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1. INTRODUCTION

In June of 2006 I prepared a Historic Structures/Sites Report for the property at 801 State Street, Santa Barbara, APN: 037-400-013, to analyze the potential effects of adding a third story to the Structure of Merit building. The minutes of the June 28, 2006 Historic Landmarks Commission meeting indicated that the Commission accepted the report but not the findings, with the condition that a Letter Addendum be provided addressing design alternatives when they are presented. In July 2019, Cearnal Collective proposed that the third floor contain two residential units.

On July 29, 2019, I prepared such a Letter Addendum addressing the impacts of the proposed design alternative. This Addendum was accepted by the Historic Landmarks Commission on August 7, 2019. Since that date, the project has changed the proposed second and third floor use from offices and two apartments to a hotel housing 14 units. This change required adding French doors with horizontally divided lights in the existing second floor openings on the south elevation and adding an elevator tower, stairwell, and roof deck. Nicole Hernandez wrote a Memo to the HLC on November 27, 2019, stating that these alterations met the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard 9 and that no further addendum to the Historic Structures/Sites Report was necessary as these proposed alterations would not have a negative impact on the building.

However, at the November 27, 2019 HLC meeting, the Commission requested that they would like to have further information from the applicant as to how the present amended project meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. As a result, this Phase 2 Addendum has been prepared, updating the proposed project’s few changes from the previous design and analyzing the impacts, if any, on the existing building from the current proposed project.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project’s changes from the previous design approved by HLC on August 7, 2019 include the alteration in use from offices and two residences to a hotel containing 14 units on the second and third floors. As a result, a roof deck would be added, approached by a stair and elevator tower at the west end of the south elevation and a stair tower set back from the east elevation roof. Windows to match period Spanish Colonial Revival style would be added to the openings in the south elevation second floor loggia and modern doors would be added in the existing third floor openings in the east façade. The new door to match the existing on the first floor south elevation will be moved down one arch to where the ATM machine is located. As well, upon further investigation, it is my professional opinion that the metal transom dividers I had thought were 1950s alterations appear to have been original, and these will be retained, rather than removed as I recommended in my July 29, 2019 letter addendum (see Sheet A202).
3. FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

During an architectural survey carried out in 1978, the building was declared eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources. In 1988, the Li Yee family, owners of the building, requested that it be designated as a Structure of Merit. In May of 1988, the Historic Landmarks Commission designated the building a Structure of Merit, under criteria A, D, G, and I.

Criterion A. This building has character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City. It anchors the northwest corner of De la Guerra Street, now part of the Paseo Nuevo Mall. It is eligible under Criterion A.

Criterion D. The Las Tiendas building represents the type of commercial Spanish Colonial Revival building constructed before the 1925 earthquake in response to the community plans and planting ideas to remake the City in a self-conscious Spanish style. As such it was an integral part of the early 1920s redesign of the downtown core of the City surrounding Casa de la Guerra, City, which included the Lobero Theatre, el Paseo, the News Press building, and City Hall. It is eligible under criterion D.

Criterion G. The building embodies elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship, in particular the arched windows on the first floor and the small arches on the second floor tower section. It is eligible under Criterion G.

Criterion I. This building anchors the northwest corner of East De la Guerra Street within the Paseo Nuevo mall. It is eligible under Criterion I.

The building retains integrity:

Integrity of location: The building retains integrity of location as it has not been moved.

Integrity of design: Its design integrity has been compromised by the 1950s alterations, yet the arched windows along De la Guerra Street, the open arches in the second floor corner, and the parapet roof with its carved rafter tails and stenciled eaves, maintain their original Spanish Colonial Revival elements and it retains integrity of design.

Integrity of setting: Since the construction of Paseo Nuevo, turning De la Guerra Street into a mall, with the addition of street furniture such as benches, trees, fountains, as mall amenities, its setting has been altered from a street setting to a plaza setting. The plaza amenities allow people to enjoy the building and the way it frames the entrance to the plaza. It retains integrity of setting.

Integrity of materials: The original plaster and red tile materials remain, as well as the arched window and door openings along the West De la Guerra Street elevation, the arched openings at the second floor corner, and the red tile roof with carved rafter tails and stenciled eaves. A review of the existing De la Guerra Street elevation reveals that it appears eight of the original 1925 transom windows, with metal muntins, and an original door at #2 survive. The door at #4, formerly Mel’s, appears to date to a later period. The building retains integrity of materials.
4. ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE

CEQA Guidelines for Determining Project Effects

CEQA defines a potential adverse effect as one that would cause a substantial change in the significance of a resource. Such a substantial change means demolition, destruction, relocation,
or alteration of the physical characteristics of the resource or its immediate surroundings that justify its eligibility for the CRHR or its inclusion in a local register of historic resources (PRC Section 15064.5 (b) (1,2)).

According to the latest CEQA guidelines, if a project involving significant historical resources follows The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties With Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Standards) (Weeks and Grimmer 1995), the project is considered to be mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historic resource (PRC Section 15064.5 (b) (3)). The Standards are as follows:

1. A property shall be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, shall not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.
8. Archeological resources shall be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a way that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Analysis of Proposed Project According to CEQA Guidelines

The previously proposed project was determined to meet these Standards, as noted in my July 29, 2019 letter accepted by the HLC. Per the HLC request at their November 27, 2019 meeting, the three proposed changes will be evaluated here.

1. A property shall be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
The distinctive materials, features, and spaces of the building are the corner elements with their second story arched openings, the rhythm of the arched openings along the De la Guerra Street first floor elevation, with the original transoms with metal muntins at eight of the ten arches, the original door at #2, the second floor loggias with their rectangular openings, and the red tile roof with its carved rafter tails and stenciled eaves. The majority of the materials are in good condition and will be repaired where necessary. The red roof tiles will be reused. The future of the roof supports and eaves and stenciling will be determined after the architect has made a study of them, to see if they are too frail to be reused. If so, detailed photo documentation of the building and architectural drawings of the eaves will be completed prior to any demolition to document the existing condition and ensure accurate replacement of any details too deteriorated to be reused.

It was described on the State Historic Resources inventory as a “well-scaled Spanish type structure”. The existing spatial relationships include its sense of scale and symmetry and its relationship to the buildings around it. The addition of the third story, set back 6 inches from the existing building and delineated by a cornice, with its reiteration of the scale and symmetry of the second story rectangular openings and wrought iron balconies and its reuse or recreation of the red tile parapet roof with its carved rafter tails and stenciled eaves, depending upon condition, will allow its sense of scale and symmetry to remain. It will still relate to the three and four story Paseo Nuevo buildings immediately to the north and west of the building (See Sheet A202). Therefore the project meets Standard 1.

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

The distinctive materials, features, and spaces of the building are the corner elements with their second story arched openings, the rhythm of the arched openings along the De la Guerra Street first floor elevation, with the original transoms with metal muntins at eight of the ten arches, the original door at #2, the second floor loggias with their rectangular openings, and the red tile roof with its carved rafter tails and stenciled eaves.

The proposed project will maintain these distinctive features, materials, and spaces. The future of the roof supports and eaves and stenciling will be determined after the architect has made a study of them, to see if they are too frail to be reused. If so, the architect will photo document them and prepare full-scale drawings to confirm that the original can be recreated accurately. Although at the west end of the elevation two doors will be reconfigured, because the rhythm of the arched openings remains, it does not remove features and spaces that characterize the property.

It was described on the State Historic Resources inventory as a “well-scaled Spanish type structure”. The existing spatial relationships include its sense of scale and symmetry and its relationship to the buildings around it. The addition of the third story, set back 6 inches from the existing building and delineated by a cornice, with its reiteration of the scale and symmetry of the second story rectangular openings and wrought iron balconies and its reuse or recreation of the red tile parapet roof with its carved rafter tails and stenciled eaves, The addition of the third story with its purposeful use of the scale and symmetry of the second story rectangular will allow the original building’s sense of scale and symmetry to remain. It will still relate to the three and four story Paseo Nuevo buildings immediately to the north and west of the building.
Therefore the project meets Standard 2.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, shall not be undertaken.

No conjectural features or elements from other historical properties will be added as part of the project. The project therefore meets Standard 3.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

There are no changes that have acquired historic significance. The project therefore meets Standard 4.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

The distinctive materials, features, and spaces of the building are the corner elements with their second story arched openings, the rhythm of the arched openings along the De la Guerra Street first floor elevation, with the original transoms with metal muntins at eight of the ten arches and the original door at #2, the second floor loggias with their rectangular openings, and the red tile roof with its carved rafter tails and stenciled eaves. The first floor original transoms and door #2, the second story arched openings, second floor loggia, and red roof tiles will be preserved. The future of the roof supports and eaves and stenciling will be determined after the architect has made a study of them, to see if they are too frail to be reused. If so, the architect will prepare full-scale drawings and complete photo documentation prior to any demolition to confirm that the original has been recreated accurately to match existing. The project therefore meets Standard 5.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

The historic features, such as the windows, transoms, and doors are not deteriorated and are generally in good condition, and will be repaired where necessary. The red roof tiles will be carefully removed and reused at the reconstructed roof. The future of the roof supports and eaves and stenciling will be determined after the architect has made a study of them, to see if they are too frail to be reused. If so, the architect will prepared full-scale drawings and complete photo documentation prior to any demolition to confirm that the original has been recreated accurately and recreated to match existing. The project therefore meets Standard 6.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.

This Standard is applicable to potential treatments of the window repair and reuse of the red roof tiles, and the potential reuse of the carved rafters and stenciled eaves. For guidance, refer to “Preservation Briefs 4: Roofing for Historic Buildings” and “Preservation Briefs 9:
The Repair of Historic Wood Windows”. When utilized, the project meets Standard 7.

8. Archeological resources shall be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

This standard is beyond the scope of this report

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

The design for the proposed addition follows the Secretary of the Interior’s New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction guidelines for additions to historic buildings. Its recommendations are:

a. “Constructing a new addition that results in the least possible loss of historic materials so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged or destroyed”.

b. “Designing a new addition that is compatible with the historic building”.

c. “Ensuring that the addition is subordinate and secondary to the historic building and is compatible in massing, scale, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.

1. Infill the existing nine second floor openings on the south elevation and the three second floor openings on the east (State Street) elevation with period-appropriate multi-paned paired French doors. These windows will infill existing openings and are compatible with traditional Spanish Colonial Revival style doors. This part of the project meets Standard 9.

2. The proposed third floor door openings will be infilled with single-pane paired French doors. Because these doors are added into proposed openings that match the size and placement of the existing openings on the second floor, they are compatible with the scale of the building; because they have modern single-pane doors, they are differentiated from the old. This part of the project meets Standard 9.

3. Recreate original door in last arch on the west as opposed to the adjacent arch as approved in the November 2019 HLC meeting. It appears that this last opening, judging from the 1925 picture, could have been a door. Because it copies the existing original door at #2 and is placed in what appears to be an original door opening, this part of the project meets Standard 9.

4. Add a third floor stair and elevator tower at west end of south elevation and a stair tower at east end of the building. In order to design an appropriately-scaled elevator and stair tower at the west end of the south elevation, the roof was pulled back so the tower, set back 6” and delineated by the cornice, would stand alone and be subservient to the roof, as well as compatible with the materials, scale and proportion of the building. The stair tower at the east end of the building is set back sufficiently from the existing roof, with a matching hipped roof, to be compatible with the materials, scale and proportion of the building. This part of the project meets Standard 9.
5. The eight existing transom windows on the ground floor, with metal muntins delineating the glass panes, unlike what my previous report mentioned, appear to be original and will be retained. Two of the transoms have no metal muntins, and they will be left as existing, simply because it is not certain when they were installed. According to preservation practice, if provenance is not certain, to leave the existing in place. This part of the project meets Standard 9.

Metal muntins in the transom windows to be retained

Because none of these alterations will have a significant impact, the proposed project meets Standard 9.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a way that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The proposed new construction on the third floor if removed, would entail the recreated parapet and eaves to be lowered so that the essential form and integrity of the significant portion of the building could be restored, although this would not be a likely scenario. The project therefore meets Standard 10.

Conclusion

State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 defines a significant impact to a historic resource as follows:
(b) A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

(1) Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.

(2) The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

   (A) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or

   (B) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

   (C) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

(3) Generally, a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer, shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant.

(4) A lead agency shall identify potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant adverse changes in the significance of an historical resource. The lead agency shall ensure that any adopted measures to mitigate or avoid significant adverse changes are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.

The proposed project, while enhancing the building to provide hotel rooms, also includes the restoration of a number of 1925 features to bring its appearance closer to its original appearance. Because the proposed project meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the impact level is considered less than significant (Class III).