



City of Santa Barbara
Planning Division

Memorandum

DATE: October 5, 2016

TO: Historic Landmarks Commission

FROM: Nicole Hernandez, City Urban Historian

SUBJECT: **Staff Evaluation of additions and alterations to a property listed on the Potential Historic Resources List that is eligible to be designated a Structure of Merit.**

ADDRESS: **2205 Oak Park Lane**

PROJECT: Proposal for construction of two-story, 722 square foot addition to a Spanish Colonial Revival one-story house constructed in 1925. The project also includes demolition of an existing storage shed and the construction of a new two-story, 538 square foot rear dwelling unit and the addition of one parking space in the front yard, in front of the historic resource. The building has been listed on the Potential Historic Resources List since 1986 as eligible to be designated a Structure of Merit. The project will require a Historic Structures/Sites Report after the first concept review.

The Urban Historian evaluates projects to historic resources by first determining if a project is following the list of guidelines for additions that incorporate historic preservation principles set forth in the City's Historic Resource Design Guidelines, which are based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The purpose of this staff evaluation is to assist the Historic Landmarks Commission in the review of a project when no Historic Structures/Sites Report (HSSR) has been prepared and in order to guide applicants appropriately towards avoiding or lessening project impacts. The project is large and will require California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Analysis with an HSSR to assist in the supportability of the project.

Guidelines Compliance Evaluation Comments

Second Story Addition:

Historic Resource Design Guidelines from Chapter 17 on Additions:

17.1 Locate additions toward the rear of the main structure, away from the main façade and street front. Set back side additions from the primary façade in order to allow the original proportions, form, and overall character of the historic building to remain prominent. Avoid blocking or obstructing views of the front of the original structure.

The project partially meets this guideline: The second-story addition is set back 25' from the front façade of the historic resource. The addition to the rear of the front residence is large in width size.

Per the illustration for appropriate additions on page 108 of the Historic Resource Design Guidelines, an addition should not be wider than the original structure, which makes it more visible from the public right-of-way.

The project does not meet this guideline direction as it is wider than the historic resource.

17.3 Preserve original architectural details. Avoid damaging, removing, destroying, or obstructing significant architectural details of the original structure.

The project is removing the stucco arch element over the driveway; it is not clear to staff if this element is original.

17.4 Design the addition to be compatible with the original structure's mass, scale, and proportions. Avoid using a style different from that of the original structure.

The project does not meet this guideline. The proportions of the windows and individual lights are larger and in a different proportion than the original.

17.5 Design the addition to be subordinate to the main building and not "compete" with it.

The project meets this guideline. The addition is set back 25' from the façade of the original building, which makes it subordinate to the original resource. This is illustrated in the perspective drawings.

17.7 Minimize the impact of a second-story addition to the main structure so that it appears to be an integral part of the overall design and not an obvious addition.

The project does not meet this guideline: Because the blank wall on the portion of the front elevation has no fenestration patterns, rather than mimicking the opening pattern of the front elevation, makes it an obvious addition. The French doors offer the divided light configuration that is compatible with the divided lights below.

17.8 Use similar materials and fenestration patterns as the original structure.

Siding: *The project meets the evaluation design criteria: The project proposes smooth stucco siding to match the original stucco siding.*

Roofing: *The project meets the evaluation design criteria: The metal coping across the roofline matches that of the original parapet coping.*

Windows: *The project meets the evaluation design criteria: The new windows have patterns and divided light material to match those of original structure. The material of the windows is not noted in the preliminary plans, but staff suggests using wood, true divided light windows and doors.*

17.9 Echo roof forms. *The project does not meet this guideline as the roof form is hipped instead of following the crenellating pattern of the parapet of the original building.*

17.12 Use windows in the addition that are similar in character to those of the main structure.

The project meets the guideline: The windows in the addition are linear and echo the pattern of the divided lights of the original windows. The proposed lights are much larger in scale than those of the original windows. The plans note the windows will be deeply set in the stucco to match the existing.

New Rear Dwelling Unit:

19.1 Locate rear units toward the rear of the main structure, away from the main façade and street front. Set side units back from the primary façade in order to allow the original proportions, form, and overall character of the historic building to remain prominent. Avoid blocking or obstructing views of the front of the original.

The project meets this guideline. The rear unit is proposed to be situated toward the rear of the main structure and main façade and minimally visible from the public right-of-way. The historic building remains prominent on the streetscape.

19.2 Use landscape and design elements, such as walls and fences, to visually screen the rear unit from the street front.

The project does not meet this guideline. At this first conceptual stage, no landscaping or fencing are proposed. Staff recommends additional landscaping be utilized to visually screen the rear unit from the street.

The project meets the following six Chapter 19 guidelines as stated below.

19.3 Design the rear unit to be compatible with the original structure's mass, scale, and proportions.

The two-story rear dwelling unit is lower in height than the proposed two-story addition to the historic resource. The rear unit mimics the massing and scale of the addition but not the original historic building. There are

minimal windows on each elevation. The windows configuration appear to be linear and divided as those in the historic building, but the panes are much larger.

19.4 Design the rear unit to be subordinate to the main building and not “compete” with it. *The rear dwelling unit is subordinate to the historic building as it is set far back from the street and façade of the historic resource.*

19.5 Echo roof forms and materials of the original structure.

The roof of the rear dwelling unit is a hipped shaped roof that does not mimic the crenelated parapet of the Spanish Colonial Revival historic resource.

19.6 Relate the rear unit to the main structure by breaking up its mass into components that relate to the original, rather than overwhelm it.

The rear unit relates more to the new addition proposed on the historic resource than to the historic structure.

19.7 Avoid using a style different from that of the original structure, but distinguish the new building from the original structure through simplified architectural details.

The style of the rear dwelling unit is contemporary and does not have the Spanish Colonial Revival detailing.

19.8 Use similar finish materials and fenestration patterns as the original structure.

The rear dwelling unit has minimal fenestration. The plans indicate the fenestration to reflect the existing, but it does not indicate if it will be wood. The addition will use metal coping to match that on the historic resource.

Parking In Front Of The Historic Resource:

The Historic Resource Design Guidelines, Chapter 15, Streetscape and Parking, page 87 states:

Santa Barbara’s historic neighborhoods were developed when the automobile was in its infancy and the streetscapes were minimally affected by the car. While auto dependency is a fact of modern life and lack of parking is a critical issue, minimizing the visual impacts of the necessary accommodations for automobiles is important if we are to succeed in preserving the traditional flavor of our older neighborhoods. Historically, parking was an ancillary use which was typically located at the rear of the site. So, avoid locating parking in the front yard of the property.

Guideline 15.2: Avoid locating parking, garages, or carports in front yards of the property.

The project does not meet this guideline with the parking space proposed directly in front of the historic resource.

The Historic Resource Design Guidelines, Chapter 15, Fences Walls and Hedges states on page 92:

“Historically, stone walls, hedges, wood picket, and wrought iron fences were low in height at the front of a property. They were relatively transparent in nature, allowing views into front yards.”

Guideline 15.52 Maintain fences or shrubbery fronting a house at a height and transparency below 3’-6” in order to preserve views to and from the street appropriate to the preservation of a “street-friendly” relationship.

The project does not meet this guideline with the proposed landscaping screening the parking.

URBAN HISTORIAN SUMMARY COMMENTS. After the first concept review and design comments are considered by the applicant, a Historic Structures/Sites Report will be required to analyze the project per CEQA and assist in supportability of the project. Staff does not support parking in front of the historic resource as this will cause a negative impact to the front yard setting of the historic resource and the streetscape. Staff may support a zoning modification request to waive the second parking space requirement if it is demonstrated that there is no other viable place for parking.

Staff suggests the addition be narrowed so that it is not wider than the historic resource and that the addition and the rear dwelling unit mimic the parapet form and shape of the original building parapet line so that the addition relates to the original building. Study the proportions of the window panes and opening placement in the addition and rear dwelling unit and include details that indicate the new windows will be wood material to match the windows of the historic resource.