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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Cultural Landscape Study for 226-232 East Anapamu Street, 1117-1211 Garden Street, and 223 East Figueroa Street and the surrounding area was prepared for Greg Reitz (Figures 1 – 2). The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines state that proposed projects are to be analyzed to determine potential effects to historic resources. HR1 of the 2012 Historic Resources Element of the Santa Barbara General Plan provides for the protection of cultural and historic resources. Guidelines for determining the significance of a property are outlined in the City of Santa Barbara Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) (City of Santa Barbara MEA: Guidelines for Archaeological Resources and Historic Structures and Sites Reports (January 2002).

The first part of the study provides an introduction and the second part of the study is the Cultural Landscape study. The Cultural Landscape study provides an historical overview and context for the assessment and an evaluation of listed and/or potential historic resources within and adjacent to the study block and places the study parcels and surrounding neighborhood’s development pattern within the larger historical context of Santa Barbara’s history. The study area is located within the City of Santa Barbara’s Laguna Neighborhood (Figures 1 - 3). This study was prepared by Pamela Post, Ph.D. (senior author) and Timothy Hazeltine. A separate Revised Phase 1 Historic Structures/Sites Report has been prepared by Alexandra Cole of Preservation Planning Associates.

1.1 Previous Studies

A Phase 1 HSR prepared by Preservation Planning Associates was last reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission on August 23, 2017 ( a revised version of this Phase 1 HSR prepared by Preservation Planning Associates dated March 2018 has been submitted for review by the HLC). The Commission requested the project owner prepare a Cultural Landscape Study. This report addresses the following comments outlined in the minutes for the August 23, 2017 meeting of the HLC:

2. Discuss the Cultural Landscape, both the Figueroa Street ensemble and general neighborhood, and their relationship to each other. This comment is addressed on pages 59 - 74 of this report.

3. Discuss, free of any label, the spatial relationships of the Figueroa Street ensemble and identify what is important and unique about this. This comment is addressed on pages 73 and 74 of this report.

4. Discuss the historic feeling remaining in the neighborhood. This comment is addressed on pages 76 -79 of this report.

5. Identify precise distances to nearby historic or potentially historic resources. This comment is addressed on page 61 of this report.

6. Provide either a readable aerial photograph and/or plot plan of the block to show the spatial relationships in plan form. This comment is addressed by Figures 3, 3a, 3b, 27 and 42b of this report.

7. Discuss “the soul” of the neighborhood. This comment is addressed on pages 73 and 74 of this report.

1.2 Report Format

The first section of the report is comprised of a Cultural Landscape Study that provides a historic and visual context for the study parcels. The second section of the report evaluates the Cultural Landscape’s eligibility for listing as a significant historic resource.
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes a mixed-use project composed of residential units and commercial space. The project would remove several of the existing building and relocate others.

Figure 1, Location Map
3.0 CULTURAL LANDSCAPE STUDY

Introduction

This section of the report applies the guidelines for Cultural Landscape Studies found in: The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service). Because the scope of a full cultural landscape study would provide information not relevant to the current study the following scope of study is proposed:

- Characterize the setting of the study area in terms of topography, natural and man-made features;
- Characterize the current setting regarding plant communities. Identify the presence or absence of native plant communities. Characterize the current plant communities represented in and near the project area. Identify character defining trees and plants;
• Identify important hardscape features such as sandstone retaining walls, hitching posts etc. that are contributors to the streetscape;

• Identify historic land use patterns and how they have changed over the last 235 years; and

• Identify demographic patterns and shifts over time (i.e. the transition from middle class to working class and the post-World War II conversion of much of the block to institutional and commercial use); and

• This information will provide baselines for the analysis of significance in Phase 2 section of this report.

3.1 Guidelines for Identifying and Characterizing Cultural Landscapes

The National Park Service defines a Cultural Landscape as follows:

a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person, or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values. There are four non-mutually exclusive types of cultural landscapes: historic sites, historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, and ethnographic landscapes (https://www.nps.gov/policy/MP2006.pdf#page=167).

Cultural Landscapes are generally categorized as one of these four types:

• Historic Sites
• Historic Designed Landscapes
• Historic Vernacular Landscapes
• Ethnographic Landscapes

Cultural landscape studies explicate the association between a resource and relevant historic themes and development patterns that characterize a specific area or property. Generally, a cultural landscape study includes the following five steps: 1) Define the geographical boundaries and period of significance for the study area; 2) Incorporate and review previous historic resource studies within the project block; 3) Research the survey area using both primary and secondary sources; 4) Provide a synthesis of the survey area’s history and development; and 5) Characterize resource types within the survey area and evaluate their status as contributors or non/contributors to the significant historic themes identified for the study area.

The California State Historical Resources Commission has identified nine general historic themes for California, some of which are relevant to this study. These include the following: Aboriginal Culture, Architecture, Arts/Leisure, Economic/Industrial, Exploration/Settlement, Government, Military, Religion, and Social/Education. These themes broadly fall within the thematic framework identified by the City of Santa Barbara for the community. The significance criteria for the study area are the criteria set forth in the City of Santa Barbara Historic Resources Element. These include the City criteria for local designation, the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources.
3.2 Geographic Boundary Definition, Period of Significance and Environmental Setting

Boundary Definition

The surrounding area is identified by the General Plan as the Laguna Neighborhood. The boundary of the approximately 324-acre Laguna Neighborhood is defined on its north by Sola, Olive, and Micheltorena Streets; on the south by Cota Street; on the east by Milpas and Canon Perdido Streets, and easterly edge of Santa Barbara Junior High School (Santa Barbara General Plan 2011, Appendix B: 83 84) (Figure 3 and see Figure 3a).

![Figure 3, Map of Laguna Neighborhood](image)

Appendix B of The General Plan characterizes the Laguna Neighborhood as follows:

The Laguna neighborhood is a mixed residential neighborhood that transitions to denser multi-family, institutional, and office uses the closer you get to Santa Barbara Street and the Downtown. The northeastern part of the Laguna neighborhood, between Victoria and Micheltorena Streets, north of Olive Street, is presently developed with single family dwellings with some duplexes and multi-family homes interspersed throughout the neighborhood. This area includes a large portion of the Lower Riviera Special Design District (Bungalow District). The General Plan land use designation for this area of Laguna is Medium Density Residential, 12 du/acre, consistent with the present R-2 zoning. This area has seen a fair share of development (both residential and non-residential) as well as mixed use over the past twenty years. A large number of parcels between Garden and Salsipuedes Street (excluding the Bungalow District area) are
developed with multiple units. However, there still remain parcels developed with single family homes that could possibly redevelop with multiple units in the future.

The neighborhood contains a number of institutional uses including Santa Barbara High School, Santa Barbara Junior High School, Antioch University, the National Guard Armory, the city’s Community Development, Public Works and Park and Recreation Buildings, and the SB High School District offices. The neighborhood contains a number of senior and affordable public housing study s including Presidio Springs senior housing, the Laguna Cottages for seniors and Presidio Gardens family housing. Ortega Park is located in the neighborhood. A portion of the Laguna neighborhood falls within El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District.

Within the Laguna Neighborhood the focus of the cultural landscape study is the block bounded by the 300 block of East Anapamu Street, the 300 block of East Figueroa Street, the 1110 block of Santa Barbara Street and the 1110 block of Garden Street as well as the facing street frontages along the west side of Santa Barbara Street, the east side of Garden Street, the north side of East Anapamu Street and the South side of East Figueroa Street (Figures 3a - 3b).
3.3 Period of Significance and Resource Type

Based on the historical overview in Section 4 of this report the period of significance is 1870 to 1945, the period when most of the block’s residential housing was built and the surrounding neighborhood developed its characteristic development pattern and visual appearance. Based on the above guidelines the study area can be classified as a Historic Vernacular Landscape.

3.4 Environmental Setting

The project block and surrounding area is defined by the General Plan as the Laguna Neighborhood. The neighborhood’s dominant landscape features are Mission Ridge which extends east from Mission Canyon to Sycamore Canyon and the raised topography that defines the boundaries of what was once El Estero, a tidal slough that extended from the beachfront to what is now Santa Barbara High School. At the base of the ridge alluvial deposits from Mission and Sycamore Canyon creeks has filled the basin between Mission Ridge and the Mesa. These geological features have resulted from...
tectonic movement and erosion over the last several hundred thousand years. Within the proposed
district the terrain generally slopes from north to south. Steeper terrain is found along the base of
Mission Ridge. Originally, the vegetation was coastal chaparral on the hillsides and riparian plant
communities along the creek beds and sloughs. Over the last 235 years human activity, including
grazing, agriculture, and urbanization, have transformed the Laguna Neighborhood into an urban
environment composed of single and multiple family residences and commercial and institutional
development. Neighborhoods in Santa Barbara, such as the Laguna Neighborhood, derive their
character from a combination of natural environmental features and the built environment. For
example, the sloping topography and hillsides along East Anapamu Street that define the edge of
the former tidal estuaries are defining features of the neighborhood which have informed patterns of
development over the last 236 years.

3.5 Review of Previous Studies and Research

Review Previous Studies

Architectural Survey records for the study block were reviewed to provide information for the historic
context. The City of Santa Barbara official lists of Landmarks, Structures of Merit and Potential Historic
Resources were also reviewed. Relevant data from selected historic resource reports for parcels in
the study block completed by Ronald Nye, Ph.D. and Alexandra Cole were also reviewed.
Architectural survey reports for the nearby Lower Riviera Neighborhood prepared by Post/Hazeltine
Associates were also examined to provide relevant information about the development of the
surrounding neighborhood.

3.6 Research

The following repositories of historic records were reviewed during the preparation of this report:

City of Santa Barbara

- Street Files for the study block and surrounding area; and
- Architectural Survey forms for the study block and surrounding area.

County of Santa Barbara, Clerk, Recorder, Assessor’s Office

- Assessor Parcel Information.

Santa Barbara Historical Museum, Gledhill Library

- Maps of downtown Santa Barbara, 1852 – 2010;
- Photograph files for downtown Santa Barbara and Anapamu, Figueroa, Santa Barbara and
  Garden Streets.
- Name File Index; and
- City Directories and Telephone Books.

University of California, Santa Barbara, Davidson Library

- Map and Imagery, Digitized Aerial Photography.
3.7 Historic Context

3.7.1 Pre-Contact Period, Prehistory to 1782

In the pre-contact period what later became the City of Santa Barbara was within the region inhabited by the Chumash, a Native American culture group who inhabited the area between Malibu and San Luis Obispo County and the Channel Islands. At the time of European contact, the Chumash were a semi-sedentary culture with extensive trade networks and a complex social and political organization. The coastal Chumash were characterized by an extensive maritime adaptation including the use of ocean-going wood plank canoes.

3.7.2 The Spanish and Mexican Periods 1782-1848

While Spain had claimed California since the 16th century, it was not until 1769 that the first permanent Spanish settlement was established at San Diego. The San Diego Mission and the nearby presidio were the first in a series of forts and missions that were built between San Diego and the San Francisco Bay area in the years between 1769 and 1820. It was not until 1782 that the Santa Barbara Presidio was founded at what is now the intersection of East Canon Perdido and Santa Barbara Streets. The Spanish established Santa Barbara, not as a civilian-governed pueblo, but as a presidio (fort) ruled by a military commandante. Built over many years, the rectangular adobe-walled fort was composed of quarters for the soldiers and commandante, workrooms, storerooms and a chapel. Some of the land surrounding the fort was brought into cultivation, while other areas were relegated to grazing livestock and horses. Beginning in the late 18th century the fort’s inhabitants began to build adobe houses near the presidio. Informally arranged, the layout of these houses did not follow a formal plan in their placement though most were within a few-minute walk of the Presidio. Due to the extreme difficulty in obtaining finished building materials, these houses, with very few exceptions, vernacular in type buildings with adobe walls, tiled roofs and wood shutters rather than glazed windows.

In 1786, four years after the Presidio was established, the Franciscan order founded Mission Santa Barbara at the mouth of Mission Canyon with the intention of Christianizing the Chumash and transforming them from hunter gatherers into agriculturalists. Eventually growing to more than 900 inhabitants, the mission complex included a church, quarters for the Franciscan fathers, a village of adobe houses for the Chumash converts, a tannery, pottery, and a weavery connected to an extensive waterworks system at the west end of Mountain Drive that included two reservoirs, a filter house for purifying water and a grist mill. This water system was supplied water from reservoirs in Mission Canyon and Rattlesnake Canyon connected via aqueducts to the mission. These aqueducts also supplied irrigation to walled gardens that extended from the Mission to east of what is now Montgomery Avenue. Grazing and the cutting of trees and brush by inhabitants of the Mission and Presidio for fuel would soon transform the hills behind Santa Barbra into an essentially barren hillside denuded of much of its vegetation.
In 1821 Spanish rule of Santa Barbara ended and California became a Mexican territory. During the Mexican era (1821 to 1848) the economy was primarily focused on cattle-raising for the lucrative hide and tallow trade. To a significant degree this economic trend was propelled by the secularization of the missions which effectively transferred their wealth and lands to the secular authorities who granted ex-mission lands and cattle herds to Mexican citizens. California’s economy was soon dominated by stock-raising, and the extensive lands brought under cultivation by the missionaries were largely abandoned. By the late 1840s the burgeoning hide and tallow trade made some California families, including several in Santa Barbara, such as the De la Guerras, Carrillos and Ortegas wealthy and politically powerful. In Santa Barbara these families built substantial town houses, such as the Casa de La Guerra that for the first time, incorporated materials such as wood flooring and extensive use of furniture and decorative elements.

Despite the construction of more substantial houses, Santa Barbara remained a small community of adobe houses clustered around the remnants of the Presidio. While accurate maps of Santa Barbara do not exist for this era, the 1853 Coast Survey Map completed shortly after California passed to American control gives a good impression of Santa Barbara at the close of the Mexican Era (Figures 4 & 4a). This map depicts the study block crossed by trails, one leading from Montecito northwest to Mission Santa Barbara (see Figure 4a). Another trail extended from the main trail up north over Mission Ridge. Except for these trails, the area between Anacapa Street and Milpas Street was largely undeveloped. Far-reaching economic and demographic changes would not occur until after 1848 when California was officially ceded by Mexico to the United States after the Mexican-American War.

Selected Development Chronology

1782: Beginnings of permanent Euro-Hispanic settlement with the establishment of the Santa Barbara Presidio at what is now the intersection of East Canon Perdido and Santa Barbara Streets;

1786: Mission Santa Barbara established at what is now the intersection of Laguna and East Los Olivos Street. Grows to a settlement of over 1,000 Chumash converts surrounded by extensive cultivation including orchards, row crops and vineyards irrigated by a waterworks system including aqueducts, reservoirs, and a water filtration system that extended from Mission and Rattlesnake canyons to the Mission. The settlement’s industrial component included a pottery, ironworking, weaving and tanning. The mission was linked to the presidio by a network of cart paths and pedestrian paths, one of which extended through the study block (see Figure 4);

c. 1790-1820: Civilian settlement extends outside of the boundaries of the presidio with the construction of houses and the establishment of cultivated fields and orchards;

c. 1790-1848: No development occurred within the study block. The Burke Adobe was located in Block 123 (now the location of the Santa Barbara Courthouse) while the north side of the 200 block of East Anapamu Street and the 200 block of East Figueroa Street remained undeveloped (see Figure 4a);

c. 1834-1848: Santa Barbara comes under Mexican rule. Santa Barbara Mission is secularized in 1834 and its extensive settlement, waterworks and industrial operations are largely abandoned. With the advent of secularization, economic and political power passes to leading families like the Ortegas and De La Guerras who build large town houses in Santa Barbara. The presidio, whose military value has decreased, falls into disrepair and the community’s center is relocated to De La Guerra Plaza adjacent to Jose De La Guerra’s town home.
c. 1834-1848: Throughout this period the study block and its environs remain undeveloped (see Figures 4 & 4a).

**Figure 4: 1853 Coast Survey Map depicting Mission Santa Barbara and Presidio Area**

(see next page)
3.7.3 Early Statehood - Americanization Period 1848-1887

Santa Barbara, like other settlements in California, began its transition into an American city during the late 1840s. The most notable manifestation of this was the imposition in the early 1850s of an orthogonal street grid over the existing settlement without regard to topography, existing placement property boundaries, roadways, or buildings (Figures 5 & 5a). Set at right angles, the orthogonal grid divided the city in a rectangular grid of streets, blocks, and lots that standardized the recording of property boundaries and the sale and taxation of property (virtually every existing town in California was platted-out during the 1850s following this standardized layout). Property boundaries that could be ascertained by survey replaced the more informal and less accurate system used during the Mexican period.

The imposition of American sovereignty in 1848 and statehood in 1850 resulted in an influx of new settlers in Santa Barbara. Initially, however, Hispanic-surnamed families continued to dominate the community’s economic and political life, as detailed in the 1850 Santa Barbara County tax assessment roles, which lists that 33 of the 45 wealthiest property owners in the county, with assets
over $5,000, had Spanish-surnames (Camarillo, 1967: 26). By the early 1860s floods and droughts had decimated the cattle herds that formed the basis for the ranchero’s wealth. During the 1860s the community’s economy transitioned away from one dominated by cattle-raising to a more diverse one featuring agriculture, real estate speculation and commercial ventures in addition to the cattle-raising that had dominated the California economy since the 1830s. It was during this period that State Street, the town’s main street began to develop as the town’s commercial corridor.

Hemmed in on the north, south and east by mountains and hills and on the west by the Santa Barbara Channel, traveling to and from Santa Barbara required arduous overland travel by stagecoach or conveyance by ship. While ships provided the quickest and most direct route to Santa Barbara, the lack of a port, or wharf precluded efficient on-loading or offloading of freight or passengers. As late as the 1860s, passengers and freight were still brought to shore by skiff. Without adequate maritime facilities or roads, Santa Barbara’s commerce and communication with the outside world was fitful and irregular at best (Graham et al. 1994: 6 - 7).

The City grew slowly during the period between 1850 and 1870 as can be seen from a comparison of the Coast Survey Maps of 1853 and 1870 (see Figures 5 – 5a). State Street between the 600 and 1000 blocks was the town’s commercial corridor. Residential neighborhoods were located on either side of State Street, with a Hispanic enclave around the remains of the Presidio at the intersection of Santa Barbara and East Canon Perdido Street and Euro-American settlement more widely scattered on either side of State Street between the 400 and 1100 blocks. During this period there was not a strict division between residential neighborhoods and commercial zones; houses and businesses were often intermixed. The area between East Anapamu Street and Milpas Street, including the study block (Block #122 on Figure 5a) whose terrain featured steeper slopes and sloughs, remained largely undeveloped except for a few houses scattered on the lower slopes of Mission Ridge.

Adobe continued to be the most common construction material, even for recently arrived Anglo settlers. The use of adobe was not a matter of choice; rather it reflected the difficulty in transporting milled lumber and building supplies to Santa Barbara. While construction of wood frame structures was expensive and beyond the means of many new residents, other architectural forms typical of Anglo construction, including double-hung glazed wood sash windows, wood floors, and steeply pitched wood shingle roofs, and, when available, horizontal wood siding, were applied to adobe houses. The employment of these architectural elements, which were readily identified as “American” rather than Hispanic, signaled an intent to impose mid-19th century American architectural forms on what had been a Hispanic pueblo. Within the study block, development proceeded slowly during the period between the late 1840s and the mid-1870s as a review of contemporary maps reveals only one house (now demolished) had been built in the study block between 1853 and 1870 (see Figures 6 – 8a). While the City’s street grid had been surveyed in 1852, few of the streets had been graded in the area between Anacapa Street and Milpas Street (then named Front Street). In fact, East Anapamu Street would not be extended completely through to Milpas Street until the 1890s.

After the completion of Stearns Wharf in 1872, the City began to assume the character and spatial layout of a Victorian-era American town. New buildings were built in a range of American architectural styles among the most popular were the Vernacular (Folk Victorian) and late Italianate styles. Wood became the dominant building material for residential construction and almost without exception new construction respected the orthogonal street grid with houses set on deep lots set perpendicular to the street. The city’s population grew throughout the 1870s, largely driven by the development of the region’s nascent resort and agriculture industries. In 1875 the Arlington Hotel, Santa Barbara’s first upscale resort hotel was opened. Tourism, and the reputedly restorative powers
of the region’s benign Mediterranean climate for those in ill-health, quickly established Santa Barbara as one of California’s leading resort towns. Tourism, agriculture and ranching would form the basis of Santa Barbara’s economy until the early 20th century.

The construction of the wharf, coupled with the development of the area’s tourist industry and the anticipated arrival of the Southern Pacific Railroad, sparked a speculative real estate boom in Santa Barbara during the mid-1870s. Speculators began to subdivide land surrounding the downtown into smaller parcels that were sold for residential development and small farms. A comparison of the 1870 Coast Survey Map, the 1877 Bird’s Eye View of Santa Barbara and the 1878 Wackenreuder, reveals the scale of this transformation, with approximately 27 buildings and structures located within the eight blocks surrounding the study block, most located within the three blocks fronting Santa Barbara Street (Figures 9 – 10a). A review of the 1877 map reveals that only part of the street grid east of Santa Barbara Street had been graded, which limited convenient access to this part of town (Figure 9a).

Construction of the wharf and later the railroad, allowed for the efficient transport of standardized milled lumber and factory-made doors, windows and hardware. This led to a standardization of building materials and architectural forms which brought Santa Barbara’s architecture into conformance with late 19th and early 20th century American architectural forms, especially in regard to the simplified versions of the Italianate, Queen Anne, National Folk styles that predominated in residential architecture.

Transportation between lower Santa Barbara, the waterfront and the Arlington Hotel improved in mid-1870s, when a mule trolley service was established between Stearns Wharf and the 1300 block of State Street. Horse drawn streetcars, which had been a common feature of larger American towns since the 1830s, helped to spur the development of suburbs by providing an efficient means of commuting from the downtown to newer residential neighborhoods located above the 1000 block of State Street. New transportation modes had a profound influence on the layout of American towns and cities. It soon became clear that:

*Transportation began to influence the geography of social and economic class, as well as the cost of traveling between home and work determined where different groups settled. The middle and working classes settled in neighborhoods closer to the central city accessible by horse-drawn cars, while those with higher incomes settled in the railroad suburbs (National Register Bulletin: Historic Residential Suburbs: (www.cr.pnpsgov/nr/publicans/bulletins/suburbs/part1.htm).*

While Santa Barbara’s compact layout precluded the development of railroad suburbs, it did develop, much in the manner of “railroad suburbs” distinct divisions between residential neighborhoods and the City’s commercial core; to some extent this was facilitated by the expansion of the City’s network of streetcar lines which made it more convenient to commute from the Upper East and Mission Ridge neighborhoods to downtown (Everett and Coombs 1990: 100). It was also driven by the middle and upper classes desire to emulate the newly popular suburban model which separated residential areas from commercial and industrial activities and provided a clearer distinction of class and race. By the 1880s, Santa Barbara’s housing began to develop divisions along racial and class lines with the area above East Anapamu Street developing as a middle and upper middle class enclave known as the Upper Eastside and the district below East Anapamu Street, located closer to downtown, primarily developing with more modest middle and working-class housing. Hispanic and Asian settlement was still largely confined to those blocks surrounding the former Presidio.
Selected Development Chronology

1850: Santa Barbara established as an American City;

1851: Street grid surveyed by Salisbury Haley;

c. 1860-1870: Sometime between the early 1860s and 1870 a house is built on the East Figueroa Street frontage of the study block; this house was located at the current location of the Police Department building abutting what is now the west side of the residential court fronting East Figueroa Street at (see Figure 5a). The remainder of the block, except for a trail leading to Mission Santa Barbara, remains unimproved. Some of the surrounding blocks are sparsely developed with houses while other are devoted to row crops and vineyards.

c. 1860 -1870: During this decade State Street between Ortega Street and Anapamu Street is transformed into the City’s commercial district, partially lined with brick and wood commercial buildings.

c.1860 – 1870: First house built in study block on the south side of East Figueroa Street (see Figure 5);

1872: Stearn’s Wharf opens, providing Santa Barbara with its first reliable connection with the rest of California. In that same year the Arlington Hotel opens;

1873: Classical Revival style Courthouse built in Block 123, across Santa Barbara Street from the study block;

1872: Mule-pulled street car line opens on State Street;

1878: The trail leading to the Mission has been converted into a linear street bisecting the study block in a north to south direction between East Figueroa and East Anapamu streets (see Figures 10 & 10a). By this year, an additional three houses and several outbuildings had been built at the west end of the block; bringing the total number of residences to three. The house on East Figueroa Street featured an orchard at the rear of the lot. By this same year, street trees had been planted along part of the East Figueroa frontage and along the north side of block’s East Anapamu Street frontage. By this year, four houses had been built on the north side of East Anapamu Street. Within the project block two houses had been built on the north side of East Figueroa Street. Another house had been built o the south side of East Figueroa Street (Figures 10 & 10a).

1880: Several changes are apparent on an 1880 map which continues to depict four residences on the study block; one of the residences fronting Santa Barbara Street featured a windmill-powered water well and five houses on the north side of East Anapamu Street (Figures 11 and 11a). The windmill is depicted on both the 1880 map and the 1888 Bird’s Eye Map.

1887: Southern Pacific Railroad Company completes railroad line linking Santa Barbara to Los Angles;

1887: New street car line opens linking the downtown to Mission Santa Barbara;
Figure 5: 1870 Coast Survey Map
Figure 5a: 1870 Coast Survey Map with detail of Study Area

Figure 6: Circa-1874 Photograph looking from the Intersection of East Cota and Anacapa Streets towards the Mission (Calisphere: Hayward and Muzzall 1874)
Figure 7: Circa-1874 Photograph looking from the 00 block of East Carrillo Street towards the Courthouse, (Calisphere: Hayward and Muzzall c.1874)

Figure 8: Circa-1875 Photograph of Part of Downtown Santa Barbara (Santa Barbara Public Library, Eldon Smith Collection)
Figure 8a: Detail of Circa-1875 Photograph of Part of Downtown Santa Barbara

(see next page)
Figure 9: 1877 Bird’s Eye Map of Santa Barbara

Figure 9a: 1877 Bird’s Eye Map of Santa Barbara, Detail of Study block (depicting block bisected by street)
Figure 10: 1878 Coast Survey Map of Santa Barbara
Figure 10a: 1878 Coast Survey Map of Santa Barbara with Detail of Study Block

Figure 11: 1880 Map of Santa Barbara
3.7.4 Later Americanization Period (after the Arrival of the Train) 1888 - 1918

During the 31-year period between the arrival of the railroad in 1887 and the end of World War I, the study block and surrounding blocks experienced a development pattern characterized by intensification of residential use with existing lots that already featuring single-family houses developed with additional single-family or duplex houses and vacant lots developed with single-family or multiple residential units sometimes in the form of residential courts or stand-alone cottages (Figures 12 & 12a).

This rapid increase in population and construction was propelled in large measure by the growth of Santa Barbara’s resort industry after the arrival of the Southern Pacific Railroad in 1887 and the subsequent completion of the northern segment of the Southern Pacific Railroad’s CoastLine linking Southern California to San Francisco in 1901. The northern segment of the Coastline linked Santa Barbara with Northern California, and at the same time replaced the narrow-gauge line between Santa Barbara and Los Angeles with standard gauge. New depots opened in Santa Barbara, Summerland, and Goleta, as well as an expanded rail yard, located in the City’s Lower Eastside. The completion of these improvements made Santa Barbara even more popular as a resort destination. Largely in response to the completion of the railroad line, the City’s leading hotels, such as the Arlington and the Upham expanded their facilities. New hotels were also built, including the more than 400-room Potter Hotel on the waterfront, completed in 1902. Resort hotels like the Potter and the Arlington, along with the newly opened Southern Pacific rail yard drew many new residents to Santa Barbara. This influx created an increased need for housing for the city’s working class as well as the expanding middle and professional classes. Working class and lower middle-class housing stock was built primarily in the area between East Anapamu Street and the lower eastside (Figures 12 & 12a). For the most part these houses, which were set on narrow deep lots, were vernacular type houses and cottages. Most of these were built from pattern books or by local contractors.

By 1898 additional residential construction had occurred on Block 122 (now Block 163), which as late as the end of the 19th century was still bisected by a street linking East Figueroa and East Anapamu.
Streets (Figures 13 – 13b). By circa-1900 this street had been replaced by additional residential construction (Figure 14). New residential development on the block at the turn-of-the-century was characterized by pairs or triplets of modest one-story contractor-built cottages set near the street frontages. Some of these houses were located on individual lots while others were clustered on larger parcels. A review of the 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map reveals the following examples of this type in the study block:

- **213 - 222 East Anapamu Street:** Three, one-story wood frame cottages built between circa-1900 and 1907 with identical plans and layouts. Now demolished, the cottages were likely designed in simplified versions of the Free Classic subtype of the Queen Anne style;

- **228 - 232 East Anapamu Street:** Three, one-story wood frame cottages built in 1905 with identical plans and layouts located on the study property. The cottages are designed in simplified versions of the Free Classic subtype of the Queen Anne style;

- **1117 - 1121 Garden Street:** Three, one-story wood frame cottages built between circa-1900 and 1907 with identical plans and layouts, two of which are located within the study parcel. The cottages, which feature centrally-placed porches flanked by bay windows, were originally designed in simplified versions of the Free Classic subtype of the Queen Anne style;

- **1103 & 1105 Garden Street:** Two, one-story wood frame cottages built between circa-1900 and 1907 with identical plans and layouts. The cottages, which feature corner porches were originally designed in simplified versions of the Free Classic subtype of the Queen Anne style; and

- **223 East Anapamu Street:** In 1916 two duplexes and two cottages were built behind an existing two-story house by Mrs. M. S. Wilhoit.

A characteristic feature of the early 20th century was the explosive growth of the automobile, which profoundly transformed transportation patterns and urban and suburban growth. With the advent of the automobile, hillside neighborhoods like the Riviera, grew in popularity, which reduced the popularity of Santa Barbara’s older neighborhoods for the middle and upper middle classes. Some of these neighborhoods, like the one below East Anapamu Street, quickly transitioned to a denser development pattern to house the lower middle class and working-class. It was now that garages and off-street parking, usually located to the rear of the lots, became a characteristic feature of the neighborhood.
Figure 12, 1888 Bird’s Map of Santa Barbara
Figure 12a, 1888 Bird’s Map of Santa Barbara with Detail of Study block

(see next page)
Figure 12c, 1892 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map of Santa Barbara with Detail of Study block (yellow highlights study area)
Figure 13: 1898 Bird's Map of Santa Barbara

Figure 13a: 1898 Bird’s Map of Santa Barbara with Detail of Study Block

Figure 13b: 1898 Bird’s Map of Santa Barbara with Detail of Under-Sheriff’s House
Selected Development Chronology

- **1888**: The National Folk style house at 226 East Anapamu Street built by Undersheriff Rufus Smith (Figure 14a). This house is the oldest surviving building on the block. A 19th century sandstone hitching post is located in the streetside planter strip;

- **1901**: The Southern Pacific Railroad Company Completes the Coast Line linking Santa Barbara to Northern California;
- **1902**: The Potter Hotel on the waterfront opens;
- **1905**: The Mission Revival style train station on lower State Street and the Union Pacific railyard open;
- **1905**: Three identical one-story houses in the Free Classic Subtype of the Queen Anne style built at 228-232 East Anapamu Street (Figures 14c – 14e);
- **1905**: Two identical shingle cottages with hipped roofs built at 1113 and 1115 Garden Street;
- **C. 1905**: Three identical shingle clad Vernacular type houses with shingle cladding built at 1117, 1119 and 1121 Garden Street (Figure 14f);
- **C. 1905**: Three identical one-story cottages (likely in the Queen Anne style) were built at 212, 214 and 216 East Anapamu Street;
- **1916**: A pair of one-unit cottages and two duplex units in the Vernacular style built behind the Victorian era house at 223 East Figueroa Street;

Figure 14: 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (standing resources in project area highlighted in yellow) (Courtesy of Alexandra Cole)
• **1908-1929:** East Anapamu Street is graded through and paved through to Milpas Street, Italian Stone pines planted on the 300 through 600 blocks under the direction of AB Doremus;

• **1909:** The Arlington Hotel on State Street is rebuilt in the Mission Revival style; and

• **C. 1910-1930:** Three parcels at the west end of the 200 block of East Figueroa Street developed with residential court-like units featuring driveways.
### 3.7.5 Regional Culture Period 1918 - 1945

This period is characterized by the increasing importance of the petroleum industry to Santa Barbara's regional economy, improvements in transportation such as the divided highway built in Montecito, and improvements to roadways and state highways linking Santa Barbara to the rest of California. It was now that the automobile became the dominant transportation mode and air travel grew in importance both regionally and on a national level.
It was during this era, especially in the aftermath of the devastating 1925 earthquake, that Santa Barbara consciously recast its visual imagery into an evocation of a Mediterranean town by emulating the architectural vocabulary of Spain, Mexico and the Mediterranean. This was accomplished through town planning efforts, major public buildings like the Santa Barbara County Courthouse (Figure 17), Santa Barbara High School (Figure 18) and Santa Barbara Junior High School, community events such as “Old Spanish Days” and private development. While premised on a selective reading of Santa Barbara’s history, these efforts resulted in the creation of a distinctive visual identity for the community. Town planning and Mediterranean inspired architecture was less visible in the city’s older working class and lower middle-class neighborhoods such as the 200 blocks of East Anapamu and East Figueroa Streets, which continued to reflect the vernacular forms of the early 20th century or later reductive architectural styles such as the Minimal Traditional.

World War II was a defining event on a local, regional and national level. Large military installations, including the Marine Air Corps Station at what is now the Santa Barbara Airport and the University of California, Santa Barbara, and Camp Cook (now Vandenberg Air Force Base), support facilities such as Hoff Hospital on Upper State Street and the use of local hotels and public facilities such as the Miramar and Biltmore Hotels and the Cabrillo Pavilion as rest and recreation centers became integral features of the local economy, which notwithstanding the war, saw increasing population growth.

In the downtown, much of the population growth between 1918 and 1945 was accommodated by an intensification of residential density through the construction of secondary residential units in the form of duplexes, cottages, courts and the conversion of existing housing into multi-family dwellings (Figures 15b - 17a). Residential courts, while not ubiquitous in Santa Barbara were a characteristic feature of this period. This housing type, which was common in California during this period was a phenomenon of the automobile age.

As noted by Stephanos Polyzoides in his book *Courtyard Housing in Los Angeles* residential courts which could be accommodated by existing parcel configurations, proved to be a popular strategy for providing increased housing density in existing residential neighborhoods:

> Early subdivision in southern California favored the single-family dwelling. It was this land parcel, typically 50 by 150 feet, that became the basic unit of development for the courts. Courtyard housing sprouted even in these tight spaces, interspersed among single-family houses, attracting tenants through their privacy and access to open space.

> Because of the unobtrusive manner in which courts merged with smaller and less socially active buildings they were utilized extensively in spot development that did not disrupt the physical and social context of a given neighborhood (Polyzoides et al. 1992: 12)

Polyzoides defined courtyard style multi-unit developments by the presence of an enclosed or semi-enclosed landscaped courtyard that excluded the automobile, which was usually relegated to the sides or rear of the development. A few examples of this type are found in Santa Barbara including the Spanish Colonial Revival style court at 210-220 West Mason Street (1924) and the Spanish Colonial Revival style Alameda Court at 220 East Sola Street (1916-1917) and a Craftsman style court at 116 West Ortega Street. However, other iterations of multi-unit residential developments which incorporated the automobile into their design were built in Southern California and Santa Barbara in the decades between the mid-teens and World War II. In these iterations of the residential court, garages and parking, rather than being accommodated on the periphery of the development, were
brought front and center with the driveway extending off the street, usually through the court’s open space to the rear of the property where uncovered or covered parking was provided. The residential court at 223 East Figueroa Street along with others in the city such as the Craftsman style Casalino Court at 617-623 De La Vina Street follow this model, which represents an acknowledgement of the increasing economic and cultural importance of the automobile.

While courts with a central driveway were a common type, other variations accommodating multiple detached units that featured driveways aligned along the side of the property or shared with adjacent parcels can also be found. This type usually featured a less formal layout of residences that were not aligned along either side of a central vista. Instead, they were characterized by a mix of cottages and larger residences that were accessed via a common driveway. Examples of this type included the development at 213, 215 & 217 East Figueroa Street (see Figure 16).

While many courts were built at one time, others residential courts such as the one at 217 (now 223) East Figueroa Street, began as a modified court in 1916 when two single-family and two duplex cottages built behind an existing two-story house by Mrs. M. S. Wilhoit (Anderle 1978; Cole 2017: 55). These cottages must have been accessed via a driveway extending along the east property line. This development pattern characterized not only 223 East Figueroa Street but also Casalino Court, a bungalow court in the 600 block of De La Vina Street. Like Casalino Court, the court on East Figueroa Street would eventually be extended to the street after its two-story Victorian era home was removed around 1925 (unlike Casalino Court, which built-out by the same family, employing a single style, the court at 223 East Figueroa Street was added onto by a different owner using a different architectural motif than the original cottages). With the removal of the house, the property on East Figueroa, with its cottages arrayed on either side of a central driveway, took on the configuration and overall appearance of a type of residential court that accommodated automobile access into their design (early to mid-20th century courtyard style housing developments included a range of configurations including the types found on the 200 block of East Figueroa Street, which accommodated the increasingly ubiquitous automobile into their design).

While residential use remained the dominant pattern for the study block and its environs, commercial use began sometime before 1930 when 216 East Anapamu Street was converted into a printing shop, and an aquarium/aviary was built behind 214 East Anapamu Street. That same year the Schauer Building was built on Santa Barbara Street (Figure 19). Designed by Edwards and Plunkett, this was the first Spanish Colonial Revival commercial building on the block (see Figure 15). This was soon followed by the Spanish Colonial Revival style commercial building at the intersection of Santa Barbara and East Anapamu Streets and another at the intersection of Santa Barbara and East Figueroa Streets (Figures 15 -15d).
Figure 15: 1928 Aerial Photograph (Map and Imagery Lab, University of California, Santa Barbara)
Figure 15a: 1928 Aerial Photograph with detail of Study Block
(Map and Imagery Lab, University of California, Santa Barbara)
Figure 15b: 1930 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map
(study parcels high-lighted in yellow)
Courtesy of Alexandra Cole, Preservation Planning Associates
Figure 15c: Circa-1930 Photograph of the West End of the Project Block, looking south
(Santa Barbara Historical Museum)

Figure 15d: Circa-1935 Photograph of the Project Block, looking northeast
(Santa Barbara Historical Museum)
Figure 16: 1946 Aerial Photograph of the Study Block depicting the location of Residential Courts (Map and Imagery Lab, University of California, Santa Barbara)
Figure 16a: 1946 Aerial Photograph with detail of Study block (Map and Imagery Lab, University of California, Santa Barbara)
Figure 17: Santa Barbara Courthouse, circa-1935

Figure 18: Santa Barbara High School, circa-1935
Selected Development Chronology

- **1924**: Mediterranean style Santa Barbara High School built;
- **1925**: Santa Barbara's downtown devastated by an earthquake leading to the construction of new civic and institutional buildings in the Spanish Colonial Revival and Mediterranean styles;
- **1925**: Victorian era house at 223 East Figueroa Street replaced by four Craftsman style cottages;
- **1926**: Romanesque Revival style (Thomas Barber, architect) First Methodist Church built at 305 East Anapamu Street;
- **1927-1929**: Spanish Colonial Revival style Santa Barbara Courthouse built;
- **1929**: Onset of the Great Depression which slowed development in Santa Barbara until after World War II;
- **1930**: Schauer Building constructed on Santa Barbara Street;
- **1932**: Spanish Colonial Revival style Santa Barbara Junior High School built;
- **1940**: Federally-funded public works projects in Santa Barbara include construction of a new post office, park improvements and the creation of the County Bowl;
- **1942-1945**: Santa Barbara area hotels converted to war-time use. Hoff Hospital was built, and Marine Air Corps Station opens at the airport; and
- **1930 - 1945**: Commercial buildings constructed on the Santa Barbara Street frontage of the study block and additional residential buildings built at the southwest corner of the block including two court-like developments at the current site of the Santa Barbara Police Department.

**3.7.6 Post-World War II Period 1946-1991**

The post-World War II period ushered in substantive and dramatic changes to Santa Barbara's economy and physical appearance (Figures 20 - 26). It was during this era that the south coast developed into a hub for defense-related research and development with companies like General Motors, Raytheon and Applied Magnetics opening facilities in the Goleta area. This trend was furthered with the opening of the University of California, Santa Barbara on part of the former Marine Air Corps base and the transformation of the base's airport into a commercial airport which provided
the growing research and development industry with an efficient means of transportation. Completion of an interstate road system and a network of freeways in California helped the state become the leading center for the nation’s Cold War defense-related industries. On the south coast this economic boom led to substantive population growth, primarily in newly built suburbs in Carpinteria, western Santa Barbara and the Goleta Valley. In downtown Santa Barbara, growth was accommodated by the demolition of older housing stock and their replacement by multi-unit apartment buildings or the subdivision of existing houses into apartments (see Figures 20 - 21a). With the growth of state, local and regional governments, additional facilities were built near the study block including the Superior Court building on the 100 block of East Figueroa Street and the Santa Barbara County Administration building on the 100 block of East Anapamu Street; these buildings featured abstracted interpretations of the Mediterranean style. It was during this period that several residential buildings on the study block, including 232 East Anapamu Street were converted to commercial use, residential courts on East Figueroa Street were replaced with a new headquarters for the Santa Barbara Police Department and several commercial buildings were constructed on the Santa Barbara, East Figueroa and East Anapamu Street frontages of the study block. With these changes the westerly half of the block was converted to non-residential use (see Figures 22 -26).

**Selected Development Chronology**

1949: Duplex moved from 1203 Anacapa Street to 227 East Figueroa Street;  
1952: Apartment building constructed at 233 East Anapamu Street;  
Late 1950s – 1991: Additional institutional buildings built on East Anacapa and East Figueroa Streets;  
1955-1991: Defense-related research and development becomes a leading economic engine for the community;  
c. 1950-1975: Post-World War II housing boom;  
1950s through 1970s: House at 232 East Anapamu Street converted to commercial use and an office building built at 1111 Garden Street;  
1975: 1119 Garden Street converted to office space; and  
1950s -1991: Much of the block transitions from residential to commercial/institutional use, which resulted in the demolition of two of the three residential courts on East Figueroa Street (leaving only the residential court at223 East Figueroa Street) and the demolition of residential housing along the length of Santa Barbara Street, the westerly half of East Anapamu Street and at least two houses at the southerly end of Garden Street.
Figure 20: 1960 Aerial Photograph of Vicinity of Study block
(Map and Imagery Lab, University of California, Santa Barbara)
Figure 20a: 1960 Aerial Photograph with detail of Study block  
(Map and Imagery Lab, University of California, Santa Barbara)
Figure 20b: 1961 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map (updated from 1930 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map)
Figure 21: 1971 Aerial Photograph with Study block
(areas outlined in green represent post World War II Commercial/Institutional Buildings)
(Map and Imagery Lab, University of California, Santa Barbara)

Figure 22: Santa Barbara Police Department Building
Figure 23: Commercial Building at 1111 Garden Street

Figure 24: Commercial Building at 222 East Anapamu Street
3.7.7 Post-Cold War Period 1991 - 2018

With fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, defense-related spending was dramatically reduced by the Federal Government. One consequence of this was the gradual exit of many defense-related research firms and defense companies from Santa Barbara County. This led to a realignment of the local economy to a more service-based model focused on tourism, agriculture, education, health care, the public sector and retirement-related businesses. One consequence of this was a concerted effort to enhance Santa Barbara’s Mediterranean style imagery through a more nuanced interpretation of the Mediterranean style, which can be seen in the justice-related buildings.
constructed on the 1100 block of Santa Barbara Street (Figures 27 - 41). Intensive commercial and institutional development occurred along the north side of the 200 block of East Anapamu Street where a four-story retirement facility was built and commercial and institutional buildings along the westerly end of the north and south sides of the 200 block of East Figueroa Street. Notwithstanding its proximity to State Street, the easterly 1/3 of the block has undergone few changes during this period and continues to exhibit a mix of commercial buildings erected after 1950 and multi-residential properties mostly built between circa-1900 and the mid-1940s.

**Figure 27: 1995 Aerial Photograph with Study Block**
(areas outlined in green represent post World War II Commercial/Institutional Buildings)
(Map and Imagery Lab, University of California, Santa Barbara)
Selected Development Chronology

- **1990s -2000s**: Nearby State Street commercial corridor redeveloped; and
- **1990s -2000s**: Spanish Colonial Revival style court-related buildings built on the 1100 block of Santa Barbara Street.

(see next page)
Figure 29: 2016 Aerial Photograph with Study block

(areas outlined in green represent post World War II commercial/institutional development while areas outlined in red delineate post-World War II multi-residential development) (227 East Figueroa Street was moved onto the property in 1949 from 1203 Anacapa Street and 233 East Anapamu Street was built in 1952)

(Google Earth)
Figure 30: Intersection of East Anapamu and Santa Barbara Streets, looking south (2017)

Figure 31: Intersection of East Anapamu and Santa Barbara Streets, looking towards the Courthouse (2017)
Figure 32: East Anapamu Street, looking east (2017)

Figure 33, Intersection of East Anapamu and Garden Streets, looking southwest (2017)
Figure 34: Intersection of East Anapamu and Garden Streets, looking west (2017)

Figure 35: Intersection of East Anapamu and Garden Streets, looking east (2017)
Figure 36: Garden Streets, looking north (2017)

Figure 37: Garden Street, looking south (2017)
Figure 38: Garden Street, looking northeast, depicting the east side of the block (2017)

Figure 39: East Figueroa Street, looking northwest, depicting the north side of the block (2017)
3.8 Characterize Resource Types

The neighborhood within the study area is defined as a vernacular landscape as it was not built to a unified plan or to create specific spatial or aesthetic effects. Cultural landscapes are composed of one or more of the 13 following landscape characteristics defined by the National Park Service,
which have been applied to the project block and surrounding neighborhood:

Natural Systems: *Processes or materials in nature influencing historic development or use*

The development pattern and history of the study block and surrounding neighborhood has been strongly influenced by natural features such as the raised topography bordering the north, south and east sides of the former slough, seasonal drainages and the nearby slopes of Mission Ridge. While some of these features have been obscured, altered or removed by later development, they affected development patterns until the 1920s. Since that time grading, earthmoving and the conversion of sloughs and tidal areas to developable acreage has eroded the ability of natural systems to convey their 19th century appearance.

Spatial Organization: *The historic three-dimensional arrangements of physical forms*

The spatial organization of the study block and surrounding blocks follows the orthogonal street grid surveyed in 1851. Buildings, structures and features are invariably orientated to this street grid. This pattern is featured on the 200 block of East Figueroa Street where residential buildings are set at right angles to the street grid with street residential development is usually set farther back from the street although there are exceptions such as the Santa Barbara Police Department Building located on the north side of East Figueroa Street.

Land Use: *Historical Activities that influenced activities or modifications*

During much of the 19th century the study block was located on the periphery of Santa Barbara’s downtown. Throughout the first 70 years of the 19th century development on the east side of State Street was largely confined to the blocks between State Street and Santa Barbara Street. The blocks between Garden Street and Milpas Street, which were bordered by or were within tidal sloughs and swampy areas, were fallow or in cultivation for much of this period. Given Santa Barbara’s small population and the availability of more easily developed land west and north of State Street, it is not surprising that substantial development within or near the study block did not occur until the mid-teens of the 20th century or later. The construction a new courthouse on Anacapa Street in 1929 and a superior court building and police department building on East Figueroa Street in the 1950s, eventually led to the redevelopment of the westerly two-thirds of the study block into office space and justice-related public institutional use. Other nearby development, including the construction of a large retirement complex on the north side of the 200 block of East Anapamu Street in the 1980s and the earlier relocation of Santa Barbara High School and Junior High School to the neighborhood in the 1920s and 1930s, ensured that the Laguna neighborhood would be a mixed neighborhood of public sector, commercial and residential uses in the post-World War II period. In the study block, the redevelopment of two-thirds of the block to non-residential use has substantially diminished the block’s ability to convey its original character as a residential block, between circa-1870 and the mid-1940s.

Circulation: *Historical systems for human movement*

While the street grid was surveyed in 1851, it took approximately 70 years to install paved and graded streets. It was the completion of the street grid and the installation of utilities that allowed the surrounding area between Garden Street and Milpas Street to be developed. Even then, the street grid was not completely realized, as the large tracts of land set aside for the construction of Santa Barbara Junior High School and Santa Barbara High School to the neighborhood in the 1920s and 1930s, meant that several streets, including East Figueroa, East Carrillo, and East Ortega Streets were not
extended through to Milpas Street.

**Cultural Traditions: Historical manifestations of collective cultural Identity**

This landscape characteristic does not apply to the study area, which was not the locale of distinctive social, economic or ethnic groups.

**Topography: Historical, human-created shape of the ground plane**

Beginning in the first decades of the 20th century, the sloughs and swampy areas between Garden and Milpas Streets were filled-in or leveled to accommodate development. Other changes included grading within individual blocks and lots to create level building pads. These activities, which continue to this day, have obscured and substantially altered the natural environment by removing traces of its original topography.

**Vegetation: Pattern of human-influenced plants both native and introduced**

Today, the vegetation of the study block and its surroundings is almost entirely composed of non-native plants introduced since the late 18th Century. Subtropical and temperate plant varieties and species which have formed a characteristic feature of Santa Barbara landscape since the last quarter of the 19th century predominate. The most notable plantings are the Italian Stone Pine street trees on the 300 through 800 blocks of East Anapamu Street planted in the early 20th Century by Dr. A. B. Doremus between 1908 and 1929 (Figure 42). These massive trees give the east end of East Anapamu Street much of its visual character. The large Ficus tree in front of 227 East Figueroa Street which has been in-place since the early 20th century and the large Redwood tree adjacent to 234 East Figueroa Street are distinctive feature of the streetscape on East Figueroa Street (Figure 42a and 42h).

![Figure 42: Italian Stone Pines on East Anapamu Street, looking west](Pacifichorticulture.org)
Cluster Arrangement: Historical pattern of aggregation in forms

This characteristic does not apply to the study block; however, Santa Barbara High School and Junior High School which are in the neighborhood represent a clustering of public educational facilities. A characteristic aggregation of building forms was the creation of residential courts between 1916 and the early 1940s on the north side of the 200 block of East Figueroa Street.

Buildings and Forms: Historical constructed forms and edifices

Before World War II, most buildings in the study block and its surrounding neighborhood were composed of one and two-story wood frame houses generally of modest size. High style architecture was uncommon with most buildings being vernacular in form or featuring simplified iterations of architectural styles of the day such as Queen Anne or Craftsman. Before the advent of the automobile and plumbing, sheds, small stables, barns and privies were commonly located to the rear of residential lots. By the teens, expansion of the City’s sewer system allowed for indoor plumbing and the increasing ubiquity of the automobile led to the construction of garages on most properties. Beginning around the teens the block, which had been single-family in character, began to transition to multi-family use through the conversion of existing houses into duplexes or apartments and the construction of cottages, houses and residential courts. By the early 1940s two residential courts composed of cottages arrayed on either side of a strip style driveway had been created on East Figueroa Street. Other multi-family properties included a court-like development on East Figueroa Street that featured a long driveway flanked on one side by cottages or apartments had also been built.

After World War II, the western two-thirds of the block adjacent to the Santa Barbara Courthouse began to transition to institutional and commercial use with the construction of the Santa Barbara Police Department building in the early 1950s and the subsequent construction of the Jury Assembly building in the 1990s and 2000s. By circa-2000 the last remaining early 20th century residential building on Santa Barbara Street had been demolished and replaced with commercial and institutional buildings whose one, two and three story massing and architectural forms are strikingly different than...
the original late 19th and early 20th century houses which once lined this side of Santa Barbara Street. By the mid-2000s commercial construction extended half-way down the block on East Figueroa Street, the cottage at 232 East Anapamu Street had been transformed from a one-story wood frame Queen Ann style house into a one and two story Mediterranean style commercial and residential building with a different form and massing.

On the east side of the 1100 block of Garden Street, 1119 Garden Street was converted to commercial use which removed the original front porch and added Modernist architectural detailing not in character with the original architecture or form of the building, the adjacent house at what is 232 East Anapamu Street was altered from an one to a two story building, two early 20th century residential units at 1111 Garden Street were demolished and replaced with a two-story Mediterranean style commercial building and a two-story Mediterranean style apartment building was built at the south end of the block, leaving only three buildings (one of which, the house at 1115 Garden Street is permitted for demolition and replacement by a three-story project) on this side of the block retaining their original residential appearance and form. Consequently, the east side of the 1100 block of Garden Street does not retain the same level of visual cohesiveness in terms of buildings and forms as the east side of the block which retains most of its late 19th and early 20th century residential architecture. Finally, the interior of the block had been largely converted to surfaced parking lots. Because of these changes the study block does not represent a single period of development; instead, its individual components and clusters of buildings in regards to their forms and architecture are representative of the period between circa-1907 and the early 2000s and with the exception of the north end of the east side of the 1100 block of Garden Street and the easterly portion of the south side of East Figueroa Street do not retain cohesiveness in regards to their buildings or architectural forms. It should also be noted that street frontages on three sides of the block including those on East Anapamu Street, East Figueroa Street and Garden Street feature this mix of both early to late 20th century architectural forms while the Santa Barbara Street frontage is entirely commercial and institutional in its development pattern and features architectural forms that are not characteristic of the block during its period of significance. The following site plan (Figure 42b) identifies the location of Listed and Potential Properties in or adjacent to the project block:

(see next page)
Figure 42b, Site Plan of Block identifying Designated and Potential Historic Resources and properties that are not listed but contribute to the surrounding streetscape

Key: CRHR (California Register of Historical Resources), NR (National Register), NL (National Landmark)
Red= Designated or Potential Historic Resources (i.e. listed resources)
Blue= Boundary of Project Area
Green=Boundary of Residential Court on East Figueroa Street
Purple=Parcels with undesignated but substantially intact pre-1945 buildings, that contribute to the setting of the study block

The proximity of designated or listed resources to the boundary of the project property is detailed below (see Figures 42c -42r for photographs of the properties listed below):
Number Key:

1. Santa Barbara Courthouse, 1931 (SBC Landmark, CRHP, NRHP, NL);
2. 1122, 1124 & 1126 Garden Street, triplet of Craftsman style bungalows (1916) (Potential List) (see Figure 42d);
3. 1116 Garden Street, Brownell House #2, Queen Anne style, 1880 (SOM) (see Figure 42d);
4. 224 East Figueroa Street, Brownell House #1 c. 1887 (Potential List) (see Figure 42i);
5. 230 East Figueroa Street, Queen Anne style house, 1880, (Potential List);
6. 234 East Figueroa Street, Queen Anne style house and large Redwood tree, 1880 (Potential List) (see Figure 42c);
7. Italian Stone Pines on East Anapamu Street, 1908-1929 (Landmark) (see Figure 42u);
8. 228 East Figueroa Street, Craftsman style house, c. 1915 (contributes to streetscape) (see Figure 4k and 42l);
9. 202 East Figueroa Street, National Folk style house, c. 1870-1877 (contributes to streetscape) (see Figure 42n);
10. 302 East Figueroa Street, Vernacular type house, c. 1890 (contributes to streetscape) (see Figure 42g);
11. 1126 Santa Barbara Street, former Schauer Printing Building, 1930 (contributes to streetscape) (see Figure 42r);
12. 205 - 207 East Anapamu Street, two Craftsman cottages, c. 1915 (contributes to streetscape) (see Figure 42s);
13. 217 East Anapamu Street, Queen Anne style house (Free Classic subtype), c. 1910 (contributes to streetscape) (see Figure 42c);
14. 303 East Anapamu Street, Romanesque Revival First Methodist Church, 1926 (Potential List) (see Figure 42u); and
15. 1134 Garden Street, Queen Anne style house, c. 1910 (contributes to streetscape) (see Figure 42c).

The proximity of the above resources to the boundary of the project property is detailed below:

1. 1117 Garden Street (part of the project property) is 108 feet west of the 1116 Garden Street (Brownell House #2);
2. 232 East Anapamu Street is 83 feet west of the Italian Stone Pines on the 300 block of East Anapamu Street;
3. 1121 Garden Street (part of the project property) is 118 feet west of the three Craftsman style houses at 1122, 1124 and 1126 Garden Street;
4. 223 East Figueroa Street (residential court) is 111 feet northwest of the Stick style house at 224 East Figueroa Street (Brownell House #1);
5. 223 East Figueroa Street (residential court) is 349 feet east of the southeast corner of the Courthouse block; and
6. The two Queen Anne style houses at 228 and 230 East Anapamu Street are 413 feet east of the northeast corner of the Courthouse block.
Figure 42c: 1134 Garden Street at the north end of the 1100 Block of Garden Street, looking east (Google Earth)

Figure 42d: North end of the East Side of the 1100 Block of Garden Street, looking north
Figure 42e: Central Section of the East Side of the 1100 Block of Garden Street, looking north

Figure 42f: South end of the East Side of the 1100 Block of Garden Street, looking east
Figure 42g: 302 East Figueroa Street, looking east
(Google Earth)

Figure 42h: East End of the 200 Block of East Figueroa Street, south side of the block, looking southwest
Figure 42h: 234 East Figueroa Street, looking south
(Google Earth)
Figure 42i: 234 East Figueroa Street, looking south (Google Earth)

Figure 42j: 230 East Figueroa Street, south side of the block, looking southeast
Figure 42k: Central Section of the 200 Block of East Figueroa Street, south side of the block, looking south

Figure 42l: Brownell House #1 at 224 East Figueroa Street, south side of the block, looking south from the residential court at 223 East Figueroa Street
Figure 42m: West end of the 200 Block of East Figueroa Street, south side of the block, looking southeast

Figure 42n: 202 East Figueroa Street, looking south (Google Earth)
Figure 42o: East end of the 200 Block of East Figueroa Street, north side of the block, looking north

Figure 42p: Central Section of the 200 Block of East Figueroa Street with the Residential Court at 223 East Anapamu Street, north side of the block, looking north
Figure 42q: West end of the 200 Block of East Figueroa Street, north side of the block, looking northwest towards Santa Barbara Police Department

Figure 42r: North end of the 1100 Block of Santa Barbara Street, looking south (Google Earth)
Figure 42s: West end of the 200 Block of East Anapamu Street, north side of the block, looking west with two Craftsman style cottages at 205 - 207 East Anapamu Street (Google Earth)

Figure 42t: 217 East Anapamu Street, north side of the block, looking north (Google Earth)
Views and Vistas: Historical range of vision, both broad and discrete

Historically, the neighborhood’s public views and vistas have been defined by the street grid who’s built improvements such as buildings and landscaping including street trees, direct views along the orthogonal street grid. The most notable of these is the view along East Anapamu Street which is defined by the overhanging canopies of Italian stone pines. Houses and buildings define the edge of the public “face” of the blocks. Within individual parcels, especially those that are multi-residential, driveways provide views towards the rear of lots. Notable exceptions to this pattern are the vistas south from East Anapamu Street down onto the grounds of Santa Barbara High School and the broad views to and from the Courthouse property.

The visual character of the neighborhood is defined by the following elements:

Variation in setbacks

Setbacks generally feature two distinct patterns with pre-1945 housing setback from the street while post World War II commercial and in some cases residential development set close to, if not abutting the sidewalk. Pre-World War II setbacks vary and can range from narrow (such as the residential court at 223 East Figueroa Street) to somewhat more expansive (the remaining late 19th and early 20th century houses on the east and west sides of the 1100 block of Garden Street. Examples of narrower commercial setbacks include the commercial buildings at the west end of the 300 blocks of East Figueroa Street and commercial/institutional buildings that line most of the north side of the 300 block of East Anapamu Street. Street trees are an important feature of the streetscape as they soften the sometime abrupt spatial disruption caused by the juxtaposition of older residential properties and larger-scale buildings.

Architectural Eclecticism and Homogeny

The neighborhood features an eclectic range of residential architecture ranging from the Stick style at 224 East Figueroa Street to several Queen Anne style houses, Vernacular style houses, Craftsman style houses and cottages to Post-World War II types such as ranch style houses (located at the...
The northeast corner of Garden and East Figueroa Streets) to boxy apartment buildings featuring attenuated references to Mid-Century Modernism. Housing types range from two-story single-family houses (often converted to multiple-unit buildings) to modestly-sized one-story cottages and houses sometimes aggregated in the form of residential courts featuring a range of configurations, to post-1945 multiple-unit apartments. The heterogenous nature of residential housing contrasts with the homogenous quality of commercial/institutional architecture that invariably references Mediterranean or Spanish Colonial Revival motifs and usually features larger volumes and massing with modest or minimal setbacks from the sidewalk and the provision for parking.

Historic and Existing Spatial Relationships and Neighborhood Character

The 300 block of East Figueroa Street was originally developed with single family houses built between circa-1870 and circa-1915. Houses were set on lots oriented towards the street. In most cases residences were located towards the front of the lots and shared similar setbacks. Houses built before 1900 were usually two-stories in height and occupied by the middle and professional classes, such as the houses on the south side of the 200 block of East Figueroa Street near its intersection of Garden Street. Sandstone block walls were a common feature of the streetscape. Surviving examples of this type include the Brownsill House #2 at 1116 Garden Street and Brownsill House #1 at 224 East Figueroa Street and two Queen Anne style houses at 230 - 234 East Figueroa Street.

By the early 1900s the residency pattern of the study block and adjoining street frontages transitioned to more modest one-story houses often built in pairs or triplets; examples of this development type include the Queen Anne style houses at 228-232 East Anapamu Street, the Craftsman style houses at 1122 -1126 Garden Street, the Vernacular style houses at 1117 – 1121 Garden Street and two Vernacular style cottages at 1113 and 1115 Garden Street. Slightly later in the mid-teens, various iterations of residential courts were developed, some incorporating existing houses into their design. These residential courts featured small, one-story cottages and duplexes usually in the Vernacular style or featuring schematized references to the Craftsman style. A characteristic feature of this development type was the incorporation of driveways and covered or uncovered parking into their design. Three examples of this housing type existed on the 200 block of East Figueroa Street, including 223 East Figueroa Street and two residential courts at the west end of the block (now demolished) (see Figure 16a). Of these, only the residential court style development at 223 East Figueroa Street incorporated a centrally-placed driveway. The other residential courts featured driveways extending along the side of the property.

Development in the Post-World War II period disrupted this development pattern by replacing residential development with commercial and institutional buildings that featured larger Mediterranean style buildings with different setbacks, scale and massing. Examples of this development pattern include the Police Department building on the north side of the 200 Block of East Figueroa Street, the commercial buildings on the south side of East Figueroa Street near its intersection with Santa Barbara Street and the commercial and institutional buildings located on the north and south sides of the 200 block of East Anapamu Street. It is these three phases of development that created the existing streetscape on and around the project block including the 200 block of East Figueroa Street.

Today, the 200 block of East Figueroa Street represents an amalgam of Victorian-era two story houses that extend along the south side of the block near Garden Street, the residential court at 223 East Anapamu Street with its small Craftsman style cottages flanking a centrally driveway, multi-unit residential buildings flanking the east side of the residential court and two and three story Mediterranean style commercial and institutional buildings at the west end of the 200 block.
Distinctive features of the streetscape include several sandstone block retaining walls and a very large Ficus tree located east of the residential court and a large redwood tree at 234 East Figueroa Street. While not unique to the neighborhood or City, the row of three Victorian era houses and one Craftsman style house at the east end of the block forms a distinctive assemblage related by history, architectural style, setbacks and proximity. Like other blocks that border the State Street/Santa Barbara Street corridor, the 200 block of East Figueroa Street functions as a transition zone between the more intensely developed commercial blocks near State Street and the residential blocks located to the east. The block’s function as a “transition” between more intense commercial development and smaller scale residential development can be considered a distinctive feature of the block.

Street Trees, Planter Strips and Landscaping

Street trees, including the Italian Stone Pines on the 300 block of East Anapamu Street are an important feature of the streetscape as they soften the sometime abrupt spatial disruption caused by the juxtaposition of older residential properties and larger-scale buildings. Planter strips when present, both recall and preserve reminders of the neighborhood’s origin as residential area. This quality is further enhanced by the preservation of late 19th and early 20th century hardscape features such as sandstone curbs, sandstone hitching posts and sandstone retaining walls such as the hitching posts present at 226 East Anapamu Street and 232 East Anapamu Street and the sandstone retaining wall at 223 East Figueroa Street and along the south side of the 200 block of East Figueroa Street.

Sandstone Hardscape Features

The ability of the neighborhood to communicate its residential origins is further enhanced by the preservation of late 19th and early 20th century hardscape features such as sandstone curbs, sandstone hitching posts at 226 East Anapamu Street and 232 East Anapamu Street (Figure 43) and sandstone retaining walls such as the one present at 223 East Anapamu Street and the south side of the 200 block of East Figueroa Street.

Parking located to the Rear of Residential Lots and Commercial Buildings

Parking has modulated the configuration of residential properties since the late teens. A notable example of this was the provision for parking provided in the three residential courts once located on the north side of the 200 Block of East Figueroa Street.

Constructed Water Features: Historical constructed forms for water retention and conveyance

This landscape characteristic does not apply to the study area.

Archaeological Sites: Historical or pre-contact ruins, traces or deposited architecture

The assessment of this characteristic is beyond the purview of this report.

Small Scale Features: Discrete, historical elements that provide detail and diversity

Two sandstone hitching posts located in the planter strips in front of 228 and 232 East Anapamu Street, remnants of sandstone curbs and the sandstone block retaining wall in front of 223 East Anapamu Street and along the south side of the 200 block of East Figueroa Street are among the few surviving small-scale features dating to the late 19th or early 20th century. While not small-scale in size,
the large Ficus tree in front of 227 East Figueroa Street which has been in-place since the early 20th century is a distinctive feature of the streetscape (see Figure 43).

Figure 43: Hitching Post in front of 232 East Anapamu Street

4.0 SIGNIFICANCE EVALUATION OF THE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE

Section 3.7 of this report provided a historic context for the study area and identified its visual and spatial characteristics. Based on this information, the study area’s period of significance is circa-1870 to 1945, the period when it initially developed as a largely residential neighborhood featuring a mix of single-family and multiple-family housing types including various iterations of multi-unit residential courts. As noted in Section 3.7 of this report, the Laguna Neighborhood initially developed in the early 1870s as a scattering of houses and small farms extending from the vicinity of Garden Street to Milpas Street. The area’s topography and expanses of swampy ground precluded intensive development until the early 20th century. Generally, houses in the area were modest National Folk Vernacular, Queen Anne or Craftsman style houses for Santa Barbara’s lower middle and working classes; by the early 20th century residential courts and secondary residential units were a common feature of the neighborhood.

The proximity of the Santa Barbara County Courthouse, and the relocation of Santa Barbara High School and Junior High School to the neighborhood during the mid-1920s through mid-1940s as well as the construction of a new courthouse in 1931 and the relocation of the Santa Barbara City Police Department to the 200 block of East Figueroa Street, meant that much of the neighborhood would be devoted to institutional uses or would transition to that use in the post-World War II period. The study block exemplifies this transition as most of its original 19th century through 1940s housing stock has been replaced with commercial and institutional development whose Mediterranean style architectural forms, larger scale massing, and site placement which is not residential in character, differ substantially from the pre-World War II period, which was characterized by modest one and two story residential building, in the Queen Anne or Vernacular architectural styles. These changes have profoundly diminished the ability of the block and its individual resources to convey their appearance during the period of significance (1870-1940). Consequently, the study block’s visual character represents an amalgam of late 19th through late 20th century residential, institutional commercial architecture.
Integrity

As noted in the 1999 guidelines developed by Caltrans, cultural landscapes must retain sufficient integrity to convey their historic appearance and significance:

> Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance. The seven aspects of integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To retain historic integrity, a property will always possess several, and usually most, of these aspects, and essential physical features must be present. Examine integrity against essential physical features that were present during the historic period and estimate the percentage of the historic landscape that is intact (Caltrans 1999: 12).

The following guidelines developed by Caltrans for Cultural Landscape studies in California have been applied to the project (Caltrans 1999: 14):

Integrity

In evaluating the integrity of historic landscapes, certain aspects may be more difficult to assess, or they may present particular issues that should be considered.

a. Vegetation

Guidance: Vegetation is generally very important to landscapes. Vegetation and the inherent characteristics of growth and evolution in plant materials present different issues related to change and integrity from those of buildings and structures. Plants grow and die, and the relationships among species vary over time due to differing growth patterns and land use. The integrity of a landscape’s vegetation may be considered reasonably intact if the original vegetation is present regardless of appearance or if substitute plantings essentially convey the landscape’s historic appearance. Original plants which have changed by natural processes do not normally cause loss of vegetative integrity, even if changes have resulted in visual alteration, such as the growth of trees originally planted in the nineteenth century around a state capitol. However, normal plant succession may destroy the most important qualities of a landscape, such as the natural regrowth of vegetation that obscures the raw scar of a hydraulic mining pit. Competing resource values in such cases can also lead to integrity loss for landscapes, if restoration of native vegetation in a park or removal of human traces in a wilderness area are valued over historic landscape preservation.

If original plant material is lost, a landscape can often maintain integrity if similar species convey the visual effect of original plantings, unless the property is significant for specific cultivars, such as an arboretum noted for hybridizing experiments. Otherwise, integrity can be preserved by comparable plantings of similar size, massing, color, and appearance as those present during the historic period. In other instances, if planting have value as examples of a design philosophy, or as physical markers, delineating boundaries or spaces, or as expressions of technology, such as spacing between plants, preserving the qualities that exhibit those values can maintain a landscape’s integrity. Agricultural crops that were rotated historically or plantings that evolved during the historic period may offer more than one option for appropriate replacement plantings. Any replacements should preferably be the same or similar species, perhaps grown from seeds collected from the original plants if important genetically.
Application of Criterion a:

While landscaping styles have changed since the early 20th century and very few original plants survive, planting schemes in and around residential properties usually emulate many of their historic features such as lawns, foundation plantings and linear arrangement of bedding and specimen plants. While the character of the landscape has been maintained in some areas, the replacement of residential buildings with commercial and institutional buildings whose scale, massing and setback vary from the original character of the block on all four of the block's frontages including the west end of the 200 block of East Anapamu Street and the west end of the 200 block of East Figueroa Street, the entire length of the east side of Santa Barbara Street and the south end of the 1100 block of Garden Street (including the permitted project at 1115 Garden Street) has substantially diminished the overall integrity of the plantings by altering setbacks (in most cases setbacks have been reduced, however, in some instances, such as the Santa Barbara Police Department on the 200 block of East Figueroa Street, setbacks have been dramatically increased) and institutional/commercial planting schemes which lack a residential quality have been introduced. Because of these changes the overall character of plantings for the block as a whole has not maintained its pre-1945 appearance which was domestic and residential in scale.

b. Continuing use

Change is often an inescapable part of a landscape. Natural processes may bring changes from plant growth, death, or succession; weathering; erosion; or soil deposits from flooding. The functioning and maintenance of properties in a landscape can also bring changes: new technologies, painting, road work, fence repair, and basic activities of a working property can have cumulative effects on a landscape's appearance. The effect of continuing use on integrity depends to a substantial degree on the historic context, which should indicate the extent of integrity that can reasonably be expected.

A working landscape in which significant characteristics survive may maintain relative integrity despite some losses, when comparative properties in the same context are more altered. For example, a mining landscape still being worked may retain integrity if modern extraction methods and character are similar to those practiced historically, important physical elements remain, and comparable properties are less intact. Similarly, working transportation facilities can retain integrity if physical features essential to the property remain. A resurfaced road that has been slightly widened may retain integrity if its original guard rails, retaining walls, bridges, and alignment remain. An operating railroad can be expected to have had its rails and ties replaced periodically, and an abandoned railroad to have had both ties and rails removed, but a railroad line might retain relative integrity if the roadbed, associated features, alignment, and setting are intact.

Application of the Criterion b:

The historic street grid, network of sidewalks and provision for street trees have survived as have concrete and sandstone retaining walls along the south and part of the north sides of the 200 block of East Figueroa Street and along part of the east side of the 1100 block of Garden Street. Other surviving streetscape features include two hitching posts at 228 and 132 East Anapamu Street and, in a few places, segments of the original sandstone curbs. The most substantive alteration since the period of significance (c. 1870-1945) encompasses the replacement of residential properties with non-residential construction whose scale, massing and setbacks do not maintain the form, scale, massing or architectural types that characterized the block during the period of significance.
While the study block as a whole does not maintain its historic integrity because changes in use patterns have substantially altered its character, the row of five late 19th century through early 20th century houses at 224 – 234 East Figueroa Street retain their visual cohesiveness and form a distinct and readily identifiable cluster of resources conveying a specific time and place, namely residential architecture in the Laguna Neighborhood between circa-1880 and circa-1915. The row of houses at 1116, 1122, 1124, 1126 and 1134 Garden Street and the houses at 224, 228, 230 and 234 East Figueroa Street form almost intact rows of houses built between the 1880s and late-teens which retain their overall integrity in regards to their architectural forms, rhythm of setbacks, scale and massing and ability to convey their original residential function dating to a specific time and place and represent continuity of use even if they have largely transitioned from single-family to multi-family in use.

c. Intrusions

Loss of integrity can come from new construction or incompatible land uses, such as modern mining or quarrying, the growth of residential subdivisions, new freeway construction, or other activities that reshape the land, disturb subsurface remains, introduce major visual intrusions, or interrupt the continuity of the historic scene. Changes outside the landscape’s boundaries can constitute intrusions when such changes introduce incompatible visible, audible, or atmospheric elements to the historic property, regardless of whether the setting itself is a contributing element. The effect of intrusions on a landscape’s integrity depends on the qualities that make the landscape eligible and must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. In some instances, large rural districts may be able to absorb changes that occur in relatively few or small isolated pockets within the landscape, but the cumulative effect of such changes must be considered.

Application of the Criterion c:

Construction since 1945, which has been in the Mediterranean style, is intrusive in nature because it has disrupted the continuity of the streetscape by isolating pre-1945 residential buildings into fragments or small pockets of resources rather than the continuous aggregations of repeated forms that characterized the neighborhood in the pre-World War II period. Because of these changes the continuity of the historic scene has been substantially disrupted along all four sides of the block. Examples of this include the west side of the 1100 block of Garden Street where only three houses, those at 1115, 1117 and 1121 retain their integrity of form in relation to the streetscape with the other four have either been demolished or so altered that they no longer retain their original form or relationship to the streetscape. On the south side of the 200 block of East Anapamu Street only three of the original nine residential buildings, those at 226, 228 and 230 East Anapamu Street, retaining their original form or relationship to the street. On the north side of the 200 block of East Figueroa Street only one residential development, 223 East Figueroa Street remain with all the other residential buildings on this side of the block having been demolished. Finally, the east side the 800 block of 1100 Santa Barbara Street retains none of the building dating to the period of significance. It should also be noted that construction on the block’s streetscape since 1945 has not maintained the historic forms, scale, massing or setbacks of the original architecture.

However, as noted above under Criterion b, the row of five late 19th century through early 20th century houses at 224 – 234 East Figueroa Street and the row of houses at 1116 -1134 Garden Street retain their visual cohesiveness that form two distinct and readily identifiable cluster of resources conveying a specific time and place that maintains the spatial, visual and historic continuity of the historic streetscape.
d. Integrity vs. Condition

Both integrity and condition must be addressed. Integrity is lost when a landscape’s important features are removed or altered, or when intrusions disrupt the landscape. Integrity can be maintained despite weathering or deterioration as long as essential physical features remain, although the condition could be poor.

For example, fences, watering troughs, and spatial arrangements may be intact in an abandoned overgrown pasture. Haul roads, camp sites, and stumps with springboard holes may identify a logged property despite a vigorous second growth of trees. A neglected garden could have both high integrity and poor condition. Similarly, landscapes containing ruins, rundown buildings, or abandoned roads that have deteriorated in place could possess integrity, while better-maintained areas still in use may have undergone substantial changes that destroy integrity. Although not relevant to an evaluation, condition can be a consideration in determining treatment options, such as finding relocation and adaptive reuse more feasible for a building in good condition than for a ruin.

Application of the Criterion d:

As noted above under Criterion b, the historic street grid, network of sidewalks and provision for street trees have survived as have some, but not all of the concrete and sandstone retaining walls along the south and part of the north sides of the 200 block of East Figueroa Street and along part of the east side of the 1100 block of Garden Street. Other surviving streetscape features include two hitching posts at 228 and 132 East Anapamu Street and, in a few places, segments of the original sandstone curbs. All of the surviving buildings and streetscape features dating to the period of significance survive in good to fair condition. While less intensive in scope, alterations to some of the surviving late 19th and early 20th century housing stock such as the row of three Vernacular style cottages at 1117, 1119 and 1121 Garden Street and the three Queen Anne style cottages at 228, 2230 and 232 have removed or altered character-defining features such as setbacks, roof types, porches, cladding and window types. These changes have disrupted the visual continuity of repeated forms and materials that characterized these street frontages during the period of significance and substantially diminished their contribution to the surrounding neighborhood’s historic character.

While the study block as a whole does not maintain its historic integrity because changes in use patterns have substantially altered its character, the row of five late 19th century through early 20th century houses at 224 – 234 East Figueroa Street and he row of houses at 1116, 1122, 1124, 1126 and 1134 Garden Street form an almost intact row of houses built between the 1880s and mid-teens which retain their overall integrity, rhythm of setbacks, scale and massing and ability to convey a specific time and place retain their visual cohesiveness and form distinct and readily identifiable clusters of resources conveying a specific time and place, namely residential architecture in the Laguna neighborhood between circa-1880 and circa-1915.

Significance Criteria

(a) Its character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City, the State or Nation;

While the study area as a whole does not meet Criterion a, the row of five late 19th century through early 20th century houses at 224 – 234 East Figueroa Street and the row of houses at 1116, 1122, 1124, 1126 and 1134 Garden Street form an almost intact row of houses built between the 1880s and mid-
teens which retain their overall integrity, rhythm of setbacks, scale and massing and ability to convey an specific time and place retain their visual cohesiveness and form distinct and readily identifiable clusters of resources conveying a specific time and place, namely residential architecture in the Laguna neighborhood between circa-1880 and circa-1915. Therefore, these two clusters of residential architecture meet Criterion a.

(b) Its location as a site of a significant historic event;

Extensive examination of records, including records on file at the Santa Barbara Community Planning Department, the Santa Barbara Historical Museum Gledhill Library, and the Santa Barbara Public Library, did not reveal any information linking the study area or this block of the Laguna Neighborhood to a significant historic event. Therefore, the study area does not meet Criterion b.

(c) Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City, the State or the Nation;

This study focused on broad patterns of historical development and did not include project specific histories for parcels outside of the project block. For those properties that were intensively studied, no historically significant person(s) were identified. Therefore, the study area does not meet Criterion c.

(d) Its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City, the State or the Nation;

While the study area as a whole does not meet Criterion d because it no longer represents a cohesive concentration of resources conveying a specific time and place, the row of five late 19th century through early 20th century houses at 224 – 234 East Figueroa Street and the row of houses at 1116, 1122, 1124, 1126 and 1134 Garden Street form an almost intact row of houses built between the 1880s and mid-teens which retain their overall integrity, rhythm of setbacks, scale and massing and ability to convey an specific time and place retain their visual cohesiveness and form distinct and readily identifiable clusters of resources conveying a range of architectural styles including Queen Anne, Stick and Craftsman styles, that convey the character of residential architecture in the Laguna neighborhood between circa-1880 and circa-1915. Therefore, these two clusters of residential architecture meet Criterion d.

(e) Its exemplification of the best remaining architectural type in a neighborhood;

While the study area as a whole does not meet Criterion e because it no longer represents a cohesive concentration of resources exemplifying a spatially cohesive range of architectural styles and types dating to the period of significance (c.1880 -1945), the row of five late 19th century through early 20th century houses at 224 – 234 East Figueroa Street and the row of houses at 1116, 1122, 1124, 1126 and 1134 Garden Street form an almost intact row of houses built between the 1880s and mid-teens that represent a range of architectural styles including Stick, Queen Anne, that retain their visual cohesiveness and form distinct and readily identifiable clusters of resources that convey the character of residential architecture in the Laguna neighborhood between circa-1880 and circa-1915. Therefore, these two clusters of residential architecture meet Criterion e.

(f) Its identification as the creation, design or work of a person or persons whose effort has significantly influenced the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;

The study area is a Vernacular landscape that with the exception of the street grid, did not develop to a
specific plan therefore, Criterion f does not apply to the study area as a whole. Application of this Criterion to individual resources at 1116 through 1134 Garden Street and 1128 through 1134 East Figueroa Street is beyond the scope of this study.

(g) Its embodiment of elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship;

The study area, which is a Vernacular landscape that does not embody outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship does not meet Criterion f. Application of this Criterion to individual resources at 1116 through 1134 Garden Street and 1128 through 1134 East Figueroa Street is beyond the scope of this study.

(h) Its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that landmark;

Preservation of the row of houses at 1116 -1134 Garden Street enhances the integrity of setting for the landmarked Italian Stone Pines on the 300 to 800 blocks of East Anapamu Street. Therefore, this cluster of residential buildings, as well as the First Methodist Church at 305 East Anapamu Street meet Criterion h.

(i) Its unique location or singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood;

While the study area as a whole does not retain sufficient integrity to meet this criterion, the row of five late 19th century through early 20th century houses at 224 – 234 East Figueroa Street and the row of houses at 1116, 1122, 1124, 1126 and 1134 Garden Street form an almost intact row of houses built between the 1880s and mid-teens that represent a range of architectural styles including Stick, Queen Anne, that have formed a established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood for over 100 years. Therefore, these two clusters of residential architecture meet Criterion i.

(j) Its potential of yielding significant information of archaeological interest;

The application of this criterion to archaeological reports is beyond the purview of this report.

(k) Its integrity as a natural environment that strongly contributes to the well-being of the people of the City, the State or the Nation (Chapter 22.22.040, City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code; Ord. 3900; 1, 1977).

The natural environment of the Laguna Neighborhood, including the study block, has been profoundly modified by human activity over the last 236 years and no longer represents a substantially intact natural environment. Therefore, the study area does not meet Criterion k.

Application of the Additional Criteria to the Study Area

Additional criteria listed in Chapter 2.3 (Section 5) of the MEA (Guidelines for Archaeological and Historic Structures and Sites, February 2002) will be applied to the study area.

5. Any structure, site or object associated with a traditional way of life important to an ethnic, national, racial, or to the community at large; or illustrates the broad patterns of cultural, social, political, economic, or industrial history.
Additional Criterion 5 which applies to individual structures, sites, or objects does not apply to the study area as a whole. The clusters of late 19th through early 20th century houses at 1116 through 1134 Garden Street and 1128 through 1134 East Figueroa Street, which represent substantially intact groups of resources that convey a specific time and place namely the initial settlement of the Laguna Neighborhood between circa-1880 and 1915. Therefore, these clusters of resources meet Additional Criterion 5.

6. Any structure, site, or object that conveys an important sense of time and place, or contributes to the overall visual character of a neighborhood or district.

Additional Criterion 6 which applies to individual structures, sites, or objects does not apply to the study area as a whole. The clusters of late 19th through early 20th century houses at 1116 through 1134 Garden Street and 1128 through 1134 East Figueroa Street, which represent substantially intact groups of resources that convey a specific time and place namely the character and feeling of the Laguna Neighborhood between circa-1880 and 1915, meet Additional Criterion 6.

7. Any structure, site or object able to yield information important to the community or is relevant to historical, historic archaeological, ethnographic, folkloric, or geographical research.

The application of this criterion to the entire Laguna Neighborhood is beyond the purview of this report.

8. Any structure, site or object determined by the City to be historically significant or significant in the architectural engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, provided the City’s determination is based on substantial evidence in light of the whole record [Ref. State CEQA Guidelines §15054.5 (a)(3)].

1116, 1122, 1124 and 1126 Garden Street, 224, 228, 332 and 334 East Figueroa Street and 305 East Anapamu Street which are either designated properties or on the potential list meet Additional Criterion 8.

Eligibility for Listing in the California Register of Historical Resources

A Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage

Extensive examination of records on file at the Santa Barbara Community Planning Department, the Santa Barbara Historical Museum, Gledhill Library and the Santa Barbara Public Library did not reveal any information that linked the study area, in its current state of preservation, to historic events that contributed to the broad patterns of California history. Therefore, the study area does not meet Criterion A.

B Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past

The criterion does not apply to the cultural landscape study please see Section 4 of this report, which evaluates individual properties for the application of this criterion.

C Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values;

While the study area as a whole does not retain sufficient integrity to meet this criterion, the row of
five late 19th century through early 20th century houses at 224 – 234 East Figueroa Street and the row of houses at 1116, 1122, 1124, 1126 and 1134 Garden Street form almost intact rows of houses built between the 1880s and mid-teens designed in a range of architectural styles including Stick, Queen Anne and Craftsman style. Therefore, these two clusters of residential architecture meet Criterion C.

D Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The application of this criterion to archaeological deposits is beyond the purview of this report.

**Eligibility for Listing in the National Register of Historic Places**

(a) That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

Extensive examination of records on file at the Santa Barbara Community Planning Department, the Santa Barbara Historical Museum, Gledhill Library and the Santa Barbara Public Library did not reveal any information that linked the study area, in its current state of preservation, to historic events that contributed to the broad patterns of local, state or national history. Therefore, the study area does not meet Criterion a.

(b) That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

The criterion does not apply to the cultural landscape study please see Section 4 of this report, which evaluates individual properties for the application of this criterion.

(c) That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;

While the study area as a whole does not retain sufficient integrity to meet this criterion, the row of five late 19th century through early 20th century houses at 224 – 234 East Figueroa Street and the row of houses at 1116, 1122, 1124, 1126 and 1134 Garden Street form almost intact rows of houses built between the 1880s and mid-teens designed in a range of architectural styles including Stick, Queen Anne and Craftsman style that represent are characteristic of residential construction in late 19th and early 20th century California. Therefore, these two clusters of residential architecture meet Criterion c.

(d) That has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The application of this criterion to archaeological deposits is beyond the purview of this report.

**5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

The cultural landscape study did not identify a substantially intact cultural landscape covering the entire study area; however, the following clusters of substantially intact resources that have a direct association with the late 19th and early 20th century settlement of the Laguna neighborhood and contribute substantially to the neighborhood’s streetscape were identified:

This table identifies significant clusters of historic resources in the study area:
## Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Landscape*</th>
<th>Local Eligibility</th>
<th>California Register</th>
<th>National Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Clusters of Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>224, 228, 230 &amp; 234 East Figueroa St:*</th>
<th>224 East Figueroa Street</th>
<th>228 East Figueroa Street</th>
<th>230 East Figueroa Street</th>
<th>234 East Figueroa Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a, d, e, i &amp; 5, 6, 8</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1116**, 1122, 1124 &amp; 1134 Garden St:*</th>
<th>1116 Garden Street</th>
<th>1122 Garden Street</th>
<th>1124 Garden Street</th>
<th>1134 Garden Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a, d, e, i, h &amp; 5, 6, 8</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please see Figure 42b for a location map
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