significance of these homes and therefore, in 1989, the neighborhood became Pasadena’s first historic Landmark District (Bungalow Heaven Neighborhood Association 2015). On April 10th, 2008, the Bungalow Heaven Historic District was listed by the United States Department
of the Interior in NRHP. As a result of the listing, Bungalow Heaven has also been listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (Bungalow Heaven Neighborhood Association website 2015).
Figure 2: Map of Bungalow Heaven Historic District in Pasadena (Images of America: Pasadena’s Bungalow Heaven 2012)
3.3.2 Angelino Heights Historic District

The historic district of Angelino Heights is located within the Echo Park district of Los Angeles. The boundaries of Angelino Heights consist of Echo Park Avenue on the west, Sunset Boulevard on the north and east, and the Hollywood 101 Freeway on the south. Angelino Heights is noted as the first suburb of Los Angeles and the second oldest district in the city. Founded in 1886, Angelino Heights contains an impressive array of architectural styles, among them: Queen Anne and Eastlake Victorian, Mission Revival, Craftsman/California Bungalow, Brownstone and Streamline Modern (Moscoso 1987).

In 1983, Angelino Heights became the City of Los Angeles’ first HPOZ that paved the way for more historic districts within Los Angeles to be recognized and distinguished as HPOZs as well (Figure 3). A total of fifty-one Victorian residences and carriage houses dominate the hill, fourteen of these homes have been designated Los Angeles cultural historic monuments and the 1300 block is listed in the National Register of Historic Places (Moscoso, 1987).
Figure 3: Map of Angelino Heights Historic District in Los Angeles (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015)
3.3.3 Whitley Heights Historic District

Whitley Heights is a residential neighborhood in the Hollywood Hills located in Central Los Angeles. This district is divided between single-family homes along the hillside and an apartment area. The boundaries of the district consist of Las Palmas Ave to the west, Emmet Terrace to the south, the Hollywood 101 Freeway to the north and Grace Avenue to the east (Figure 4). Whitley Heights consists of Spanish Colonial Revival styles and it is also well known for being home to several well-known actors and people in the motion-picture industry. The construction of the Hollywood 101 Freeway through the district resulted in the destruction of forty-nine houses, including those where actors Rudolph Valentino and Charlie Chaplin had lived (Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2015).

In 2004, Whitley Heights Historic District became a City of Los Angeles’ HPOZ. The HPOZ is split into two parts by the Hollywood 101 Freeway running through the Cahuenga Pass. In 1982, Whitley Heights was made a state historic district by the California Historical Resources Commission (Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2015) and registered on the NRHP.
Figure 4: Map of Whitley Heights Historic District in Hollywood (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015)
3.3.4 27th and 28th Streets Historic District

27th and 28th Street is a small neighborhood located off of Central Avenue in South East Los Angeles. This district contains a high volume of turn of the century homes such as Victorian and Craftsman styles, all built between 1893 and 1912. 27th and 28th Street is a proposed HPOZ within the City of Los Angeles. In 2009, half of the district was registered on the NRHP (Figure 5).
Figure 5: Map of 27th and 28th Street Historic District in Los Angeles (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015)
3.3.5 Pico-Union Historic District

Pico-Union is located in central Los Angeles. This district is divided up into three sub-sections (Figure 6). The first sub-section is located within the boundaries of Hoover Street to the west, Pico Boulevard to the south and Union Street to the east. The second sub-section is located within the boundaries of Pico Boulevard to the north, Alvarado Street to the west, Venice Boulevard to the south and the Harbor 110 Freeway to the east. The third sub-section is located within the boundaries of Venice Boulevard to the north, Hoover Street to the west, the Santa Monica 10 Freeway to the south east and 18th Street to the south.

The district consists of single-family residences that feature a wide range of architectural styles such as late 19th century Victorian-era cottages, early 20th century Craftsman and Mission Revival bungalows. Some of the larger homes consist of Period Revival and Classical Styles. Alvarado Terrace Historic District and South Bonnie Brae Historic District were both added to the NRHP in 1984 and 1988. These two districts are located within the Pico-Union HPOZ. Pico-Union Historic District became the City of Los Angeles’ 19th HPOZ in August 10, 2004 (Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2015).
Figure 6: Map of Pico-Union Historic District in Los Angeles (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015)
3.3.6 University Park Historic District

University Park is a residential community located in South Los Angeles. This neighborhood was developed due to the founding of the University of Southern California which is located nearby. University Park consists of residences built between 1885 and the 1920s. Architecture styles such as 19th century Queen Anne, Craftsman, Spanish Colonial Revival and American Colonial Revival are located with the district. On March 22, 2000, the district became a HPOZ within the City of Los Angeles. University Park contains one of the highest concentrations of City Historic Cultural Monuments of any HPOZ in Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2015). Twentieth Street, Saint James Park and Chester Place are historic districts register on the NRHP and located with the HPOZ. The boundaries of the district consist of the 10 freeway and Washington Boulevard to the north, the 110 freeway to the east, Adams Blvd and 24th Street to the south and Vermont Avenue to the west (Figure 7).
Figure 7: Map of University Park Historic District in Los Angeles (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015)
3.3.7 Harvard Heights Historic District

Harvard Heights is a neighborhood located in Central Los Angeles that contains a large collection of architecturally significant single-family residences including the only remaining Greene and Green house in Los Angeles. The district is home to a collection of Craftsman houses built between 1902 and 1910 and features work by the famous Heineman brothers and notable West Adams architect Frank Tyler. Its boundaries consist of Pico Boulevard to the north, Normandie Avenue to the east, the Santa Monica 10 Freeway to the south and Western Avenue to the west (Figure 8). Harvard Heights became the City of Los Angeles’ HPOZ on August 2, 2000.
Figure 8: Map of Harvard Heights Historic District in Los Angeles (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015)
3.3.8 Miracle Mile Historic District

Miracle Mile North HPOZ is a neighborhood in Los Angeles that consists of single-family homes built from 1924 to 1941. Many of the homes consist of architectural styles such as Spanish Colonial Revival. Several Tudor and American Colonial Revival Styles can also be found in the neighborhood. The boundaries of the district consist of Beverly Boulevard to the north, Detroit Street to the east, 3rd Street to the south and Gardner Avenue to the west (Figure 9). On April 10, 1990 Miracle Mile became an HPOZ within the City of Los Angeles (Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2015).
Figure 9: Map of Miracle Mile Historic District in Los Angeles (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning  2015)
3.3.9 Balboa Highlands Historic District

Balboa Highlands is a residential community located in Granada Hills in Northern San Fernando Valley. This district is the first post-World War II to achieve historic district status in the San Fernando Valley. Balboa Highland was constructed from 1962 to 1964 by developer Joseph Eichler, who built thousands of homes in Northern California (Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2015). Balboa Highlands represents an outstanding example of Mid-Century Modern residential architecture. The boundaries of the district consist of Lisette Street to the north, Balboa Boulevard to the east, Westbury to the south and Jolette Avenue to the west (Figure 10). The district became a City of Los Angeles’ HPOZ on February 12, 2010 (Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2015).
Figure 10: Map of Balboa Highland Historic District in Granada Hills (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015)
3.3.10 Stonehurst Historic District

Stonehurst Historic District is located in the community of Sun Valley in the northeastern San Fernando Valley in Los Angeles. Many of the structures were built between 1923 and 1925 by Dan Montelongo, a local artisan and stonemason, using stone selected from the nearby washes and the foothills of the Tujunga Valley (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015). Stonehurst Historic District contains a high volume of homes utilizing native river rock as a primary building material. Many of these homes were designed in a ‘Stonemason Vernacular’ style that is a derivative of American Craftsman architecture style. Stonehurst homes are frequently small bungalows on large lots, often on horse-keeping or animal-keeping properties, giving this neighborhood a unique, rustic character among Los Angeles’ historic districts (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015). The boundaries of the district consist of Sheldon Street to the north, Stonehurst Avenue to the east, Wicks Street to the south and Allegheny Street to the west (Figure 11). On August 12, 2008, Stonehurst Historic District became a City of Los Angeles’ HPOZ.
Figure 11: Map of Stonehurst Historic District in Sun Valley (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015)
3.4 Housing Price Data

I obtained data on the current prices of homes from the Zillow Group website. The Zillow Group website is an online real estate database company that provides data on homes across the United States. The online database provides features such as current market prices and home value reports. It also displays basic information such as the square footage of the home, number of bedrooms and bathrooms and even aerial views. The Zillow Group website determines an estimate of a home based on publicly available information. Obtaining data from the Zillow Group website is permitted for current market housing prices.

I restricted the data to the prices of homes within the boundaries of the HPOZ districts and the Bungalow Heaven historic district. Prices for each individual home were manually obtained from the Zillow Group website and permitted for current selling prices. The prices for each home in all four categories – i.e. ‘Contributing,’ ‘Non-Contributing,’ ‘Contributing-Altered’ and ‘Not Available/No Data’ were noted when available and entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet program. This was later analyzed and an overall median home value was then determined for each category.

3.5 Methods of Analysis

Data analysis followed a multiple-step process. Initially, processing of map data and housing price data was performed using the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet program. In order to understand any significance between the five districts listed on the National Register and the five that are not listed on the National Register, it was necessary to sort the housing price data into two columns for each district. These two columns consisted of ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ data. In six of the ten districts, an additional
column was added that consisted of ‘Contributing-Altered’ and/or ‘Not Available/No Data’ data.

The median home value was then taken from each column within each district. From this data, a comparison of the median home value can be made within each district and to all ten of the districts. The results of any relationship between the districts with respect to home value was simplified using a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet that individually demonstrated the median home value of each column for all ten districts.

3.6 Limitations

The scope of this study is limited by the data. In any research study, limiting factors can affect the overall accuracy and effectiveness of the study. A number of the property lines from three of the HPOZ maps did not match up with the property lines from the Zillow Group website. While some HPOZ maps provided accurate property lines, some appeared to have been merged with properties that consisted of both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ structures. Therefore, it was not possible to obtain accurate data for those particular districts.

There was a limitation in using the Zillow Group website as there appeared to be a lack of data available for some structures in the HPOZ districts as well as in the Bungalow Heaven district. Data that appeared as not available affected all four categories ‘Contributing,’ ‘Non-Contributing,’ ‘Contributing-Altered’ and ‘Not Available/No Data’. Therefore, this restricted the overall median home value for each historic district.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS OF STUDY

The general research hypothesis of this study is that there is a significant relationship between property value and designated historic districts in Los Angeles County. Los Angeles in particular contains both national and local designations. The results show an intricate relationship between the five districts listed on the NRHP to the five not yet listed within Los Angeles County. The results support the second hypothesis of districts designated at both the national and local level and how they benefit the entire community. All results are based on the housing price data from the Zillow Group website in 2015. These results also support the third hypothesis of the contribution that ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties add to districts.

The first step of my study consisted of identifying and selecting ten historic districts within Los Angeles County. Nine of the ten districts selected are found within the City of Los Angeles and have been designated at the local level as HPOZs through the city. Nine of these maps were utilized and incorporated into the study. The second step consisted of obtaining housing price data for each of the ten districts both listed on the NRHP and those not yet listed. This housing price data contained properties listed as ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ as well as properties that were listed as ‘Contributing-Altered’ when applicable to the district.

The second step of the study was to obtain housing price data from the Zillow Group website for all 10 districts. This was done by manually obtaining housing price data from 2015 for each district for all ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ structures.
and when applicable for all ‘Contributing-Altered’ structures found on the maps. The housing prices for all ten districts were all entered into an excel spreadsheet where the median was then determined for each district. Next, an analysis of each district was performed using the same method however incorporating all three categories; ‘Contributing,’ ‘Contributing-Altered’ and ‘Non-Contributing’. A comparative analysis was then performed for both districts listed on the NRHP and those not yet listed.

4.1 Housing price analysis of districts listed on NRHP

The Bungalow Heaven historic district contains 684 properties that have been surveyed for this study and by the NRHP. The map utilized was obtained by the book, *Images of America: Pasadena’s Bungalow Heaven* and consists of both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. Results from this study found that 511 properties contributed to the district and 167 did not contribute. The results also found that six properties did not provide any housing prices from the Zillow Group website. These six properties are a combination of both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. The median housing prices for ‘Contributing’ properties is $754,365 and $778,022 for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties (Table 4.1). The median housing price is higher for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties than ‘Contributing’ properties by $23,657. Housing price data for this district is accurate as the map is provided by the NRHP.
The Angelino Heights historic district contains 668 properties that have been surveyed for this thesis study and by the City of Los Angeles. The Angelino Heights HPOZ map provides both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. The map also provides a total number of properties surveyed by the City of Los Angeles that totaled 732 properties. Of these 732 properties, 587 are ‘Contributing’ and 145 are ‘Non-Contributing.’ However, housing price data for this district was limited as a great number of properties did not match the properties provided on the Zillow Group website. A number of properties appeared to have been merged on the Zillow Group website, therefore for this study, the total number of properties surveyed differs from the total number of properties surveyed by the City of Los Angeles. For this study, 459 properties contributed, 89 did not contribute to the district and 120 provided no data from the Zillow Group website (Table 4.2). The median housing price for ‘Contributing’ properties is $767,575 and $810,141 for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. The median housing price for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties is higher than the median housing price for ‘Contributing’ properties by $42,566.
Table 4.2. Angelino Heights Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
<th>Number of Properties (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>767,575</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>810,141</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research from this study found that Angelino Heights historic district is designated at only the local level through the City of Los Angeles as an HPOZ. Often times the entire district is mistaken as being listed on the NRHP. However, research from this study also identified the entire 1300 block of Carroll Avenue to be officially listed on the NRHP (Figure 12). Carroll Avenue consists of 34 properties listed on the NRHP and of those 34 properties, 32 contribute to the NRHP and 2 provided not price data from the Zillow Group website. The median housing prices for ‘Contributing’ properties on Carroll Avenue is $826,327 (Table 4.3). The median housing price on Carroll Avenue for ‘Contributing’ properties is higher than the median for ‘Contributing’ properties in the Angelino Heights HPOZ by $58,752.

Table 4.3 Carroll Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
<th>Number of Properties (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>$826,327</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Price Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 12: Map of 1300 Carroll Avenue in Angelino Heights HPOZ (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015)
The Whitley Heights historic district contains 239 properties surveyed for this thesis study by the City of Los Angeles. The map contains both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. For this study, 184 contributed to the district, 27 did not contribute and 28 provided no data from the Zillow Group website (Table 4.4). Properties that provided no data from the Zillow Group website consisted of both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. The median housing price for ‘Contributing’ properties is $1,325,000 and $1,415,253 for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. The median housing price for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties is therefore, higher than ‘Contributing’ properties by $90,253.

Research from this study found that Whitley Heights historic district is designated at both the local and national level through the City of Los Angeles as an HPOZ and by the NRHP. Data for this district is limited as the NRHP does not clearly define the boundary lines of the district nor does it provide an accurate number of homes within the district. Property data for this district may differ based on both local and national designations due to the undefined boundary lines.

Table 4.4 Whitley Heights Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
<th>Number of Properties (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>1,325,000</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>1,415,253</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 27\textsuperscript{th} and 28\textsuperscript{th} Street historic district contains sixty properties surveyed by the City of Los Angeles. The map contains ‘Contributing,’ ‘Contributing-Altered’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. The results of this study consisted of 29 ‘Contributing’ properties, 10 ‘Contributing-Altered’ properties, 16 ‘Non-Contributing’ properties and 5 containing no data (Table 4.5).

The median housing price for ‘Contributing’ properties is $482,501, $522,298 for ‘Contributing-Altered’ and $491,609 for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. The median housing price for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties is higher than ‘Contributing’ properties by $9,108. By including the median housing price for ‘Contributing-Altered’ properties, the median consisted of $522,298 which clearly exceed that of both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property type</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
<th>Number of Properties (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>482,501</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing-Altered</td>
<td>522,298</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>491,609</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. 27\textsuperscript{th} & 28th Street Historic District Median Home Price: 2015

Research from this study found that 27\textsuperscript{th} and 28\textsuperscript{th} Street historic district is designated at both the local and national levels through the City of Los Angeles as an HPOZ and the NRHP. However, only half of the district is listed on the NRHP under 27\textsuperscript{th} Street historic district (Figure 13). Therefore, data is limited as to why only have of the district is list on the NRHP. The 27\textsuperscript{th} Street historic district consists of 57 properties listed.
on the NRHP and of those 57 properties, 45 contributing to this study and 12 provided no data from the Zillow Group website. The median housing price for 27th Street historic district is $482,582 and appears to be slightly higher than the median for 27th & 28th Street HPOZ by $81 (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6. 27th Street Historic District
Median Home Price: 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property type</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
<th>Number of Properties (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>482,582</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Price Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 13: Map of 27th Street Historic District in 27th & 28th Street HPOZ (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015)
The Pico-Union historic district contains 1,013 properties surveyed for this study by the City of Los Angeles. The map consists of both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. The results of this study consists of 405 ‘Contributing’ properties, 147 ‘Non-Contributing’ properties and 461 properties that did not contain any data from the Zillow Group website (Table 4.7). The median housing price for ‘Contributing’ properties is $636,389 and $637,461 for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. The median housing price for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties is higher than the median for ‘Contributing’ properties by $1,072. Properties that contained no data from the Zillow Group website consisted of both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. Housing price data was limited for this district as many of the properties on the map did not match the properties on the Zillow Group website. These properties appeared to have been merged therefore, not providing an accurate count for each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
<th>Number of Properties (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>636,389</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>637,461</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research from this study found that the Pico-Union historic district is designated at the local level through the City of Los Angeles as an HPOZ. However, research from this study also found that two additional districts are listed on the NRHP and can be found within the Pico-Union HPOZ. Alvarado Terrace historic district and South Bonnie
Brae historic district have been officially listed on the NRHP (Figure 14). Data was also limited for the South Bonnie Brae historic district as the NRHP does not provide accurate boundary lines nor an accurate count of homes but rather just the street name and cross street.

The Alvarado Terrace historic district consists of ninety properties surveyed for this study and by the City of Los Angeles. The results of this study consists of 53 ‘Contributing’ properties and 37 properties that provided to price data from the Zillow Group website. The median housing price is $838,264 and when compared to the rest of the Pico-Union HPOZ is much higher (Table 4.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
<th>Number of Properties (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>838,264</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Price Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 14: Map of Alvarado Terrace Historic District and South Bonnie Brae Historic District in Pico-Union HPOZ (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015)
4.2 Housing price analysis of districts not listed on NRHP

The University Park historic district consists of 800 properties surveyed by the City of Los Angeles. The map consists of ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. Results from this study consisted of 337 ‘Contributing’ properties, 113 ‘Non-Contributing’ properties and 350 properties contained no data from the Zillow Group website (Table 4.9). These 350 properties are a combination of ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties within the district.

The median housing price for ‘Contributing’ properties is $588,363 and $590,115 for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. Therefore, the median housing price for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties is higher than ‘Contributing’ properties by $1,752. Housing price data was limited as many properties within the district did not match the map on the Zillow Group website. The median housing price both types of properties is therefore not accurate for this study as 350 properties provided no data.

Table 4.9. University Park Historic District
Median Home Price: 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
<th>Number of Properties (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>588,363</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>590,115</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research from this study found that the University Park historic district is a local designation within the City of Los Angeles as an HPOZ and two districts are registered on the NRHP within the University Park HPOZ. Twentieth Street historic district and St. James Park historic district can both be found within the HPOZ boundaries. Research
from this study also found an additional district listed on the NRHP located southwest of the University Park HPOZ, however not a part of it (Figure 15). The North University Park historic district has been officially designated with the NRHP and is often times confused with University Park HPOZ.

The North University Park historic district consist of over 60 homes listed on the NRHP. Data is limited as the exact count of homes is not provided by the NRHP however the boundaries are defined. The district consists of 43 ‘Contributing’ properties for this study and 17 that provided no data from the Zillow Group website. The median housing price is $1,175,605 which is clearly higher than the median for the University Park HPOZ by $587,242 (Table 4.10). Data is also limited explaining the reason this district is not within the University Park HPOZ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
<th>Number of Properties (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>1,175,605</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Price Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10. North University Park Historic District
Median Home Price: 2015
Figure 15: Map of North University Park Historic District and Twentieth Historic District in University Park HPOZ (Los Angeles’ Department of City Planning 2015)
The Harvard Heights historic district consists of 825 properties surveyed for this study by the City of Los Angeles. The map consists of both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties within the district. Results from this study consisted of 473 ‘Contributing’ properties, 124 ‘Non-Contributing’ properties and 228 properties that provided no data from the Zillow Group website (Table 4.11). Properties that contained no data consisted of both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties.

The median housing price for ‘Contributing’ properties is $761,476 and $694,383 for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. Therefore, the median housing price for ‘Contributing’ properties is higher than ‘Non-Contributing’ properties by $670,093. Housing price data was limited as some of the properties on the map appeared to have been merged therefore, not matching properties on the Zillow Group website. Research from this study found that Harvard Heights historic district is designated at only the local level through the City of Los Angeles as an HPOZ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
<th>Number of Properties (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>761,476</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>694,383</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miracle Mile historic district consists of 604 properties surveyed for this study and by the City of Los Angeles. The map consists of both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties within the district. Results from this study consisted of 541
‘Contributing’ properties, 60 ‘Non-Contributing’ properties and 3 that provided no data from the Zillow Group website (Table 4.12). The 3 properties containing no data all consisted of ‘Non-Contributing’ properties.

The median housing price for ‘Contributing’ properties is $1,823,995 and $1,674,015 for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties within the district. Therefore, the median housing price for ‘Contributing’ properties is higher than ‘Non-Contributing’ properties by $149,980. The housing price data for this district was accurate as all properties on the map matched with those on the Zillow Group website with the exception of the three properties containing no data. Research from this study found that the Miracle Mile historic district is designated at only the local level through the City of Los Angeles as an HPOZ with no other districts from the NRHP located within it.

Table 4.12. Miracle Mile Historic District
Median Home Price: 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
<th>Number of Properties (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>1,823,995</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>1,674,015</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Balboa Highlands historic district consists of 156 properties surveyed for this study and by the City of Los Angeles. The map consists of ‘Contributing’ properties, ‘Contributing-Altered’ properties and ‘Non-contributing’ properties within the district. Results from this study consisted of 67 ‘Contributing’ properties, 43 ‘Contributing-Altered’ properties and 46 ‘Non-Contributing’ properties (Table 4.13). The housing price
data for this district was accurate as all properties on the map matched with those on the Zillow Group website.

The median housing price for ‘Contributing’ properties is $659,690, $656,371 for ‘Contributing-Altered’ and $655,042 for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties within the district. The median housing price for ‘Contributing’ properties is higher than the median housing price for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties by $4,648. By including the median housing price for ‘Contributing-Altered’ properties, the median was $656,371 which appears to be within the median housing prices of both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. Research from this study found that the Balboa Highlands historic district is designated at only the local level through the City of Los Angeles as an HPOZ with no other districts listed on the NRHP located within it.

Table 4.13 Balboa Highlands Historic District
Median Home Price: 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
<th>Number of Properties (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>659,690</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing-Altered</td>
<td>656,371</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>655,042</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Stonehurst historic district consists of 87 properties surveyed for this study and by the City of Los Angeles. The map contains ‘Contributing,’ ‘Contributing-Altered’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties found within the district. Results from this study consisted of 28 ‘Contributing’ properties, 28 ‘Contributing-Altered’ properties, 27 ‘Non-Contributing’ properties and 4 that provided no data from the Zillow Group website.
These 4 properties consisted of 3 ‘Contributing’ properties and 1 ‘Non-Contributing’ property. Housing price data is limited as a number of properties did not match the map on the Zillow Group website and appear to have been merged however, these properties are ‘Non-Contributing’ properties.

The median housing price data for ‘Contributing’ properties is $392,091, $446,674 for ‘Contributing-Altered’ properties and $444,048 for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties (Table 4.14). The median housing price for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties is higher than the median housing price for ‘Contributing’ properties by $51,957. By including the median housing price for ‘Contributing-Altered’ properties the median is $446,674 which appears to be higher than the median for both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
<th>Number of Properties (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>392,091</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing-Altered</td>
<td>446,674</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>444,048</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.14 Stonehurst Historic District
Median Home Price: 2015

4.3 Comparative analysis of overall property values

The first hypothesis is that there is a significant relationship between property value and designated historic districts in Los Angeles County. The results indicate higher property values on the five districts containing districts listed on the NRHP compared to the five districts with only local designations (Table 4.15 and 4.16). Question one is
answered as the results clearly show an increase in property value in districts designated at the national level in Los Angeles County. The results from the comparative analysis indicate a trend for house price increase between both districts. Studies have shown that districts designated at either the local or national level tend to benefit from property value increase. In this case, eight of the ten districts are officially listed on the NRHP with nine containing local designations through the City of Los Angeles.

Table 4.15. Districts Listed on the NRHP
Median Home Price: 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bungalow Heaven Historic District</td>
<td>754,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelino Heights Historic District</td>
<td>767,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley Heights Historic District</td>
<td>1,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th &amp; 28th Street Historic District</td>
<td>482,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pico-Union Historic District</td>
<td>636,389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.16 Districts Not Listed on the NRHP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Median Price ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Park Historic District</td>
<td>588,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Heights Historic District</td>
<td>761,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miracle Mile Historic District</td>
<td>1,823,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balboa Highlands Historic District</td>
<td>659,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonehurst Historic District</td>
<td>392,091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second hypothesis is that both types of designations benefit the entire community. Research from this study has helped answer questions three and has found that local involvement has been effective in both local and national designated districts as homeowners and residents alike adhere to the districts guidelines and tend to properly maintain their historic home. As district designation takes place, homeowners and community members can take part in rehabilitating their neighborhood. Active community involvement gives residents a sense of pride therefore, actively maintaining their homes to their original design.

The third hypothesis is that both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties add integrity to districts. The results from the analysis for both districts designated at the local and national level show an intricate relationship between ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties. The results from the analysis showed the median housing price for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties to be higher than ‘Contributing’ properties in seven of the ten districts. This shows that ‘Non-Contributing’ properties benefit from being in a
designated district as property value appears to be higher and therefore adds integrity to the district. This hypothesis helps answer question two as the results show that the median housing price for three out of the ten districts were relatively close.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

Data for the median housing price for all ten districts within Los Angeles County was obtained in order to study the relationship between the five districts listed on the NRHP to the five that only containing a local designation. The results show the differences of the median housing prices within each district and amongst all ten. Research and the results of the analysis of the median housing prices showed additional districts that were also studied and compared.

The results of the housing price analysis showed a significant relationship between property values and designated historic districts in Los Angeles County. This analysis helped support the first hypothesis with the results indicating higher property values on the five districts listed on the NRHP compared to the five districts with only local designations. The results show the median home price for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties to be higher than the median for ‘Contributing’ properties within the districts. Overall, the Whitley Heights historic district contained a higher median home price difference between ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties of $90,253 as oppose to the other four districts listed on the NRHP where the median home prices were a lot less.

The research for this study uncovered additional districts found within five of the ten districts. This helped support the second hypothesis of dual designations, local and national, benefitting the entire community. Research found homeowners and residents actively participate in the preservation process within their designated districts by
adhering to the districts guidelines and properly maintaining their historic homes. Active community involvement has given residents a sense of pride for their neighborhood.

The research for districts listed on the NRHP did uncover only two of the five districts to be fully listed on the NRHP. Both the Bungalow Heaven historic district and the Whitley Heights historic district are listed on the NRHP however, data is limited as the exact boundary lines and number of properties for the Whitley Heights historic district are not provided by the NRHP. Research also found additional districts listed on the NRHP within five of the ten districts therefore, these districts contain dual designations through the NRHP and as an HPOZ through the City of Los Angeles. These five districts varied in size and in the number of ‘Contributing’ properties. Data was limited as the exact boundary lines and number of ‘Contributing’ properties is not provided by the NRHP.

Research found only half of 27th and 28th Street historic district to be listed on the NRHP. 27th Street is fully listed on the NRHP while data is limited as to why 28th Street of the district is not included. Research also found an additional district listed on the NRHP located just southwest of University Park historic district. This district known as the North University Park historic district is fully listed on the NRHP and it is often mistaken for the University Park historic district. However, data is limited as to why it is not part of the University Park HPOZ since it is in close proximity.

The results help support the third hypothesis of both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties and the integrity they add to historic districts. Results from the analysis indicate the median for ‘Non-Contributing’ properties to be higher than ‘Contributing’ properties in seven of the ten districts. This intricate relationship between
the two property types shows that both ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties benefit from local and national district designations as property values appeared to be higher.

Research and data were both limited by many factors. Future research on this topic would need to address several issues. First, nationally designated districts do not provide accurate boundary lines nor an accurate amount of “Contributing” properties. Having this information would allow for an accurate analysis of property values and an accurate comparison between all districts. Second, properties on the HPOZ maps provided by the City of Los Angeles did not match the properties on the Zillow Group website as many properties appeared to have been merged on the HPOZ maps. This did not allow for an accurate count of ‘Contributing’ and ‘Non-Contributing’ properties for the housing price analysis. Lastly, many properties from all districts did not provide housing prices on the Zillow Group website. This limited the data as the overall housing price median for all districts did not account for all of the properties displayed on the maps.

Results should add to the literature on historic preservation within Los Angeles County and may allow for additional district designations. These findings create additional research questions. First, the relationship between property value and any type of historic district designation should be extended to include other historic districts within Los Angeles County. These findings may lead to the need to compare historic districts to other cities or counties in California to allow for more diverse data. Second, comparing housing price data for local designations to national designations within other counties should be evaluated to illustrate how they may differ from the median housing prices in
this study. Additional factors would strengthen future studies. Factors could include historic landmarks, historic commercial buildings, income and ethnicity. As the amount of research on this topic increases, strategies to preserve historic homes, districts and landmarks can bring awareness to future preservationists and the public alike.
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