



**City of Santa Barbara**  
 Planning Division

**Memorandum**

**DATE:** November 10, 2015

**TO:** Historic Landmark Commission

**FROM:** Nicole Hernandez, City Urban Historian

**SUBJECT:** **Staff Evaluation of addition to a contributing building in the proposed Bungalow Haven Historic District**

**ADDRESS:** **621 East Sola Street**

The Urban Historian evaluates small 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 Secretary of 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 appropriately guide applicants towards avoiding project impacts. The Historic Landmarks Commission may confirm staff's conclusions regarding compliance with the listed guidelines at the time of project review; or may require other design changes; or a more detailed HSSR to be prepared.

**Property:** The survey found the minimal traditional style house constructed in 1938 retains a majority of its character defining elements including its combination of wide horizontal siding and board and batten siding, exterior shutters, and six over six, double hung wood windows. The house contributes to the visual and physical integrity of the district as the type of residence typically found in the City's modestly scaled residential neighborhoods during the first four decades of the twentieth century. The living area is primarily on the second level, with a one-car garage on the first.

**Project:** Proposal to construct the following; a one-story addition to the residence on the west side elevation set back 19' from the front elevation; a new uncovered parking space in front of the addition with a rolling gate to provide screening; an one-story addition to the rear elevation; a detached accessory building in the rear of the property that is not visible from the streetscape; remove a portion of the sandstone wall to widen the driveway by 2' and reconstruct using the salvaged stones to match existing; install a new roof with either composition shingle or standing seam metal material.

**Evaluation and Compliance with Guidelines for Additions**

- 1. Locate additions toward the rear of the main structure, away from the main façade and street front.**

*The project meets the evaluation guidelines:* The addition is in the rear and away from the main façade.

- 2. Use landscape elements, such as walls and fences, to visually screen the addition.**

*The project meets the evaluation guidelines:* The addition on the rear is screened by the historic resource and the proposed rolling gate.

**3. Design the addition to be compatible with the original structure's mass, scale and proportions.**

*The project meets the evaluation guidelines:* The rear additions are compatible with the original structure's mass, scale and proportions.

**4. Design the addition to be subordinate to the main building, and not "compete" with it.**

*The project meets the evaluation guidelines:* Because the rear addition is screened from the streetscape, it will be subordinate to the original structure, which will dominate the streetscape, and the additions will not compete with it.

**5. Echo roof forms and materials of the original structure.**

*The project meets the evaluation guidelines:* The rear additions echo the gable roof form of the original structure and will match existing material.

**6. Relate the addition to the main structure, rather than overwhelming it, by breaking up its mass into components that relate to the original.**

*The project meets the evaluation guidelines:* The rear additions mass are broken away from the main structure and relate to the main structure by echoing the shape.

**7. Avoid using a different style from the original structure. But, distinguish the addition from the original structure through simplified details.**

*The project meets the evaluation guidelines:* The addition uses simplified single pane, clad, casement windows that differ from the divided light, multi-light, double hung, wood windows of the original structure that distinguish it from the original.

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

*The project does not meet the evaluation guidelines:* The addition will use siding material to match the original material. If the project uses standing seam metal roofing, it will not be similar to the existing composition roof. Composition roofs mimic the original wood shingles roofs that were prevalent in the area. A standing seam metal roof would be an inappropriate treatment. The new windows on the side and rear elevation use a casement configuration, a different configuration as the original windows, however the clad windows will and have a wood trim similar to the original windows. However, the elevations are not visible from the streetscape and will not have a negative impact on the original front elevation of the house or streetscape.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** No Historic Structures/Sites Report is necessary at this time as the project will not have a negative impact to the potential historic significance of the contributing structure of the Bungalow Haven district. The project meets almost all of the evaluation design guidelines except for the use of a standing seam metal roof. The project, therefore, may qualify for a categorical exemption if the Commission agrees with the above evaluation and conclusions. Should the project significantly change, a Historic Structures Report may be required.