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I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project consists of the conversion of the existing 1,494 square foot second floor at 1325 State Street from office space to two residential units of approximately 728 square feet and approximately 766 square feet under the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. No exterior or interior alterations to the existing ground floor are proposed. The only external change proposed on the second floor is to remove two awnings on the western façade (facing the paseo at the rear of the building). New rooftop equipment, including HVAC equipment and skylights, are proposed to serve the proposed residential units.

The 4,108 square foot C-G zoned lot is currently developed with a two-story commercial building. The ground floor is currently occupied by a restaurant, while the second floor is vacant, but was most recently used as office space. The second floor is accessed off the paseo at the rear of the existing building.

II. REQUIRED APPLICATIONS

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

A. A Parking Modification to not provide the two required on-site parking spaces for the two residential units (SBMC §30.150.090.F and SBMC Chapter 30.250); and
B. An Open Yard Modification to provide less than the required private open yard for each of the two residential units (SBMC §30.150.090.G.2.b and SBMC Chapter 30.250).

APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE: October 20, 2018
DATE ACTION REQUIRED: January 18, 2018.

III. RECOMMENDATION

If approved as proposed, the project would conform to the City’s Zoning and Building Ordinances and policies of the General Plan. In addition, the size and massing of the project are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the project, making the findings outlined in Section X of this report, and subject to the conditions of approval in Exhibit A.
IV. BACKGROUND

The subject lot is developed with a two-story building containing two commercial operations. Opal Restaurant is on the ground level, and now vacant office space (previously the Noozhawk newspaper office, prior to that, a hair salon) is on the second floor. The proposed project includes redeveloping the second floor office space into two apartment units under the Average Unit-Size Density Program. No work is proposed on the ground level.

Initially, the proposal was to convert the office space to one singular residential unit. However, the scope of work changed following discussions with the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC), and two units were deemed supportable by first the HLC and then Planning and Transportation staff in order to develop additional housing in the Downtown area on State Street.

The existing building was designed by the architectural firm of Soule and Murphy and was constructed in 1946.
V. SITE INFORMATION AND PROJECT STATISTICS

A. SITE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Susette Naylor, AIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner:</td>
<td>Almond Holdings, LLC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Number:</td>
<td>039-131-017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>4,108 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan:</td>
<td>Commercial/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density Residential (28-36 du/ac)/Priority Housing (37-63 du/ac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>C-G (Commercial-General)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use:</td>
<td>Commercial; Ground Floor – Restaurant Upper Level – Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography:</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent Land Uses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North – State Street, and Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South – Arlington Village multi-unit housing (under construction) and Arlington Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East – Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West – Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. PROJECT STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Area – Unit 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>728 square feet (net)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Area – Unit 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>766 square feet (net)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Space</td>
<td>5,186 square feet (net)</td>
<td>3,692 square feet (net)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,186 square feet (net)</td>
<td>5,186 square feet (net)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. POLICY AND ZONING CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

A. ZONING ORDINANCE CONSISTENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Requirement/ Allowance</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>Existing Requirement (all commercial): 5,186 sq. ft./500 (CBD) x 0.95 (5% Zone of Benefit) = 9 commercial spaces</td>
<td>0 commercial spaces**</td>
<td>0 residential spaces*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Requirement (commercial on the ground level and residential on the upper level): 3,692 sq. ft./500 (CBD) x 0.95 (5% Zone of Benefit) + 2 (AUD residential) = 7 commercial spaces and 2 residential spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Open Yard – Unit A</strong></td>
<td>Existing Requirement (all commercial): N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>existing 18 sq. ft. (net) balcony with 8’-6” x 2’-0” dimensions*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Requirement (commercial on the ground level and residential on the upper level): 72 sq. ft. with 6’-0” x 6’-0” minimum dimensions</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Open Yard – Unit B</strong></td>
<td>Existing Requirement (all commercial): N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 sq. ft.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Requirement (commercial on the ground level and residential on the upper level): 72 sq. ft. with 6’-0” x 6’-0” minimum dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Coverage</strong></td>
<td>- Building: N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Paving/Driveway: N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Landscaping: N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed change of use does change how the parking requirement is calculated (see the above table), but results in the same number of required parking spaces (9).

The existing development is nonconforming to the minimum number of parking spaces required by the Zoning Ordinance. Pursuant to SBMC §30.175.020.B.3.a, the ground level commercial operation can continue without providing additional parking. However, per SBMC 30.175.020.A, when a new residential unit is established, conforming parking must be provided for that unit. Therefore, only the two parking spaces required for the proposed two residential units are subject to the Modification request.

The applicant has searched for off-site parking, and summarized the results of their search in their applicant letter (Exhibit C). The applicant and the building’s property management team have approached six businesses within approximately 750 feet of the subject lot, and have not found long-term lease opportunities for the two required residential parking spaces.

Per Downtown Parking and Transportation staff, parking spaces within City parking lots are not currently available for purchase to satisfy a development’s parking requirements. However, residents could pursue a monthly parking permit in a City lot on their own accord, if they work in the area. Monthly parking permits are not issued solely for residential use. Per Downtown Parking’s webpage, monthly parking permits are currently available in Lot 6, located behind the Granada Theatre on the 1200 block of State Street for $160 per month ($1,920/year). Monthly parking permits are not available at Lot 5, which is located at the corner of W. Victoria Street and Chapala Street, or at Lot 7, which is located adjacent to the Santa Barbara Central Library on Anacapa Street.

The project site is within Area D of the Residential Parking Permit Program, with yearly parking permits available for $30 year; however, per Downtown Parking staff, permits are not issued for new development, or for Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program projects. Additionally, staff and the Planning Commission have been conditioning projects that receive a parking modification such that they are not eligible for those parking permits.

There is precedent in the area for parking modifications being granted to allow for no parking on-site, although it has been many years since these modifications were approved. On July 19, 2006, the Staff Hearing Officer approved a parking modification at 1210-1216 State Street (MST2005-00323), located approximately one block southeast of the subject parcel, to allow creation of two residential condominium units within an existing commercial building (Granada Tower). In that case, the project’s conversion did not result in an increase in parking demand compared to existing uses and the location in the urban core close to services and shopping were cited as key reasons for supporting the parking modification. On October 11, 2006, the Staff Hearing Officer approved a Parking Modification at 1311 State Street (MST2006-00479), five parcels south of the subject parcel, to allow expansion of a restaurant without requiring parking on-site. In that case, parking availability in Lot 6 and no increase in parking demand were cited in the findings approving the project.
Transportation staff reviewed the proposed project and is supportive of the proposed Parking Modification given that the total parking requirement (9 spaces) would remain unchanged and the precedents at 1210-1216 and 1311 State Street.

Zoning staff is supportive of the proposed Parking Modification to allow no on-site parking for the proposed residential units due to the built-out nature of the site, the building’s historic designation that could be impacted by substantial redevelopment to accommodate on-site parking (see Sections VII and VIII of this report for more information), the number of existing and proposed required spaces (9) is the same, the lack of positive outcomes in pursuing off-site parking, and General Plan policies and Possible Implementation Actions encouraging additional housing in the downtown area.

b. Open Yard Modification

The subject parcel was originally developed with a commercial building, with no open yard requirement. In order to convert the second floor to two residential units, both units require private open yard. Common open yard is not required as the lot is in a non-residential zone and is proposed to be developed with less than four AUD units (SBMC Section 30.150.090.G.2).

An existing balcony, approximately 18 square feet in size and measuring 8'-6” x 2'-0” within the guardrail, overhangs the paseo on the building’s west elevation, off of proposed Unit A. Early versions of the project included adding a second matching balcony for Unit B or recessing a portion of the rear façade to create conforming open yard. However, in reviewing the project with the Urban Historian, the applicant eliminated these additional balconies from the project in an effort to preserve the historic integrity of the western elevation (see Sections VII and VIII for more information of the historicity of the existing structure).

The existing rooftop is largely inaccessible; there is one rooftop hatch that would remain accessible from proposed Unit A. Once on the roof, an occupant would find that it is covered with existing rooftop equipment that serves the existing restaurant operation on the ground floor and the previous office space on the second floor. Expanding roof access would require alteration to either the State Street or paseo façade, as the building extends the entire width of the lot. Improvements to rooftop equipment are proposed as part of this project, including new skylights and air conditioning units for the proposed residential units, but no new rooftop access is proposed.

The applicant has submitted a diagrammatic plan showing open recreational spaces in the downtown Santa Barbara area, most within three blocks of the project site, and includes public parks as well as public open spaces such as the County of Santa Barbara Courthouse’s sunken gardens. The project site is also located on State Street, within 1 block of a stop of the Downtown-Waterfront Shuttle (Anacapa/Sola) that would allow a resident to easily access other outdoor living opportunities in the community, such as the waterfront area beaches and parks.

Given that the site is fully developed, that there are physical and historic constraints that prohibit the creation of addition open space on the lot, and that there is access to off-site outdoor living opportunities nearby, staff is supportive of the applicant not providing the
required private open yard for Unit B and providing minimal private open yard for Unit A on the existing balcony.

2. **AVERAGE UNIT-SIZE DENSITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM**

The subject parcel is located in a Commercial/High Density Residential (28-36 du/ac)/Priority Housing Overlay (37-63 du/ac) area. The base density of the subject C-G zoned parcel is one residential unit. To qualify for the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program (AUD Program), the proposed project must exceed the base density of the lot, be in an allowable zone, and include a proposed average unit size corresponding to the density/unit size tables included in SBMC Chapter 30.150. With the proposed two units, the density would be 21.21 dwelling units/acre. The average unit-size would be 747 square feet, well under the allowable 1,245 square feet per unit for two units (using the High Density land use designation).

Standard conditions of approval related to AUD Program projects are included in Exhibit A.

B. **GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY**

The project site is located in the Downtown Neighborhood, which is bounded on the north by Sola Street; on the south by Ortega Street; on the east by Santa Barbara Street; and on the west by De la Vina Street. The Downtown Neighborhood is the most intensively used part of the City. The Downtown is a major tourist draw with historic sites, retail stores and cultural arts venues, including the adjacent Arlington Theatre and nearby Granada Theatre. The General Plan (Appendix B) identifies the importance of providing residential development in the Downtown Neighborhood as it is the major employment center for the City. The General Plan land use designation for the project site is Commercial/High Density Residential (28-36 du/ac)/Priority Housing Overlay (37-63 du/ac).

The proposed project is generally consistent with the policies of the General Plan. Additional analysis of key policies is provided below.

1. **HOUSING ELEMENT**

   **Policy H10. New Housing.** Given limited remaining land resources, the City shall encourage the development of housing on vacant infill sites and the redevelopment of opportunity sites both in residential zones, and as part of mixed-use development in commercial zones.

   **Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered H10.3. Building Reuse.** Encourage residential reuse of existing nonresidential buildings, for both ownership and rental affordable housing.

   **Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered H11.2. Priority Housing Overlay.** Encourage the construction of rental housing, employer sponsored housing, and co-operative housing in the Downtown, La Cumbre Plaza/Five Points area, C-M Commercial Manufacturing Zone and Milpas Street area by providing incentives such as: increased density overlays up to 63 du/ac as part of the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program, higher Floor Area Ratios (FAR) when such standards are developed,
more flexibility with zoning standards (e.g. reduced parking standards), expedited Design Review process, fee waivers or deferrals.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered H17.2. Zoning Standards. Consider amending the Zoning Ordinance to change how, where, and the extent of outdoor living space, yard and setback requirements for housing in commercial zones.

The proposed project includes redeveloping a commercial building, within a commercial zone in the Downtown area, to a mixed-use property with two Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program residential units, thus, the proposed project is consistent with the policies listed above. More flexible zoning standards in the form of a Parking Modification and Open Yard Modification are requested, consistent with practices outlined in Policies H11.2 and H17.2 specifically.

2. Historic Resources Element

Policy HR1. Protect Historic and Archaeological Resources. Protect the heritage of the City by preserving, protecting and enhancing historic resources and archaeological resources. Apply available governmental resources, devices and approaches, such as the measures enumerated in the Land Use Element of this Plan, to facilitate their preservation and protection.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered HR1.1. Use all available tools. Consider specific preservation strategies and land use regulation mechanisms, including those listed in the Land Use Element, such as revised development standards, buffer protection, overlay zones, Design and Historic Districts, Landmark, and Structure of Merit designations.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered HR1.4. Interpret regulations flexibly. In order to ensure that a historic resource will be perpetuated, even if it historical use becomes obsolete or is discontinued, avoid the application or strict interpretation of regulatory codes and ordinances which might erode or alter its traditional or historic character. In accord with the spirit and the intent of the California State Historical Building Code, interpret and apply such codes so that flexible yet equally safe alternates can be substituted that promote the future vitality of the historic resource.

Policy HR4. Pursue Adaptive Reuse. Encourage the adaptation of historic buildings or structures for uses other than the original intended use when the original use is no longer viable.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered HR4.1. Provide Incentives. Provide incentives for the adaptive reuse of historic buildings. Support zoning modification approvals for parking and setbacks to allow more change of uses for historic properties and allow more flexible building code compliance alternatives. For example, employ the California State Historical Building Code to allow more flexibility in code compliance.

The subject lot is built-out with a designated historic resource (see Sections VII and VIII of this report for more information). Only approximately 3.5% of the lot, 140 square feet, is open, and currently hardscaped. The proposed modifications include waiving the on-site parking requirements for the new residential units and greatly reducing the required
on-site open yard areas. As described above in Section VI.A of this report, providing the required parking and open yard would require substantial redevelopment/renovation of the site that could impact the historic designation. The project includes returning the western façade to the original design, which included the one existing balcony. The Historic Landmarks Commission determined that, from a design and preservation standpoint, not adding additional open yard – such as additional or enlarged balconies – was appropriate for this particular site (see Section VIII, below, for more information). Additionally, a majority of the Historic Landmarks Commission offered support for the requested parking reduction to preserve the integrity of the building. The proposed modification requests, in conjunction with the Historic Landmarks Commission’s designation of the existing structure as a Structure of Merit, are consistent with these General Plan policies.

3. CIRCULATION ELEMENT

Policy C7. Parking Management. Manage parking Downtown to reduce congestion, increase economic vitality, and preserve Santa Barbara’s quality of life.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered C7.6. Residential Off-site Parking. 
Amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow residential required parking off-site in commercial zones.

The applicant has attempted to find off-site parking in lieu of requesting the proposed Parking Modification, as described above in Section VI.A of this report. The existing site is built-out, with no available space for parking. Commercial operations nearby do not have parking spaces for sale, and City operations do not allow for residential parking for new development via the Residential Parking Permit program or in City parking lots. The requested Parking Modification would essentially require any vehicle owned by a tenant to be parked off-site, consistent with this General Plan policy and implementation action.

VII. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Staff has determined that the project qualifies for an exemption from further environmental review under Section 15183 [Projects Consistent with a Community Plan or Zoning] of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, which allows for projects which are consistent with the development density established by the existing general plan for which an EIR was certified to not require additional environmental review, except to determine whether or not there are project-specific significant impacts.

City Council environmental findings adopted for the 2011 General Plan remain applicable for this project. A decision-maker finding that the project qualifies for the §15183 CEQA determination is required and is included in Section X of this report.

1. HISTORIC RESOURCES

Post/Hazeltine Associates prepared a Historic Structures/Sites Report, dated February 27, 2018, detailing the project site’s history and architectural style. The Report is included as Exhibit E in this report.

While the State Street façade (east elevation) is one story, the west elevation, facing the paseo behind the building, rises to two stories and houses the area proposed for
conversion to residential use. The west elevation has been modified since the initial 1946 construction date, but all significant changes were on the ground floor, including door and window replacement. Despite these changes, the Report confirms that “this elevation of the building is largely intact as the division into three storefronts [on the ground floor] is readily discernible” and that “most of the design elements of the paseo elevation...including all of the second floor fenestration ...still convey the character of its original construction materials” (Post/Hazeltine, 22). The Report’s conclusions note that the structure is eligible for designation at the local level as a Structure of Merit (Post/Hazeltine, 30).

The Report also details the character-defining features of the building. On the west elevation, the character-defining features include the two-story massing; gabled roof with terra cotta tiles; linear façade divided into three storefronts (on the ground floor); sash windows and metal grilles on the ground floor; the second floor fenestration, shutters, and metal grilles; and the second floor balcony (Post/Hazeltine, 34).

The Report concludes that the proposed project’s impacts are anticipated to be less than significant (Post/Hazeltine, 39).

While Post/Hazeltine considered the original project description – conversion of the upper level to one two-bedroom unit – the project description change does not affect the findings of the report, which concludes the project “would not encompass alterations to the State Street façade (east elevation) or to surviving historic fabric on the rear elevation (west elevation)” and that the project “would preserve the design cohesiveness of the Paseo elevation (west elevation)” (Post/Hazeltine, 38). The project description change and project evolution have resulted in fewer exterior changes to the ground floor. Previously, new doors and windows were proposed on the left-hand side of the west elevation. Now, no exterior changes to the ground level are proposed. The only change proposed on the west elevation is to remove non-character-defining awnings.

The Historic Landmarks Commission reviewed the Report on March 21, 2018 and accepted it, specifically commenting that the west elevation is to return to the original design and that if any significant changes to the project were to occur, the Urban Historian could approve a revised report. Staff reviewed the project description changes with the Urban Historian, and no revised report was required for environmental review due to the reduction in exterior changes on the western façade.

B. WATER QUALITY

No new impervious surfaces are proposed; therefore, the project is only subject to voluntary Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) Tier 1 best management practices.

VIII. DESIGN REVIEW

As noted above, the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) reviewed and approved a Historic Sites/Structures Report for the proposed project on March 21, 2018. The HLC noted that the existing structure is eligible for historic designation and agreed with the Report’s findings that the proposed project’s impacts to the significant historic resource would be less than significant (Class III). The HLC subsequently designated the building as a Structure of Merit on September 19, 2018.
The project design was also reviewed by the HLC on March 21, 2018. The seven-member board unanimously agreed in a series of straw votes that:

1. Restaurant odors are a concern regarding livability,
2. Two units could be supported in lieu of one,
3. Required open yard could be provided off-site in nearby public spaces in lieu of changing the existing balcony or adding another,
4. The west elevation should return to the original design, and
5. The HLC would be supportive of the Planning Commission restricting occupancy and number of allowed vehicles for the proposed residential portion of the project.

Five of the seven members were supportive of the proposed Parking Modification. The two commissioners not in support of the Parking Modification noted concerns about cumulative parking impacts and setting precedent.

In regards to the design, the HLC was supportive of the project. The full meeting minutes are included as Exhibit D in this report.

**IX. FINDINGS**

The Planning Commission finds the following:

**A. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

The project qualifies for an exemption from further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 based on city staff analysis and the CEQA certificate of determination on file for this project.

**B. PARKING MODIFICATION**

The Parking Modification is appropriate given that the project site exemplifies unusual or unique circumstances in regards to site constraints to provide parking on-site. The project site is built-out, nearly lot line to lot line, with a designated Structure of Merit that was initially constructed in 1946. Supplying parking on-site without demolishing a portion of the structure, most likely the historically-intact rear (west) elevation, is not feasible. Further, in reviewing the existing and proposed parking requirement, the total number of spaces required for the development (9 spaces) remains the same despite the change of use. Finally, General Plan policies encourage housing in the Downtown area and flexible development standards, including a reduction in parking.

**C. OPEN YARD MODIFICATION**

The Open Yard Modification is necessary to secure an appropriate improvement on the lot (conversion of commercial space to two residential units) and prevent unreasonable hardship due to the physical characteristics of the existing development. The proposed project’s only exterior alterations are to remove non-character-defining awnings from the rear (west) elevation. An existing balcony, original to the 1946 construction, is proposed to be the private open yard for one of the residential units. Per guidance from the Historic Landmarks Commission, altering the existing balcony or adding a second balcony for the second residential unit would not be appropriate for this designated historic resource. Additionally, the roof area is not accessible from both units and is covered in rooftop equipment serving
the existing commercial operations, making it unsuitable for open yard. Waiving the on-site Open Yard requirement would not impede residents’ access to outdoor living opportunities. The location of the project site, on State Street in the Downtown area, would allow residents to access public open spaces and entertainment opportunities within walking distance and within affordable public transportation routes, such as the Downtown-Waterfront Shuttle.

Exhibits:

A. Draft Conditions of Approval
B. Site Plan
C. Applicant's letter, dated October 2, 2018
D. Historic Landmarks Commission Minutes, dated March 21, 2018
E. Historic Sites/Structures Report, prepared by Post/Hazeltine and dated February 27, 2018
PLANNING COMMISSION DRAFT CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1325 STATE STREET
PARKING MODIFICATION AND OPEN YARD MODIFICATION
DECEMBER 6, 2018

I. In consideration of the project approval granted by the Planning Commission and for the benefit of the owner and occupants of the Real Property, the owners and occupants of adjacent real property and the public generally, the following terms and conditions are imposed on the use, possession, and enjoyment of the Real Property:

A. **Order of Development.** In order to accomplish the proposed development, the following steps shall occur in the order identified:
   1. Obtain all required design review approvals.
   2. Record any required documents (see Recorded Conditions Agreement section).
   3. Permits.
      a. Submit an application for and obtain a Building Permit (BLD) for construction of approved development and complete said development.
      b. Submit an application for and obtain a Public Works Permit (PBW) for any required public improvements and complete said improvements.

Details on implementation of these steps are provided throughout the conditions of approval.

B. **Recorded Conditions Agreement.** The Owner shall execute a written instrument, which shall be prepared by Planning staff, reviewed as to form and content by the City Attorney, Community Development Director and Public Works Director, recorded in the Office of the County Recorder, and shall include the following:
   1. **Approved Development.** The development of the Real Property approved by the Planning Commission on December 6, 2018 is limited to the conversion of the upper level of 1325 State Street from commercial floor area to two residential units and the improvements shown on the plans signed by the chairperson of the Planning Commission on said date and on file at the City of Santa Barbara.

   2. **Residential Permit Parking Program.** Residents shall not participate in the Residential Permit Parking Program.

C. **Requirements Prior to Permit Issuance.** The Owner shall submit the following, or evidence of completion of the following, for review and approval by the Department listed below prior to the issuance of any permit for the project. Some of these conditions may be waived for demolition or rough grading permits, at the discretion of the department listed. Please note that these conditions are in addition to the standard submittal requirements for each department.

   1. **Community Development Department.**
      a. **Recordation of Agreements.** The Owner shall provide evidence of recordation of the written instrument that includes all of the Recorded

EXHIBIT A
Conditions identified in condition B “Recorded Conditions Agreement” to the Community Development Department prior to issuance of any building permits.

b. **Design Review Requirements.** Plans shall show all design, landscape and tree protection elements, as approved by the appropriate design review board, and all elements/specifications shall be implemented on-site.

c. **Conditions on Plans/Signatures.** The final Resolution shall be provided on a full size drawing sheet as part of the drawing sets. A statement shall also be placed on the sheet as follows: The undersigned have read and understand the required conditions, and agree to abide by any and all conditions which are their usual and customary responsibility to perform, and which are within their authority to perform.

Signed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>License No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>License No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>License No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

D. **Construction Implementation Requirements.** All of these construction requirements shall be carried out in the field by the Owner and/or Contractor for the duration of the project construction, including demolition and grading.

1. **Construction Storage/Staging.** Construction vehicle/equipment/materials storage and staging shall be done on-site. No parking or storage shall be permitted within the public right-of-way, unless specifically permitted by the Public Works Director with a Public Works permit.

2. **Construction Parking.** During construction, free parking spaces for construction workers shall be provided on-site or off-site in a location subject to the approval of the Public Works Director.

E. **Prior to Certificate of Occupancy.** Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, the Owner of the Real Property shall complete the following:

1. **Repair Damaged Public Improvements.** Repair any public improvements (curbs, gutters, sidewalks, roadways, etc.) or property damaged by construction subject to the review and approval of the Public Works Department per SBMC §22.60. Where tree roots are the cause of the damage, the roots shall be pruned under the direction of a qualified arborist.
F. General Conditions.

1. **Annual Resident Survey.** For informational purposes only, the owner of all Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program projects in the Medium High and High Density and Priority Housing Overlay zones shall conduct an annual resident survey and report the following information for each unit to the Planning Division by December 31st of each year for the first eight years of the project commencing six months after the final Certificate of Occupancy. The annual report for each unit shall include:
   a. Net floor area.
   b. Number of bedrooms.
   c. Monthly rent (or condominium purchase price) and utilities.
   d. Periods of vacancy.
   e. Household size.
   f. Current employment location of each adult resident by zip code.
   g. Prior employment location of each adult resident by zip code.
   h. Prior residence zip code for each adult.
   i. Number of cars, trucks and bikes owned by each resident. Please list types of alternative transportation used (if any).

2. **Compliance with Requirements.** All requirements of the city of Santa Barbara and any other applicable requirements of any law or agency of the State and/or any government entity or District shall be met. This includes, but is not limited to, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 [ESA] and any amendments thereto (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.), the 1979 Air Quality Attainment Plan, and the California Code of Regulations.

3. **Approval Limitations.**
   a. The conditions of this approval supersede all conflicting notations, specifications, dimensions, and the like which may be shown on submitted plans.
   b. All buildings, roadways, parking areas and other features shall be located substantially as shown on the plans approved by the Planning Commission.
   c. Any deviations from the project description, approved plans or conditions must be reviewed and approved by the City, in accordance with the Planning Commission Guidelines. Deviations may require changes to the permit and/or further environmental review. Deviations without the above-described approval will constitute a violation of permit approval.

4. **Litigation Indemnification Agreement.** In the event the Planning Commission approval of the Project is appealed to the City Council, Applicant/Owner hereby
agrees to defend the City, its officers, employees, agents, consultants and independent contractors ("City’s Agents") from any third party legal challenge to the City Council’s denial of the appeal and approval of the Project, including, but not limited to, challenges filed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (collectively “Claims”). Applicant/Owner further agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City and the City’s Agents from any award of attorney fees or court costs made in connection with any Claim.

Applicant/Owner shall execute a written agreement, in a form approved by the City Attorney, evidencing the foregoing commitments of defense and indemnification within thirty (30) days of being notified of a lawsuit regarding the Project. These commitments of defense and indemnification are material conditions of the approval of the Project. If Applicant/Owner fails to execute the required defense and indemnification agreement within the time allotted, the Project approval shall become null and void absent subsequent acceptance of the agreement by the City, which acceptance shall be within the City’s sole and absolute discretion. Nothing contained in this condition shall prevent the City or the City’s Agents from independently defending any Claim. If the City or the City’s Agents decide to independently defend a Claim, the City and the City’s Agents shall bear their own attorney fees, expenses, and costs of that independent defense.

NOTICE OF MODIFICATION APPROVAL TIME LIMITS:

The Planning Commission action approving the Modification shall terminate three (3) years from the date of the approval, per Santa Barbara Municipal Code §30.205.120, unless:

1. An extension is granted by the Community Development Director prior to the expiration of the approval; or

2. A Building permit for the use authorized by the approval is issued and the construction authorized by the permit is being diligently pursued to completion and issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
October 2, 2018

Lesley Wiscomb, Chair
Planning Commissioners
City of Santa Barbara
630 Garden Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Subject: Revised Letter of September 20th 2018 for 1325-1327 State Street (APN 39-131-017) Zoning Modifications for Conversion of Offices to 2 Residential Units
MST2018-00079

Dear Chair Wiscomb and Planning Commissioners;

On behalf of the property owners, Almond Holdings, we are pleased to submit this letter as part of our application for a Permit under the Average Unit Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program to allow the conversion of 1494 s.f. net of existing office space to two 1-bedroom residential units. The offices are located in an existing partial 2nd storey above an existing restaurant and we propose no expansion to the existing volume or area of the building.

We wish to provide more housing in downtown Santa Barbara. By rehabilitating an existing historic building to provide these two units we believe we can contribute to the revitalization and appreciation of what our downtown has to offer. In addition we would serve as a demonstration of the type of evolutionary re-use of existing historic resources as a tool for revitalizing the CBD per the underlying philosophy of the Historic Resource Element.

Due to the physical constraints of its existing embedded location and preservation concerns (as detailed below), we find we must request two zoning modifications:

a. Open Yard Area
b. Parking

Chronological Summary of Process:

From the start, we have been seeking to make our project fit into the community. Initial analysis indicated that conversion to residential units was not only feasible but fulfilled several goals of the General Plan (see Addenda - Housing, Historic Resources, Circulation Elements). Our efforts were greatly aided by planning staff under the umbrella of the SBAccelerate program.

The existing property contains one building with one full lower floor (3692 s.f. net) occupied by Opal restaurant and a partial upper floor (1494 s.f. net) currently unoccupied but most recently occupied as offices. There is no change to the area nor exterior volume of the building.
We originally proposed converting the offices into one 2-BR apartment. After a pre-application consultation with staff for the Staff Hearing Officer, we presented our project at a concept meeting with HLC. We then subsequently conferred with Modification and Transportation staff regarding the input we received from HLC and we revised our design to accommodate two 1-BR apartments. The fact that we have two existing stairways from the Paseo up to the second floor is unusual and provides an exciting opportunity for the creation of two residential units.

Original Proposal: Conversion of existing office space to one 2-BR apartment on upper floor above existing restaurant; removal of one access stair requiring partial remodel at lower floor; partial remodel of roof framing and skylights with no change in volume of exterior roof envelope. Replacement of commercial HVAC units with residential. Mitigation of existing and proposed noise/vibration impacts of HVAC systems.

2 modifications required:
Parking (waiver of 1 uncovered parking space)
Open yard modification for 1 unit (providing only 18 s.f. < req’d)

Actions:
1. February 13, 2018: Pre-Application meeting with Ms. Swanson, Staff
   Result: support for open yard modification; tentative support for parking

   Result: Positive comments
   Support for open yard (unanimous) and support for parking (majority)
   Suggestion of two 1-BR apartments
   Support for either one 2-BR or two 1-BR apartments
   Approval of HSSR findings re: eligibility as a Structure of Merit

3. April 4, 2018: Motion to add property to Potential Historic Resources List as it was found eligible to be designated as a Structure of Merit
   Result: Approved to be added to next round of designations — scheduled for Sept. 18, 2018

Revised Proposal: Under Average Unit Size Density Incentive (AUD) Program, proposal to allow conversion of upper floor existing office space (1494 s.f.) to two 1-BR apartments above existing restaurant (3692 s.f.); partial replacement of roof framing and skylights, addition of 1 skylight with no change in volume of exterior roof envelope. Replacement of commercial HVAC with residential units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Average Unit Size</th>
<th>Residential Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit A</td>
<td>729.5 s.f.</td>
<td>2 units/0.094 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit B</td>
<td>771.5 s.f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>750.5 s.f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We will mitigate existing noise/vibration impacts of existing and proposed HVAC systems.

2 modifications required:
Parking (waiver of 2 uncovered parking spaces)
Open yard modification for 2 units - waiver of partial open yard for Unit A and full waiver for Unit B.

Actions: Communication/meeting with Modification staff and Transportation staff
Result: support for 2 units

Property Information

The subject parcel is located in the C-G zone. It is within the GMP development area and is included in the AUD overlay. Our proposed use complies with the zone and AUD (commercial/high density and priority housing) overlay. The Base residential Density is one dwelling unit. The GMP overlay is irrelevant as no new non-residential use is proposed. We are located within the CBD-500 parking district and are currently served by City sewer and water. If we were proposing any site improvements we would be categorized as Tier 1 in SWMP.

As we are in the C-G zone, on the North, South, East and West we are adjacent to commercial properties. The South and West of this block of State Street contains recent transformations such as the Arlington Village and Alma de Pueblo and we are located in very sensitive historic adjacency to the Arlington Theatre and its Paseo.

Current use of the property:

1. Lower Floor: Opal restaurant - fronts on both State Street and the Paseo
2. Upper Floor: Offices (currently unoccupied) which front and are accessed only from the Paseo.

We are in the El Pueblo Viejo District. We recognized this building as an historic piece of this neighbourhood, communicated with the Urban Historian and commissioned an HSSR. The HSSR evaluated the building as being worthy of status as a Structure of Merit and has been nominated for designation by the City (Historic Structures and Site Report by Post Hazeltine Associates, see attached). Designation is scheduled for Sept. 19, 2018. Originally designed by the firm of Soule and Murphy, the building has two public facades – one at State Street and one at the Paseo at the Arlington Theatre.

City of Santa Barbara archived records show the permitted evolution of the building. The first major structural and spatial change to the building was by Lenvik and Minor. Originally 3 separate retail spaces, each bay had a mezzanine accessed from within by an interior stair from the lower floor. These were remodeled to become a completely separate upper floor with access rerouted to two new stairs from the Paseo. What was originally intended and designed as accessory area to the lower floor was converted to a separate storey.
Over the years, the lower floor at 1325 has been remodeled as a variety of commercial uses but since the 1980's has been used exclusively, as was 1327 from 1949, as restaurant space with the attendant needs of that use. HVAC and plumbing system needs affect the rooftop of both floors but in particular populate the first floor rooftop for the restaurant. Permit history is scanty with regard to the upper floor. Per City of Santa Barbara permit records it was occupied by a beauty salon for the previous owner. Subsequent use as an office occupancy has no recorded history in the street files and the seismic retrofit drawings from the 1980’s indicate a prior tenant improvement somewhat different from current existing improvements.

Projected Construction Impact of proposed project

As the project is primarily an interior remodel of an existing 2nd storey space in concert with mitigation and improvement of existing HVAC equipment impact, we anticipate that demolition will occupy one week during an entire project timeline of 3 months. We anticipate a timeline of 3 months because we wish to accommodate Opal, our tenant below, by stopping construction during the lunchtime hours of 11:30 – 2:30, resuming construction till 5 p.m. when they will open for dinner.

During this interval there will be a steady crew of 3 – 5 workers on a daily basis for the duration of the project. All required materials will be taken into the space and loaded from Sola Street so there will be no need for an outside staging area.

Environmental Services – Trash/Waste

Currently due to the construction of Arlington Village trash and waste is temporarily being detoured from its previous location and processing. The Municipal Code requires a screened enclosure for our two 65 gal bins for each unit but this is not possible with the current building and its context. We have been in contact with Environmental Services and have determined that Arlington Village planned for an oversized trash enclosure (capacity 5 dumpsters) on its property with the intention of accommodating the properties which line the Paseo at the Arlington. We have conferred with Environmental Services and have received their support for our two residential units.

Parking

We are in the CBD-500 parking district, with a 5% zone of benefit. We are not privy to information with regard to current parking conformance. Per consultation with staff, we understand that as a mixed use residential unit in the CBD, we are required to provide 1 uncovered space per unit (2 total) with no guest parking nor bicycle space required. (see attached 2018-02-13 modification consultation letter)

Parking demand analysis:

Communication with Transportation staff with the following information resulted in their determination that a parking study was not required.
If the upper floor remains an office- Prior zoning ordinance required 3 spaces
New zoning ordinance (effective Oct. 2017) will require 2 spaces
The lower floor occupancy, size, use and parking remain unchanged (3692 s.f. net with a required parking need of 7.01 spaces or 8 spaces per prior zoning, 7 with current NZO) and remains non-conforming. The restaurant has a lunch/dinner service.

The current office space would have required: 1494 s.f. (net)/500 = 2.98 x 95% = 2.83 spaces or 2 spaces in the current NZO.

The proposed two residential units will require 2 spaces total.

With regard to demand in terms of time of day, we assume the commercial use of the offices is highest during working hours and anticipate residential use would be the opposite - in the evening, when the impact is lower in this area.

We are very interested in the options such as an in-lieu fee and possibility of renting parking from the City (e.g. in nearby city parking lots) for overnight parking.

The interesting location of this property at the edge of the AUD high density (28-35 du/acre) overlay zone indicates City planning hopes and our aligned choice to both introduce more residential use to this zone as well as retain the essential characteristics of not only the vehicular and pedestrian streetscape of State Street but also compound the successful pedestrian streetscape of the Paseo at the Arlington.

Efforts to pursue parking:

There is neither space available nor any ability to access if there were space on the property for parking. We have diligently sought possible parking spaces within and somewhat beyond the required 500 feet (walking distance) from our property. My clients and I contacted the following entities which appeared to have potential parking spaces available: (see attached letter from Hayes)

1. Lady of Sorrows Church: 21 E. Sola St:
   No long term, overnight parking available.

2. Chase Bank Parking lot: 1302 State Street:
   Owner allots daytime parking for Chase patrons and other patrons during the evening.

3. Public Market Alma Pueblo: 38 West Victoria:
   Manager stated they do not rent spaces out to the public.

4. Louise Lowry Davis Center: 1232 De la Vina:
   They only allow parking for participants of the senior center and public park.

5. Arlington Village: 1330 Chapala
   Owner, Metropolitan Theatres stated they are unable to offer parking.

6. United States Bankruptcy Court: 1415 State Street
   Owner has surplus parking spaces above requirements but they are not currently available.
Open Yard Area Requirements

Because of the challenges (the embedded location of the existing building, difficulty of expanding over the restaurant roof), its historicity and contribution to the streetscape on State and on the Paseo, and per the Historic Resources Element of the General Plan for Santa Barbara we request a modification for the Open Yard requirements.

This request for modifications to Open Yard requirements is three-fold:

1. We can only provide an existing balcony of 18 s.f. to meet the required private open yard of 72 s.f. for Unit A. In addition, the existing balcony does not meet the minimum dimensions of 6’0” x 6’0”.

2. We cannot provide any required private open yard of 72 s.f. for Unit B.

Exploration of avenues for open yard at upper floor:

Towards State Street:

The height of the lower floor roof is approximately 4 feet above the floor level of the upper floor which would require stairs and additional height for any open yard area. In addition the existing HVAC equipment for the restaurant would entail complications that preclude seeking open yard in this direction.

West/East

We are hemmed in by the immediately adjacent one storey buildings and the height of their roofs.

Paseo façade:

As the upper storey façade has remained relatively untouched by alterations our suggested proposals to either expand the balcony or to remodel the front façade by carving a loggia into the interior was not supported by the Historians nor the Urban Historian. The acceptance of the HSSR by HLC presumes agreement on this issue.

When we considered opening up the existing shed roof to create an unroofed patio, subsequent consultation with our structural engineer revealed that the previous seismic retrofit in the 1980’s used the shed roof assembly/sheathing to tie the main beam back into the structure.

Even if we were to consider this option, the new ordinance - while providing more flexibility for covered private yards - requires one side which is “substantially unenclosed”. As we are bounded on two sides by adjacent buildings and a compatible façade change would require substantial columns and guardrails this was not viable.
Urban Living: Downtown Green Spaces:

This property was not originally designed to be a mixed use property but rather to be a commercially efficient property. However the evolution of both floors from a building partitioned into 3 separate retail spaces into one building with a separate lower floor occupancy and a separate second floor now lends us the opportunity of a mixed use.

We show on our map (Sht. A0) the adjacency of several available public park/green spaces within walking distance of our property: These “lungs” embedded in our city provide a variety of diverse open spaces. Due to thoughtful urban planning for our community over many years, they are linked to our cultural history, recreational needs, botanic resources, educational opportunities and all else a community can provide in public parks.

We are appreciative of our path through City process since we first engaged with staff through the SBAccelerate program. Planners in every department we have reached out to have been helpful to us on our path. We appear before the Planning Commission having received support from city staff and Historic Landmarks Commission in the hope that our goals are aligned with that of the City and our community.

On behalf of the owners, I thank you for your consideration of the proposed project.

Sincerely,

Susette H.H.C. Naylor, AIA
Thompson Naylor Architects
ADDENDA

A. Findings:

30.250.60 (B) Parking Modification heard by Planning Commission

A modification for reduced parking may only be approved if the Planning Commission finds that:

1. All of the same findings as the Staff Hearing officer
   (reduced parking will meet anticipated parking demand generated by the project site)

2. Other criteria consistent with the purposes of the parking regulations and based on
   the unusual or unique circumstances of a particular case, as deemed appropriate by
   the Planning Commission

And if it is helpful perhaps reference to the following findings will serve:

30.250.60 (E) Preservation of Historic Resources.

A Modification of any provision of this Title to allow improvements to an existing structure or site in
order to preserve a designated historic resource may only be approved if the Review Authority makes all
of the following findings:

1. The Modification is consistent with the general purposes of this Title or the
   specific purposes of the zoning district in which the project is located;

2. The project design proposes improvements that encourage rehabilitation or adaptive
   re-use of a designated historic resource, as an alternative to demolition or relocation;

3. Reduction or waiver of zoning requirements would facilitate the preservation of the
   historic resource; and

4. The Modification approval and project after completion will be consistent with the
   City's Historic Resource Design

I refer to the below because it provides a basis for the above specific findings.

30.250.60 (F) All Other Modifications -

1. The Modification is consistent with the general purposes of this Title or the
   specific purposes of the zoning district in which the project is located; and

2. The Modification is necessary to accomplish any one of the following:
a. Secure an appropriate improvement on a lot; or
b. Prevent unreasonable hardship due to the physical characteristics of the site or development, or other circumstances including, but not limited to, topography, noise exposure, irregular property boundaries, proximity to creeks, or other unusual circumstance; or
c. Result in development that is generally consistent with existing patterns of development for the neighbourhood, or will promote uniformity of improvement to existing structures on the site; or
d. Construct a housing development containing affordable residential units rented or owned and occupied in the manner provided for in the City's Affordable Housing Policies and Procedures.

B. AUD MAP
Applicable General Plan Goals and Policies

LAND USE ELEMENT GOALS

- Resource Allocation: Achieve a balance in the amount, location and type of growth within the context of available resources including water, energy, food, housing, and transportation.

- Character: Maintain the small town character of Santa Barbara as a unique and desirable place to live, work, and visit.

- Design: Protect and enhance the community's character with appropriately sized and scaled buildings, a walkable town, useable and well-located open space, and abundant, sustainable landscaping.

- Historic Preservation: Protect, preserve and enhance the City's historic resources.

- Neighborhoods: Maintain and enhance neighborhoods with community centers where requested.

- And improved connectivity to daily necessities, including limited commercial activity, transit, and open spaces while protecting the established character of the neighborhood.

Maintain or reduce the existing ambient noise levels in single family neighborhoods.

POLICIES

LG4. Principles for Development. Establish the following Principles for Development to focus growth, encourage a mix of land uses, strengthen mobility options and promote healthy active living.

- Focus Growth. Encourage workforce and affordable housing within a quarter mile of frequent transit service and commercial services through smaller units and increased density, transit resources, parking demand standards, targeted infrastructure improvements, and increased public areas and open space. Incorporate ideas as a result of an employee survey.

- Mix of Land Uses. Encourage a mix of land uses, particularly in the Downtown to maintain its strength as a viable commercial center, to include retail, office, restaurant, residential, institutional, financial and cultural arts, encourage easy access to basic needs such as groceries, drug stores, community services, recreation, and public space.

- Mobility and Active Living. Link mixed-use development with main transit lines; promote active living by encouraging compact, vibrant, walkable places; encourage the use of bicycles; and reduce the need for residential parking.
LG6. Location of Residential Growth. Encourage new residential units in multi-family and commercial areas of the City with the highest densities to be located in the Downtown, La Cumbre Plaza/Five Points area and along Milpas Street.

HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES

HIO. New Housing. Given limited remaining land resources, the City shall encourage the development of housing on vacant infill sites and the redevelopment of opportunity sites both in residential zones, and as part of mixed-use development in commercial zones.

HII. Promote Affordable Units. The production of affordable housing units shall be the highest priority and the City will encourage all opportunities to construct new housing units that are affordable to extremely low, very low, low, moderate and middle income owners and renters.

HII.2 Priority Housing Overlay
Encourage the construction of rental housing, employer sponsored housing, and co-operative housing in the Downtown, La Cumbre Plaza/Five Points area, C-M Commercial Manufacturing Zone and Milpas Street area by providing incentives such as:

- Increased density overlays up to 63 du/ac as part of the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program.

- Higher Floor Area Ratios (FAR) when such standards are developed.

- More flexibility with zoning standards, (e.g., reduced parking standards).

- Expedited Design Review process.

- Fee waivers or deferrals.


OPEN SPACE, PARKS AND RECREATION ELEMENT POLICIES

OPI. Variety and Abundance. Provide ample open space through a variety of types, including nature reserves, parks, beaches, sports fields, trails, urban walkways, plazas, paseos, pocket parks, play areas, gardens, and viewpoints, consistent with standards established for this city.
HISTORIC RESOURCES ELEMENT POLICIES

HRI. Protect Historic and Archaeological Resources. Protect the heritage of the City by preserving, protecting and enhancing historic resources and archaeological resources. Apply available governmental resources, devices and approaches, such as the measures enumerated in the Land Use Element of this Plan, to facilitate their preservation and protection.

HR2. Ensure respectful and compatible development. Seek to ensure that all development within the City respects rather than detracts from individual historic and archaeological resources as well as the neighborhood and the overall historical character of the city. Assure compatibility of development, respect for the historical context of historical resources, and consideration of sustainable design alternatives where compatible.

1.1.1 Optimize access and parking for customers in business areas by implementing policies of the Circulation Element aimed at reducing dependence upon the automobile, and improving and increasing pedestrian, bicycle use, and transit use.

2.1 Work to achieve equality of convenience and choice among all modes of transportation.

5.1 The City shall create an integrated pedestrian system within and between City neighborhoods, schools, recreational areas, commercial areas and places of interest.

8.5 The City shall promote/facilitate the development of housing to decrease the need for parking through an increased walking/biking population that lives, works, and shop in the Downtown
CIRCULATION ELEMENT GOALS AND POLICIES

C8.2.9 Consider reducing parking requirements for the downtown core if implementation strategies are successful in reducing employee parking.

C8.2.10 Implement the strategies contained in the Circulation Element, Land Use chapter, and the Land Use and Housing Elements pertaining to increasing housing in the downtown core and along major transit routes.

C8.5 The City shall promote/facilitate the development of housing to decrease the need for parking through an increased walking/biking population that lives, works, and shops in the Downtown (see chapter 13)

C8.5.2 Allow residential parking in public parking lots for mixed use development after ensuring that there is adequate capacity to serve existing uses.

C13.3 Provide incentives for mixed use development

C13.3.2 Continue to identify and pursue new strategies to encourage the development of mixed use projects

C13.3.3 Continue to assist in the development of mixed use projects through such methods as, but not limited to land use policies, modified development standards, and public-private partnerships and/or financial support, where a City Council finding of General Plan consistency has been made.
PEDESTRIAN MASTER PLAN GOALS AND POLICIES

Goal 3  Protecting and Expanding the Paseo System

Policy 3.1 The City shall protect, preserve, and enhance the Paseo network

Goal 5  Encourage more people to work

Goal 6  Establish an institutional foundation that will promote the implementation of the plan

Policy 6.1 The City shall incorporate the Pedestrian Master Plan into the land development process

Policy 6.2 The City shall pursue revisions to the zoning ordinance that will help implement the Plan
DATE: February 13, 2018

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
Proposed MOD for parking and open yard for new residential unit.

ISSUES DISCUSSED & PEOPLE PRESENT:
Summary of Pre-Consult Meeting held on February 7, 2018

Present: Susette Naylor (Architect), Stephanie Swanson (Assistant Planner)

Discussed:
Existing development consists of a two-story commercial building with two tenants (downstairs - Opal Restaurant; upstairs - vacant (formerly space for Noozhawk reporting staff). The structure is built from property line to property line with no required setbacks, and is located in a 5% parking zone of benefit and is in the Central Business District. These parking reductions are applicable to commercial spaces, not residential spaces.

There are no pending enforcement cases on the property.

The proposed project is to convert the second story to a residential unit. An interior remodel on the ground floor would also be required.

A Modification is required for the proposed number of parking spaces. With the structure built property line to property line, there is no space on-site to provide the required one residential parking spaces (SBMC 30.175.030.O). Staff will confirm the bicycle parking requirement during Phase 2 of this consultation. The applicant submitted a letter and diagram showing where they have attempted to find off-site parking. No permanent off-site parking has been located.

A second Modification is required for the proposed open yard dimensions and square footage. The proposed project would result in a second-story two-bedroom unit in a mixed use building; therefore, 84 square feet of open yard, with minimum dimensions of 6'-0" x 6'-0" would be required. There is an existing 8'-6" x 2'-6" balcony (21.25 square feet). Roof equipment for the restaurant prevents open space atop the first floor, and the structure is built to the property lines on the other three elevations. Per the architect, the Urban Historian discourages alterations to the rear of the building due to the building's potential for historic designation; the rear elevation is largely unaltered since its construction. Staff will review the project with the Urban Historian to confirm if the existing balcony could be expanded without risking the structure's designation eligibility.

The project does require Design Review by the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC). Per the architect, a Historic Site/Structures Report is being prepared for the project.

The project does not require coastal review.

Due to the scope of work, Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) Tier 1 requirements are anticipated.
Due to the project's location in an archaeological sensitive area, an Archaeological Letter Report will be required if more than 12" deep of ground disturbance or more than 500 square feet of ground disturbance is anticipated. Per the architect, ground disturbance is not expected to exceed these limitations; therefore, no Archaeological Letter Report will be required.

A Parking Study may be required to make the findings for the Parking Modification.

A CEQA determination cannot be made until the technical studies are reviewed and approved.

FEES will be confirmed in Phase 2 of the Modification Pre-Consult.

DECISIONS/CONCLUSIONS:

Summary of Research and Findings After the Pre-Consultation Meeting

Staff has confirmed that no bicycle parking would be required for the project (SBMC 30.175.050.B.2).

If the parking Modification were presented to the Staff Hearing Officer (SHO), the following findings would need to be made:
1. Reduced parking will meet anticipated parking demand generated by the project site; or
2. A physical hardship exists that would otherwise prevent reasonable use of the property for an existing single-unit residence, including but not limited to extreme slope, narrow lot width; or location of existing development.

Staff is tentatively supportive of the reduction in parking pursuant to the review or a parking study. Staff understands that the applicant has attempted to find off-site parking and that the lot is highly constrained; however, in a close reading of the required findings, the second finding related to physical hardship is only applicable to an existing single-unit residence, not a proposed mixed use project. Staff has reviewed the project with Transportation Planning staff. The site would not have a 0 space parking demand, and therefore, the first required finding cannot be made. Therefore, the parking Modification - and therefore the entire project - will need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission (PC) has greater flexibility in parking Modifications, with the below findings. Please note that staff is not the decision-maker for modifications, and the PC acts as an independent decision-maker.

A Modification for reduced parking may only be approved if the Planning Commission finds that:
1. All of the same findings as Staff Hearing Officer above, for any project requiring Planning Commission approval; or
2. Other criteria consistent with the purposes of the parking regulations and based on unusual or unique circumstances of a particular case, as deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission.

The proposed project presents a unique circumstance in that the lot is fully developed, with no space for on-site parking. Additionally, there are City parking lots that a resident could rent a parking space from, and while that would not provide on-site parking as directed by the ordinance, it would provide off-street parking for the tenant. Staff is also supportive of the proposed parking Modification due to the anticipated parking demand of the proposed project being less than that of the existing uses on-site.

The open yard Modification, as presented, is supportable based on the required findings for a Modification. The Planning Commission, would also be reviewing the open yard Modification, and the following findings would need to be made:
1. The Modification is consistent with the general purposes of this Title or the specific purposes of the zoning district in which the project is located; and
2. The Modification is necessary to accomplish any one of the following:
   a. Secure an appropriate improvement on a lot; or
   b. Prevent unreasonable hardship due to the physical characteristics of the site or development, or other circumstances, including, but not limited to, topography, noise exposure, irregular property boundaries, proximity to
c. Result in development that is generally consistent with existing patterns of development for the neighborhood, or will promote uniformity of improvement to existing structures on the site; or
d. Construct a housing development containing affordable residential units rented or owned and occupied in the manner provided for in the City’s Affordable Housing Policies and Procedures.

Staff is supportive of the proposed project as the design would create a new residential unit in the downtown corridor, and the lot is constrained by existing development and its historic designation eligibility. Staff reviewed the project with the Urban Historian and confirmed that exterior changes to the existing building are not encouraged due to the structure's potential designation. The designation eligibility will be reviewed in the pending Historic Structures/Sites Report. Further, the lot is located near many open spaces in the City for a resident to enjoy. Staff strongly encourages the applicant to create a map of no-cost recreational opportunities within walking distance of the proposed project, such as parks. The applicant may also wish to include amenities such as museums and theaters, but uses that require a fee should be shown differently on the diagram.

Please note, any new information, including environmental review data, could affect the supportability of the Modification.

The following fees would be required for the proposed project:
1st Modification (Open Yard): $2,470
2nd Modification (Parking): $1,255
Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) Design Review: $345 (full board, alterations, 1 unit)
Environmental Review: $2,135
Mailed Notice: $470 (for Staff Hearing Officer and Design Review)
Total: $6,675

Please submit the Design Review submittal packet to the Planning Counter at 630 Garden Street. After receiving comments from the Design Review Board, the applicant may submit for the Modification. A Modification application with the above listed fees, color photos, and all other submittal requirements in the Modification submittal packet will be required. In the required applicant letter, please describe how the proposed project meets the required findings. Please submit the packet to the Planning Counter at 630 Garden Street. After the application is deemed complete, a hearing date will be set.

This report documents the general information and conclusions discussed during the Pre-Application Consultation meeting with Staff. If the proposal is revised, a new Pre-Application Consultation meeting is required. Please note that the Consultation fee is non-refundable.

The pre-application consultation is intended to help identify relevant project issues, verify application completeness, and determine the correct process for your project. Be advised that projects that involve complex or multiple requests may require the applicant to submit for the Development Application Review Team (DART) process. This pre-application consultation is not a guarantee of approval or denial of the request(s). The decision of the Staff Hearing Officer will be made at a public hearing after thorough review of the application, site visit, public input, and consideration of all other relevant information. All decisions by the Staff Hearing Officer are appealable to the Planning Commission or, thereafter, the City Council.

STAFF CONTACT: Stephanie Swanson (805) 564-5470 x4569
OWNER & AGENT(S): ALMOND HOLDINGS, LLC
30712 PRINCIPIO DR, MALIBU, CA 90265
February 7, 2018

Tim Elkins & Susette Naylor
Sent Via Email

Re: 1325 State Street – Off Site Parking Search Update

Dear Tim and Susette,

Over the last few months, Mike Martz and I have been using our resources within the local commercial real estate industry and community to try to locate any parking spaces available for long-term lease in the vicinity of the above referenced property. Unfortunately, despite our efforts, we have been to yield any positive results. Thus far we have taken the following actions to try to produce leads for any available parking:

- Directly contacted our clients and colleagues located within an approx. 750’ radius of the 1325 State Street property
- Sent a mass email regarding the to the commercial brokerage community
- Posted and discussed the need internally within our office

In response to our efforts, a number of parties have recommended approaching the city to see whether there are any available long term parking leases available at the nearby public lots on Chapala / Victoria and Anacapa / Anapamu, though none were able to offer the possibility of leasing a private parking space.

Please feel free to call me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Dylan Ward

805-898-4392
Present: David Stone, Archaeological Consultant

Staff comments: Ms. Plummer stated that Dr. Glassow has reviewed the report and concluded that the archaeological investigation supports the report’s conclusions and recommendations.

Public comment opened at 1:59 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Motion: Accept the report as submitted.
Action: Drury/Mahan, 7/0/0. (La Voie absent.) Motion carried.

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW

2. **1325 STATE ST**
   (1:50) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 039-131-017
   Application Number: MST2018-00079
   Owner: Almond Holdings, LLC
   Architect: Susette Naylor

(The two-story commercial building constructed by Winsor Soule may be eligible to be designated a Structure of Merit. Proposal to convert the existing 1,494 square foot second story from existing office occupancy to a residential unit. The proposal includes a remodel at the first floor commercial space, demolition of one of two existing access stairs to paseo, and minor improvements involving a remodel to the existing roof structure, replacement of skylights, and removal of upper floor exterior awnings. No expansion of existing floor area is proposed. The project requires Planning Commission review for an Open Yard Modification for the second floor balcony, and a Parking Modification for the required one residential parking space.)

(A. Review of the Phase I Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Post/Hazeltine Associates. The report determined that the building designed by Soule and Murphy in 1946 is eligible for listing as a Structure of Merit. The proposed project impacts to the significant historic resource would be less than significant (Class III).)

Actual time: 2:01 p.m.

Present: Tim Hazeltine and Pamela Post, Historical Consultants, Post/Hazeltine Associates; and Susette Naylor, Architect, Thompson Naylor Architects

Staff comments: Ms. Hernandez stated that she agrees with the conclusions of the report that the building is eligible as a Structure of Merit and that there is no negative impact from the project.

Public comment opened at 2:03 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

* The motion was tabled until after the concept review. *

Motion: Continue indefinitely with comment that the rear storefront is to return to the original Soule design.
Action: Mahan/Hausz. Motion substituted.

The motion was substituted as follows:

EXHIBIT D
Motion: Approve the report with comments:
1. The rear storefront is to return to the original Soule design.
2. If there is significant change to the design, the Urban Historian shall approve the revised report.
3. The property shall be added to the Potential Historic Resources List at the next meeting.

Action: Drury/Hausz, 7/0/0. (La Voie absent.) Motion carried.

(B. Concept Review. Comments Only. Project requires Planning Commission review for an Open Yard Modification for the second floor balcony, and a Parking Modification for the required one residential parking space.)

Actual time: 2:05 p.m.

Present: Tim Hazeltine and Pamela Post, Historical Consultants, Post/Hazeltine Associates; and Susette Naylor, Architect, Thompson Naylor Architects

Staff comments: Ms. Plummer stated that the project has two requested modifications; the Commission should consider if the modifications are aesthetically appropriate. Also, the project will require Project Compatibility Criteria if it is forwarded to the Planning Commission.

Public comment opened at 2:15 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Straw vote: How many Commissioners are concerned about restaurant odors impacting the residential unit? 7/0 Passed

Straw vote: How many Commissioners can support a two residential unit option? 7/0 Passed

Straw vote: How many Commissioners can support open space being provided outside of the residential unit, such as at nearby parks, instead of changing the balconies? 7/0 Passed

Straw vote: How many Commissioners can support the storefront returning to the original Soule architecture? 7/0 Passed

Straw vote: How many Commissioners can support asking the Planning Commission to restrict occupancy of the residential unit and number of allowed vehicles? 7/0 Passed

Straw vote: How many Commissioners can support the Parking Modification? 5/2 Passed

Individual comments:
1. Commissioner Lenvik can support the Parking Modification; parking is important in the Central Business District, but the project location is at the periphery, and there are opportunities to accommodate off-site parking for a small project at this edge.
2. Commissioner Mahan cannot support the Parking Modification due to a negative cumulative parking impact in the immediate neighborhood.
3. Commissioner Hausz cannot support the Parking Modification and requested that the Planning Commission carefully consider whether it will set a precedent.
Motion: Continue to the Planning Commission with comments:
1. The Commission in its entirety supports the Open Yard Modification because of the proximity of recreational areas.
2. The majority of the Commission supports the Parking Modification.
3. The rear storefront is to return to the original Soule design.
4. Study window openings in the bedrooms. The floor plan will need to allow light, air, and emergency egress.
5. Concern was expressed about restaurant odors and equipment noise impacting the residential unit.
6. An option for two smaller units was supported.
7. The Commission requests that the Planning Commission, if possible, restrict the occupancy and the number of allowed vehicles for the residential unit.
8. The Commission finds that the Compatibility Analysis Criteria generally have been met (per SBMC 22.22.145.B.) as follows:
   a. The project fully complies with all applicable City Charter and Municipal Code requirements. The project’s design is consistent with design guidelines applicable to its location within the City.
   b. The design of the project is compatible with desirable architectural qualities and characteristics that are distinctive of Santa Barbara and of the particular neighborhood surrounding the project.
   c. The size, mass, bulk, and scale of the project are appropriate for its location and neighborhood.
   d. The design of the project is appropriately sensitive to adjacent Landmarks or other nearby designated historic resources.
   e. Public views of the ocean and mountains are not affected.
   f. The use of open space and landscaping is irrelevant.

Action: Drury/Hausz, 7/0/0. (La Voie absent.) Motion carried.

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED

3. 806 VINE AVE
(2:30)
Assessor’s Parcel Number: 031-023-009
Application Number: MST2017-00528
Owner: Jack Delano Family Limited Partners
Architect: Keith Rivera

(The residence located at 415 Old Coast Highway is a designated Structure of Merit. Proposal to relocate the historic 1,631 square foot single-unit residence from 415 Old Coast Highway to the lot at 806 Vine Avenue. The project includes constructing a new under story consisting of a 1,096 square foot four-car common garage and 608 square feet of habitable area, resulting in a new cumulative 2,239 square foot single-unit residence. No work is proposed on the existing 1,283 square foot singe-unit residence also on the lot. The proposal will involve new associated site paving, landscaping, utilities, and a new 24" inch retaining wall. Project requires a Modification by the Staff Hearing Officer for the reduced area of qualifying open yard.

(A. Review of the Phase II Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Post/Hazeltine Associates. The report concluded that the proposed project’s impacts to significant historic resources on and adjacent to the existing location of the resource and its proposed relocation from 415 Old Coast Highway to 806 Vine Avenue are less than significant (Class III).)
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1.0 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

This Historic Sites/Structures Report is for the property at 1325-1327 State Street (APN 039-131-017) (Figures 1 – 2). The applicant proposes to remodel the existing building and make alterations to the interior. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines state that proposed projects are to be analyzed to determine potential effects to historic resources. Principal No. 8 of the City of 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). This report will determine if the property is a significant historic resource for the purposes of environmental review. If the property is determined to be historically significant the report will evaluate project impacts to significant historic resources identified in this report. Prepared by Post/Hazeltine Associates, this HSSR follows the guidelines for historic property studies set forth in the City of Santa Barbara MEA.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to convert 1,494 square feet (net) of existing second story office to a two-bedroom residential unit. The existing roof structure and assembly will be remodeled within the building’s existing envelope, including the replacement of the existing skylights. Interior structural posts will be replaced in same location. One of the two existing access stairs to the paseo will be demolished and the opening between the floors will be enclosed. Changes to the first floor of paseo elevation (south elevation) would include the removal of the existing awnings and the remodeling of the area around the exit door by replacing it with a new wall, door and glazing (Appendix A, Project Plans). The architectural firm for the project is Thompson/Naylor Architects.

3.0 DOCUMENTS REVIEW

The following resources and information sources were consulted during the preparation of this report (Bibliographical resources are listed in Section 12):

City of Santa Barbara:
Street Files for 1325-1327 State Street
Planning Files for 1325-1327 State Street

Santa Barbara Historical Society, Gledhill Library

Preliminary Sketch of Santa Barbara (1853); Field Notes of Survey (1853.) Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley (Copy on file at the Santa Barbara Historical Society, Gledhill Library)

United States Coast Survey Map of Santa Barbara: 1852, 1870 and 1878.

1877 Bird’s Eye View of Santa Barbara, California. Drawn and published by E. S. Glover
C.1887 Bird’s Eye View of Santa Barbara. 1898 Bird’s Eye View of Santa Barbara.

United States Geological Survey, Santa Barbara County Special Maps: 1903 and 1909 Bird’s Eye View of Santa Barbara. El Pueblo de Las Rosas. Published by E. S. Glover

1917 Map of the City of Santa Barbara
Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps 1886-1961
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The dominant landscape feature of the city's downtown is the massive alluvial fan that extends from the base of Mission Ridge to the Mesa. This geological feature is a result of the accumulation of decomposing sedimentary residues from the Santa Ynez Mountains deposited over the alluvial fan by the flow of Mission and Sycamore Creeks and a number of small subsidary streams. Over the centuries, the creeks have moved over the entire width of their alluvial fans, depositing sediment and building the fan to its present-day level. Before the arrival of the Spanish in the late 18th century, vegetation was characterized by oak woodland and the Coastal Sage Community, with riparian plant communities along Mission and Sycamore Canyon Creek and the coastal estuaries. The natural environment of the downtown neighborhood has been modified by a variety of human activities since Spain founded the Santa Barbara Presidio in 1782 and Mission Santa Barbara, in 1786. Since the arrival of Europeans in 1782 these habitats have largely been eliminated by stock grazing, agriculture, and commercial and residential development.

5.0 NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT

The 1300 block of State Street is located within the 169-acre Downtown Neighborhood, which is bounded on the north by Santa Barbara Street, on the south by Ortega Street, on the east by De la Vina Street and State Street (Figures 3 and 4). The City's major commercial corridor bisects the Downtown Neighborhood. Development is characterized by a mix of commercial buildings including restaurants, offices, and stores, as well as public and private institutional buildings, including, among others, the Santa Barbara County Courthouse, the Santa Barbara City Hall, and Our Lady of Sorrows Church. Residential housing is comprised of a mix of single-family houses, multi-unit apartment buildings, and multi-unit condominium developments. An eclectic mix of architectural designs characterize the neighborhood and range in style and time period from Spanish and Mexican era buildings (the Hill-Carrillo Adobe and the Casa de la Guerra, among others), to Victorian era houses, such as the Italianate style Martimer Cook House on Chapala Street, as well as 19th century vernacular, Queen Anne, Craftsman, and early 20th century Period Revival designs, including the Spanish Colonial Revival style Arlington Theatre at 1317 State Street, the Tudor Revival Victoria Street Theatre at 33 West Victoria Street, and the postwar Streamlined Moderne style, Christian Science Reading Room at 1303 State Street.
Figure 3: Neighborhood Context, West Side of the 1300 block of State Street
(Looking southwest)

Figure 4: Neighborhood Context, 1300 block of State Street
(Looking northwest)
Figure 5: Neighborhood Context, East Side of 1300 block of State Street (Looking west)

Figure 6: Neighborhood Context, East side of the 1300 block of State Street (Looking north)
6.0 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

6.1 The Founding of the Spanish Presidio to California as a Territory (1782-1848)

Long before the Spanish Presidio was founded, in 1782, a Chumash village existed near the mouth of Mission Creek. This settlement was inhabited for at least eight hundred years prior to the arrival of the Spanish. When an exploratory party of Spanish soldiers, commanded by Gaspar Portola, arrived in 1769, the village had a population of approximately six hundred individuals. The village was known as Syuxtun (the word Syuxtun means “the road that branches”) and was the residence of Yanonaltit, the most powerful Chumash chief at the time (Agrén 1997: 2). By 1797, Syuxtun’s native population had shrunk to 125; six years later the village had been abandoned completely, the remaining inhabitants having moved to the neophyte village at Mission Santa Barbara.

During the Spanish Colonial/Mexican period, (1769-1848) European settlement in Santa Barbara was concentrated primarily around the Presidio at what is now the intersection of East Canon Perdido and Santa Barbara Streets. The Spanish established Santa Barbara not as a pueblo, but as a presidio governed by a military commandante. In order to support the soldiers and their families, a large tract of land was assigned to the Presidio for the maintenance of the fort and its inhabitants. This tract included the future location of the property at 1325-1327 State Street. In 1822, Spanish rule ended and California became a Mexican territory. For the next 26 years, California developed slowly and it was not until the end of the 1830s that the lucrative hide and tallow trade made some of its families, including several in Santa Barbara, wealthy. However, this prosperity resulted in little substantial growth in Santa Barbara, which continued to remain a small enclave of adobe houses clustered around the remnants of the presidio. A review of the earliest maps of Santa Barbara, including the 1852 Coast Survey Map and the 1853 Wackenreuder Map, indicate that the project parcel and surrounding neighborhood remained undeveloped throughout the Spanish and Mexican periods.

6.2 Development of the 1300 Block of State Street (1848-1946)

On March 10, 1848 the United States Senate passed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo following the end of the Mexican/American War of 1848. Just two months later, on May 19, 1848, Mexico ratified the treaty which ceded California to the United States. For the next two years California was ruled by an American general. During this period Santa Barbara’s ayuntamiento (town council) continued to function as it had before American rule (the ayuntamiento was first established in Santa Barbara, in 1826). On December 20, 1849 a local civil government was established in California. Some nine months later, on September 9, 1850, California became an American state. Shortly before statehood, in April of 1850, a common council and mayoral system was established for the City of Santa Barbara. On September 9, 1850 California was admitted to the Union as its 31st state. One of the first acts of the new common council was to authorize a survey of the city. The two most important purposes of the survey were to establish a grid of streets and blocks and to delineate the extensive landholdings that the City of Santa Barbara had inherited from the former Mexican pueblo. Carried out in 1851 by Colonel Salisbury Haley the survey established the orthogonal street grid that has since delineated the City’s downtown area between the waterfront and Mission Street. As part of this survey the block bounded by the 00 block of West Sola Street, the 1300 block of Chapala Street, the 00 of West Victoria Street, and the 1300 block of State Street, was designated Block 91. As late as 1870 Block 91 (in which the project parcel is located) was
comprised primarily of cultivated fields (1870 Coast Survey Map). By 1872, Block 91 and the surrounding blocks had begun to develop with houses set on large parcels. Among the most notable of these was the Italianate style house built for banker, Mortimer Cook, at 1407 Chapala Street.

Block 91, however, continued to remain unimproved until 1875 when the Arlington Hotel was developed by William W. Hollister, Santa Barbara County's largest landowner and one of its most influential business leaders. Designed by the architect Peter Barber, the Italianate style 90-room hotel was named in honor of the ancestral home of Confederate general, Robert E. Lee. When completed the hotel and its gardens took up all of the land within Block 91. The Arlington, along with the Potter Hotel (built on the waterfront in 1902) and the Miramar Hotel, in Montecito, helped to establish Santa Barbara as one of California's premier resort destinations. Featuring opulent interiors, grounds lushly landscaped with exotic specimen plants and a deer park, the Arlington Hotel attracted a socially elite national and international clientele that included, among others, Princess Louise of Great Britain, Presidents William McKinley and Rutherford Hayes, and the King of Hawai'i.

In 1887, the same year that the Southern Pacific Railroad's coastal line reached Santa Barbara, the 50-room Arlington Hotel Annex, a freestanding three-story wing, was built at the northeast corner of the intersection of West Victoria Street and Chapala Street. By this time, driven in large measure by the success of the Arlington Hotel, commercial development had begun to extend up another three blocks, from the 900 block to the 1200 block of State Street. One of the most notable buildings constructed during this period was the Upper Hawley Building in the 1200 block of State Street. Developed by Hollister, the building, for a few years, housed Santa Barbara College. Today, the greatly remodeled building has been incorporated into an office and retail space known as Victoria Court. By the end of the century, the extension of street car lines to upper State Street made the area between Victoria Street and Mission Street a popular residential district for Santa Barbara's affluent middle and upper classes. By the turn-of the 20th century the residential neighborhood surrounding the Arlington Hotel had been largely developed with commodiously-sized houses, designed primarily in the Italianate and Queen Anne styles (much of this development was along the 1400 and 1500 blocks of Chapala Street and those cross streets between the two blocks). Commercial development also intensified, much of concentrated in the blocks below the Arlington Hotel, on the 1100 and 1200 blocks of State Street.

The Arlington Hotel continued to operate as one of Santa Barbara's most luxurious hotels. Destroyed by fire in 1909 in the two years it took to rebuild the main hotel the freestanding Arlington Hotel Annex continued to remain open. In 1911 the New Arlington Hotel was completed. Designed by architect, Arthur Benton in the Mission Revival style the hotel's new design subsequently led to the remodeling of the Annex in the same style. Both buildings featured architectural motifs drawn from Mission Santa Barbara, including arcades, plastered walls, tile roofs, and towers capped by domes. During this period the future location of 1325-1327 State Street was incorporated as a part of the hotel's formal gardens that included a masonry wall built along State Street. In the early decades of the 20th century development in the area continued to intensify, with houses being moved or demolished to make way for commercial and/or institutional buildings. Among the most notable of these built at the time was the Gothic Revival style (with Tudor Revival style elements) First Baptist Church designed by Norman F. Marsh in 1910 (No longer a church, the building is located at 33 West Victoria Street-1236 Chapala Street. In 1913, a large residential hotel was built at 105 West Sola. Featuring an eclectic mix of Craftsman and Period Revival style elements, the hotel was
designed by Arthur Benton, who had designed the second Arlington Hotel. Other, more modest buildings built during this period included the Craftsman style house/office for Dr. Myra Sperry at 21 West Victoria Street (circa 1900) and a store at 1315 State Street (possibly designed by Arthur Benton, it was constructed in circa-1922) (Conard and Nelson 1986: 94).

The Arlington Hotel continued to remain a popular destination for affluent visitors until after World War I, when the increasing popularity of automobile travel and shorter vacation stays made extended holidays at such full service hotels less popular. In 1926 a devastating earthquake badly damaged the hotel; shortly after it was razed. The declining popularity of large resort hotels, as well as the cost of needed repairs undoubtedly led to the decision to demolish the Arlington in 1926, followed by the Annex in 1928 (Permit #A-1644, March 2, 1926; Permit #A-1946, May 6, 1926; Permit #A-4058, June 6, 1928). Today, the only remaining remnants of the Arlington Hotel are a pedestrian archway and several Canary Island Date Palms located near the northeast corner of the intersection of Chapala and Sola streets. In the immediate months and years following the earthquake a number of lots along State Street were developed. Responding to an increased interest in the regional architecture of the Period Revival movement, as well as the mandate of the newly established Architectural Board of Review, the newly constructed buildings were designed in the Spanish Colonial Revival style. One such building, located near the project area was the Town House Restaurant. Designed by A. C. Saunders, in 1926, it was located at 1321 State Street (Conard and Nelson 1986: 95).

In 1927, the architectural firm of Edwards and Plunkett was commissioned to design the Fox Arlington Theatre on the site of the demolished Arlington Hotel. Designed in the Spanish Colonial Revival style, the scenographic movie theater, which featured a prominent tower, paseos, and an arced entrance loggia, was located near the center of the block with its main entrance on State Street. Completed in 1931, the movie theater was intended to function as the centerpiece of a retail/commercial development that was to be sited along the 1300 block of State Street and the 00 block of West Sola Street. Ultimately only a few single-story shops were built. Located to the north of the Fox Arlington, on the west side of State Street, the stores, like the theater, were designed in the Spanish Colonial Revival style, including the project parcel at 1325-1327 State Street, built in 1946 (City of Santa Barbara Building Permit #C-1394, March 12, 1946). Like the El Paseo complex in the 800 block of State Street (built 1922-1924; 1928-1929), the scheme for the Arlington Theatre featured tiled roofs, plastered walls, a tower and an arced loggia that evoked a romanticized vision of colonial era California and Andalusian Spain. Landscaping included linear planting beds along either side of the open arcade linking the Arlington Theatre with State Street and rectangular lawns embellished with trees, shrubs and flowers that extended along either side of the building’s north and south elevations. With the exception of the pedestrian paseos linking the Arlington Theatre to West Victoria Street and West Sola Street, the original plan to extend commercial development via shops and pedestrian paseos to Chapala Street and then along West Sola Street did not come to fruition, largely due to the onset of the Great Depression in 1929.

Just before and subsequent to the construction of the Arlington Theatre the street frontage located on the south side of the 1300 block of State Street, underwent development, including the construction of Spanish Colonial Revival and Mediterranean style buildings, among which were a commercial building at 1309 State Street by the architectural firm of Edwards and Plunkett (1934); the former Gilchrist’s jewelry store at 1311 State Street by the architectural firm of Edwards and Plunkett (1931); an addition to the former I. Magnin store at
1315 State Street, by architectural firm of Edwards, Plunkett & Howell (1926); the former Town House Restaurant at 1321 State Street by designer A. C. Sanders (1926); the project parcel’s three-storefront building at 1325 State Street by the architectural firm of Soule and Murphy (1946); and the Streamline Moderne commercial building at 1329 and 1333 State Street by designer Alex D’Alfonso (1940).

6.3 Development of 1325-1327 State Street (1946-2018)

The project parcel was developed in 1946 when owner George N. Strike commissioned the architectural firm of Soule and Murphy (see biography in Section 6.4) to design a three-storefront building on State Street with a mezzanine above, rising to a two-story level at the rear elevation facing on the rear paseo. Designed in the Mediterranean style with stucco walls and a terra cotta tiled roof (at the rear elevation), the 40 foot wide by 100 foot long building was constructed at an estimated cost of $21,500.00 (City of Santa Barbara Building Permit #C-1394, March 12, 1946). Contractor for the work was Harry Henry C. Laskey (1893-1962). Laskey, born in Ontario, Canada, immigrated to the United States in 1907, first to Niagara Falls, New York, later to Port Huron, Michigan in 1920 and eventually to Santa Barbara where he was living and working as a builder by 1940. Laskey died at the age of 71 on August 26, 1962 (Laskey Family Tree, ancestry.com).

1325 State Street

The first listing in the city directory for 1325 State Street is in 1949, with the W. P. Conner Real Estate as occupant/tenant. Between 1954 and 1957 the Perry I. Newton Music Center was listed as tenant. By 1960 1325 State Street had three tenants, including Perry I. Newton Music Center, the Harry Conover Modeling Agency and the St. Francis Shop (1960). Five years later tenants included Continental Knits at 1325 State Street and the St. Francis Book Shop at 1325 ½ State Street (1965). In 1970, 1325 State Street was listed as vacant, while St. Francis Book Shop continued to occupy what was now 1325A State Street. Between 1972 and 1974 Presidio Office Interiors was listed at 1325 State Street, and St. Francis Book Shop at 1325A State Street. By 1977 occupants of 1325 State Street included Frames By You and at 1325A State Street, the St. Francis Book Shop. By the early 1980s tenant occupants for 1325 State Street were now exclusively restaurants, including The Mandarin Garden (1983) and Maison Robert Français Restaurant (1985-1987) (1949-1985 City of Santa Barbara Directories; City of Santa Barbara sign approval, May 5, 1987). Currently, 1325 State Street is occupied by Opal Restaurant, whose owners had purchased interest in Brigitte’s Restaurant, which in 1992 had expanded its occupancy of 1327 State Street to incorporate the space at 1325 State Street.

1327 State Street

The first listing for occupancy of 1327 State Street is in 1949 for the J. E. Keogh Restaurant, the first in a series of restaurants, at that address. Two years later, in 1951, J. W. Keogh’s was succeeded by The Cheerio Shop restaurant, which remained in the same location until 1976 when La Grange Restaurant opened in its place (City of Santa Barbara Building Application #B6050, July 12, 1976). By 1982 it was Tony’s Pizza and three years later, in 1985, the occupant at 1327 State Street was Brigitte’s Restaurant, which in 1992, expanded the restaurant to include 1325 State Street (City of Santa Barbara Master Application, MST92-0811, September 10, 1992). For a brief period of time, in 1993, the tenant at 1327A State was Moira Salon (City of Santa Barbara Master Application, MST93-0198, April 2, 1993). Brigitte’s remained in business until tenant, Brigitte Guehr, sold her interest in the restaurant to Tina Takaya and Richard Yates.
who then re-opened it as Opal Restaurant, the current tenant at 1325 State Street (1949-1985 City of Santa Barbara Directories).

6.4 The Architectural Firm of Soule and Murphy

Winsor Soule (1883-1954), the principle of Soule Murphy and Hastings, was born on November 3, 1883 in Stanton Island, New York, the son of Richard Herman and Ida Helen Soule. It is unclear as to where Winsor grew up, though it is known that he attended secondary school in Concord, New Hampshire (Andree and Young 1975: 181). He continued his education at Harvard where he received a Bachelor of Art degree in 1906 (Andree and Young 1975: 181). After graduating from Harvard, Soule completed a one-year course at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), where he received a Bachelor of Science degree in 1907 (Andree and Young 1975: 181). In 1907, shortly after graduating from MIT, Cram, Goodhue and Ferguson, one of the most prolific and well-known architectural firms on the East Coast hired Soule. Specializing in ecclesiastical architecture and public buildings, the firm designed some of the most notable buildings of early 20th century America, including West Point Academy and the Russell Sage Memorial First Presbyterian Church. While Soule only worked for the firm for a year, his contacts with the firm’s partners, particularly Bertram Goodhue, who would later practice in California, must have proven invaluable.

Following his apprenticeship at Cram, Goodhue and Ferguson, Soule was hired, in 1908, as associate architect for Bryn Mawr College. At the time Soule was hired the school was undergoing an expansion program overseen by college president, M. Carey Thomas. While at Bryn Mawr, Soule collaborated with the renowned architect and designer, Lockwood de Forest, Sr. on a number of projects. De Forest was one of the United States’ most noted interior designers of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Famed for his collaborative efforts with Louis Comfort Tiffany, de Forest, Sr. was most noted for his participation in Tiffany Studio’s redesign of the interiors of the White House in 1890s, as well as a number of projects in Europe. While he was most well-known for his work with Tiffany Studios, De Forest also undertook other commissions, including his work for Bryn Mawr where Soule collaborated with him on the design of a new gymnasium (1908) and infirmary (1912). It was through Soule’s professional association with de Forest that he met, and later married De Forest’s daughter, Judith. In 1911, Soule visited Santa Barbara, where his father-in-law had been spending annual summer holidays since the late 1880s. In 1912, less than a year after his visit, Soule and his wife relocated to Santa Barbara.

Though Soule’s architectural career on the East Coast lasted barely five years it had provided him with critical exposure to some of the foremost practitioners of Period Revival architecture in the United States, including, in addition to Cram, Goodhue and Ferguson, the firm of Allen and Collins for whom he briefly worked as a draftsman. His professional collaboration with, and familial ties to Lockwood de Forest Sr., who did much to popularize the eclectic style that dominated American interior design between the early 1880s and 1910, must have provided additional inspiration to his career.

Shortly after Soule’s arrival in Santa Barbara he formed a partnership with local architect Russell Ray that lasted until 1917. The firm’s most noted commission was the YMCA building at 100 West Carrillo Street (demolished in the 1980s). Completed in 1913, the building’s symmetrical elevations and axial plan were clearly inspired by the principals of Beaux Arts architecture. Some features of the building’s design and
materials, however, including its tile-clad roofs and use of local sandstone for the entrance stairs and retaining walls, reference Mediterranean style architectural traditions, a style that would be a popular architectural motif of the firm in the succeeding years.

In 1917 Russell Ray left the firm and John Frederic Murphy, who had worked for the firm as a designer since initially hired in 1914, now joined Winsor Soule as a full partner. Murphy was born on September 25, 1887 in Winterset, Iowa. His post-secondary education began at Grinnell College (1906-1908) and was completed at Columbia University where he received his Bachelor of Architecture degree in 1912. Returning to Iowa Murphy worked initially as a draftsman for the Des Moines firm of Proudfoot, Bird and Rawson. After two years Murphy and his wife, Marjorie, left Iowa and moved to Santa Barbara. Over the next four years the firm of Soule and Murphy continued to refine its interpretation of the Mediterranean and Spanish Colonial Revival style. In 1921 a third partner, T. Mitchell Hastings, was added to the firm.

Hastings’ inclusion in the firm, now Soule, Murphy and Hastings, coincided with the firm receiving the commission to build a house for Walter Hodges at 2112 Santa Barbara Street. Successful as residential designers the firm would go on to achieve great success in the design of institutional buildings, specifically public schools. This initially began in 1922 when the firm received commissions to design Lincoln and Nelson Elementary schools in Santa Barbara. So successful was their reception, that for the next 20 years, the firm would design almost every public elementary school in Santa Barbara (the firm’s design for McKinley School received a citation from the American Schoolbook Journal “as one of the best-designed schools in the United States” (Andree & Young, 1975: 178). These schools, like their other public commissions, did much to bring the Mediterranean and Spanish Colonial Revival style to the attention of the public. Hastings participation in the firm lasted just five years before he left in 1926.

After Hastings departure, the firm returned to the two-man partnership of Soule and Murphy. This partnership lasted throughout the 1930s until 1954 when John Murphy retired. In addition to their institutional projects, some of their best known work during this period included the Veteran’s Memorial Building in Carpinteria (1936), the Emmanuel Lutheran Church (1940) and the UCSB Science Center (1953). For the most part Soule and Murphy’s commissions in the post-World War II period presented more simplified versions of the traditional architectural styles the firm practiced in the prewar years. One example of this more minimalist interpretation was their scheme for both the project parcel at 1325-1327 State Street (1946) and Cate School’s Long House dormitory in Carpinteria (1952). The firm continued in practice until 1954 when John Murphy retired. After Murphy’s retirement the architect, Glen Mosher, became Soule’s business partner. This association lasted less than a year before Winsor Soule’s death later that year. Three years later, in 1957, John Murphy died. The legacy of Soule, Murphy and Hastings was the firm’s concerted effort to make Mediterranean and Spanish Colonial Revival the city’s dominant architectural styles. The firm along with George Washington Smith, Reginald Johnson and Edwards and Plunkett, men, such as Winsor Soule, Russell Ray, John Murphy and T. Mitchell Hastings play an important and pivotal role in recasting Santa Barbara’s built environment in the Mediterranean style.
7.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

The property at 1325-1327 State Street is located on the west side of State Street, north of the State Street entrance to the Arlington Theatre. It was developed in 1946 with the existing building designed externally and internally as three storefronts. Currently the building is occupied by one tenant. The visual unity of the building is accentuated by the employment of a continuous solid parapet and single-light windows and doors. The rear elevation of the project parcel, which faces a pedestrian paseo linking West Victoria Street and West Sola Street to the entrance off the Arlington Theatre, is the most referential to the Spanish Colonial Revival style and was likely, designed to present a more visually sympathetic adjunct to the nearby Arlington Theatre. While Soule and Murphy’s scheme still acknowledges the nearby pre-World War II Spanish Colonial Revival style buildings regarding massing and overall architecture, its stylistic vocabulary reflects the firm’s predilection in the postwar period, to schematize and attenuate the building’s ornamentation, thereby adhering to a more “modern” interpretation of the Mediterranean style.

7.1 The Property at 1325-1327 State Street

The project parcel that formerly incorporated the addresses of 1325 and 1327 State Street is currently the site of Opal Restaurant, with the address of 1325 State Street (Figure 7). The building is 40 feet wide and 100 feet long, with a street façade that is one-story with a mezzanine above and a rear elevation that rises to two stories. Both the east and west elevations are plastered. Designed in a reductive interpretation of the Mediterranean style it was conceived by the architectural firm of Soule and Murphy in 1946 (City of Santa Barbara Building Permit #C-1393, March 12, 1946) (Figure 7a).

Figure 7: Context view of 1325-1327 State Street
(Looking southwest)
East Elevation (primary façade facing State Street)

The east elevation is linear in configuration with a continuous parapet embellished a "diapering" pattern (Figures 8 – 10). Four finials with schematized Plateresque detailing are spaced evenly along the roof line; this decorative element draws its inspiration from the Arlington Theatre’s decorative motifs. The slightly projecting flat-roofed storefront is divided into three angled bays by two recessed glazed wood doors (Figure 7a). A fabric canopy extends the length of the elevation. Fenestration is composed of large plate glass windows set on a plastered parapet with a tile coping.

![Figure 7a: Soule and Murphy First Floor Plan](image)

Alterations and Modifications to the East Elevation (Street façade)

Other than possibly in 1961, there appear to have been no modifications to the front elevation.
of 1325 State Street until 1987 when a sign for Maison Robert was inset into the "diapered"-patterned mezzanine level of the façade (Sketch of approved signage, May 5, 1987). In 1992 a double-acting door was installed for universal access at 1327 State Street (City of Santa Barbara Application Request for Determination of Unreasonable Hardship, December 14, 1992). In that same year both 1325 State Street and 1327 State Street were combined into one address, 1325 State Street. This took place when Brigitte's Restaurant expanded into storefronts; architect for the renovation was Thompson/Naylor Architects (City of Santa Barbara Master Application, MST92-0811, September 10, 1992). This expansion entailed significant alterations to the street façade, including removing the original three recessed entry doors and windows and replacing them with two recessed entry doors, flanked by plate glass windows.

Figure 8: East elevation (State Street façade) of 1325-1327 State Street (Looking northwest)
Figure 9: South End of the State Street Façade at 1325-1327 State Street (Looking north)

Figure 10: Central Section of the Street Façade at 1325-1327 State Street (Looking southwest)
West Elevation (rear paseo elevation)

The two-story west elevation is linear in configuration with three recessed, rectangular storefronts separated by piers on its first floor (Figures 11 - 14). All three piers feature small sash windows covered by metal grilles. The storefront at the north end of the elevation features a door set at-grade level flanked to its south by a glazed wood door set atop a short flight of steps (with a curved solid railing). The central storefront features a glazed wood door, flanked on one side by a glazed display case. The storefront at the south end of the elevation features a glazed door, flanked on either side by plate glass windows.

The second floor’s fenestration is composed of two double three-light wood casement windows (one covered by metal grille) flanked on their north end by a multi-light French door opening onto a shallow metal balcony. All three openings are embellished with decorative wood shutters. A side gable roof covered in c-shaped terra cotta tiles caps the elevation. Molded string courses embellish the division between the first and second floors.

![Image of 1325-1327 State Street](image)

**Figure 11: Project parcel at 1325-1327 State Street**
(rear elevation facing pedestrian paseo)
(looking northeast)
Figure 12: Project parcel at 1325-1327 State Street (rear elevation facing pedestrian paseo) (Looking southeast)

Figure 13: Project parcel at 1325-1327 State Street (rear elevation facing pedestrian paseo) (Looking east)
Figure 14: Project parcel at 1325-1327 State Street  
(rear elevation facing pedestrian paseo)  
(Looking northeast)

Modifications and Alterations to the West Elevation

The west elevation was remodeled in 1979-1980 by the architectural firm of Lenvik and Minor (Figures 15 & 16). The modifications entailed altering all three of the first floor storefronts through the replacement of the original doors, windows, trimwork and moldings. An additional door was added to the storefront at the north end of the elevation. New trimwork, composed of quarry tile, also was installed (City of Santa Barbara Application and Permit #A15329, November 28, 1979).

(see next page)
South Elevation

The building, whose south wall is set flush with the wall of the adjacent commercial property at 1321 State Street, has no visible south elevation.
North Elevation

The building, whose north wall is set flush with the wall of the adjacent commercial property, has no visible north elevation.

Modifications that Encompass the Entire Building

In 1963 unspecified alterations were made to the exterior of the building by the firm of Cooke and Schmandt (this could possibly have included both the east and west elevations or just one of the elevations) (City of Santa Barbara Permit #10256, October 10, 1961). Subsequent changes to the building, other than to the individual elevations, include the installation, in 1980, of new ventilation hoods on the roof (City of Santa Barbara Permit Application, March 12, 1980). In 1992 both 1325 State Street and 1327 State Street were combined into one address, 1325 State Street. This took place when Brigitte’s Restaurant expanded using both storefronts; architect for the renovation was Thompson/Naylor Architects (City of Santa Barbara Master Application, MST92-0811, September 10, 1992). In the following year, the building underwent earthquake reinforcement; contractor for the job was B. M. P. Construction (City of Santa Barbara Master Application, BLD91-0816, October 9, 1990; completion date, June 23, 1993). In 2004, the building was re-roofed when the existing red roof was replaced with a new roof system of PVD single ply roofing with a white IB roofing section, and grey roofing on the lower roof sections (City of Santa Barbara Building Permit #BLD2004-01421, June 15, 2004).

7.2 Adjacent Properties

The Arlington Theatre at 1317 State Street

Located at 1317 State Street, the Arlington Theatre was designed by the architectural firm of Edwards and Plunkett (Joseph Plunkett was responsible for the actual design). Responding to the stylistic mandate of Santa Barbara’s newly created Architectural Board of Review (formed after the 1925 earthquake) the theater was designed in the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Completed in 1931 the richly appointed 2,025-seat theatre, with its scenicographic interior designed as a Spanish Village and murals and stage curtain painted by the plein aire artist, John Marshall Gamble, the Fox Arlington was one of the most impressive movie palaces of its time. The Arlington Theatre was designated a City of Santa Barbara Landmark in 1983.

Inspired by the architectural motifs of Andalusian Spain, Plunkett’s monumentally scaled design for the Fox Arlington was intended to create the effect of an 18th century basilican type cathedral. As envisioned by its developers at the time the theater, subsequently to be augmented by smaller commercial structures, was to form the centerpiece of a “Spanish style village.” As a part of this scheme a cross axis formed by a paseo linking West Sola Street with West Victoria Street was created. The paseo passes through the west end of the arcuated hyphen linking the theatre’s auditorium with State Street. Unfortunately, for Plunkett’s grand scheme, the onset of the 1929 Great Depression precluded the completion of the “Spanish style village” and ultimately, the mixed-plan he had envisioned was not completed. Instead, some of the undeveloped space was transformed into a parking lot on the north and west side of the theater, while the southwest side of the property was subsequently developed with a grocery market and parking to accommodate its customers.
The Property at 1301 State Street

The Christian Science Reading Room at 1301 State Street was placed on the City of Santa Barbara's Potential Historic Resources List in 1978 (this designation is considered by the City of Santa Barbara to also encompass 1303 and 1303A State Street).

The Property at 1309 State Street

The Drake Building (the former Lou Rose Annex), a Spanish Colonial Revival Style commercial building was built in 1934. It was placed on the City of Santa Barbara Potential Historic Resources List in 1978.

The Property at 1315 State Street

This Spanish Colonial Revival Style building, which once housed I. Magnin & Company and later the Lou Rose Dress Shop, was built in 1925. It was placed on the City of Santa Barbara Potential Historic Resources List in 1978.

The Property at 1329 State Street

This Streamline Moderne/Mediterranean style building was built to the design of Alex D'Alfonso in 1940. It was placed on the City of Santa Barbara Potential Historic Structures/Sites List in 1978.

8.0 EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS

This section of the report will determine the historic significance of the property at 1325-1327 State Street as well as its physical and visual integrity. The historic significance of the property will be evaluated using the criteria set forth in the City of Santa Barbara's Master Environmental Assessment (MEA), the State Historic Resources Code and the National Register of Historic Places. The evaluation will determine if the property qualifies for designation as City of Santa Barbara Landmark or Structure of Merit, placement on the California Register of Historical Resources or listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The integrity of the resource will be evaluated through the application of the integrity criteria developed by the National Park Service.

The property at 1325-1327 State Street is not a designated City of Santa Barbara Landmark or Structure of Merit nor is the building at 1325-1327 State Street listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places.

8.1 Establishing the Resource's Potential Period of Historic Significance and Historic Themes

Research and field survey have identified one potential theme for 1325-1327 State Street "Historic Architecture" because its design represents the work of the architectural firm of Soule and Murphy. The period of significance for the property encompasses the period of 1946, the year that the building, encompassing 1325-1327 State Street, was built.

8.2 Evaluation of Integrity

Integrity means that the resource retains the essential qualities of its historic character. Built in
1946, the property at 1325-1327 State Street meets the 50-years-of-age criterion usually necessary for evaluation. Properties also must retain sufficient integrity to convey the essential features of their appearance during their period of significance. The seven aspects of integrity are location, setting, feeling, association, design, workmanship and materials. The National Register defines integrity in the following manner:

The authenticity of a property’s historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property’s prehistoric or historic period. A property must resemble its historic appearance as well as retain materials, design features, and construction details dating from its period of significance. It must convey an overall sense of time and place. If a property retains the physical characteristics it possessed in the past then it has the capacity to convey association with historical patterns or persons, architectural or engineering design and technology, or information about a culture or people (National Register Bulletin 15, 1999).

The Seven Aspects of Integrity

1) Location (the building, structure or feature has not been moved).
2) Design (the combination of elements that create the form, plan, and style of a property).
3) Setting (the physical environment of a property).
4) Materials (the physical elements used at a particular period of time to create the property).
5) Workmanship (the physical evidence of craft used to create the property).
6) Feeling (the property’s expression of a particular time and place).
7) Association (the link between a significant event or person and the property).

The relevant aspects of integrity depend upon the National Register criteria applied to the property. For example, a property nominated under Criterion A (events), would be likely to convey its significance primarily through integrity of location, setting, and association. A property nominated solely under Criterion C (architecture) would rely upon integrity of design, materials, and workmanship.

Application of the Integrity Criteria to the Property at 1325-1327 State Street

The potential resource will be evaluated using the seven aspects of integrity listed below:

1) Integritv of Location

Integrity of location means that the resource and its major components remain at its original location.

The building at 1325-1327 State Street has remained in place since its construction in 1946. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street retains its integrity of location.

2) Integrity of Design

Integrity of design means that the resource accurately reflects its original plan.
The building has undergone some changes to its street façade and its rear elevation, which faces onto a pedestrian paseo since its construction in 1946. These include the reconfiguration and replacement of almost all of the street façade’s original glazing and doors and the removal of one of the recessed entries. Notwithstanding these alterations the street façade preserves its overall form composed of glazed storefronts capped by a continuous parapet embellished with finials and reductive Plateresque detailing. Despite minor changes to the rear elevation’s storefront entries, this elevation of the building is largely intact as the division into three storefronts is readily discernible. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street, which can still convey the essential features of its post-World War II Mediterranean style architecture, retains its integrity of design.

3) Integrity of Setting

Integrity of setting means those buildings, structures, or features associated with a later development period have not intruded upon the surrounding area to the extent that the original context is lost.

The setting of 1325-1327 State Street has undergone some changes since the building was constructed in 1946. Within the last some 40 years the north end of the 1300 block of State Street was redeveloped with large Mediterranean style commercial building at the corner of State Street and East Sola Street and the properties located south of the project parcel between the State Street entrance to the Arlington Theatre and 1325-1327 State Street have been remodeled or completely rebuilt. On the east side of the 1300 block of State Street a gas station the intersection of Arlington Avenue and State Street was transformed into a restaurant at, a small shopping center was built on the north side of Arlington Avenue, and two-story commercial buildings were built at either end of the block. Within the last six years a grocery store at 34 West Victoria Street has been replaced with a Mediterranean style mixed-use project (the store’s tile murals were relocated on-site) and the parking lot behind the project parcel at 1330 Chapala Street is currently being redeveloped with a Mediterranean style mixed-use project. Notwithstanding these changes, the west side of the 1300 block of State Street, which is lined with one and two-story Spanish Colonial Revival and Mediterranean style commercial buildings, most of them built between circa-1925 and the late 1940s, can still convey its historic development pattern and character that has existed since late-1940s. Therefore, the immediate setting of the building at 1325-1327 State Street, designed by Soule and Murphy, has retained its integrity of setting.

4) Integrity of Materials

Integrity of Materials means the property retains most or all of the physical materials that date to its period of significance.

The building at 1325-1327 State Street, has retained sufficient of its original building materials including its tile roof and decorative detailing, such as the “diapering” pattern and finials on the State Street façade and most of the design elements of the paseo elevation including the division into three storefronts, some of the first floor and all of the second floor fenestration that it can still convey the character of its original construction materials. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street has retained its integrity of materials.
5 Integrity of Workmanship

Integrity of Workmanship means that the original character of construction details is present. These elements can not have deteriorated or been disturbed to the extent that their value as examples of craftsmanship has been lost.

The building at 1325-1327 State Street, has retained much of its construction materials, including its decorative detailing, such as the “diapering” pattern and finials on the State Street façade and most of the design elements of the paseo elevation including the division into three storefronts, some of the first floor and all of the second floor fenestration and the tile-clad roof. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street, which can still convey the essential character of its original construction, retains its integrity of workmanship.

6) Integrity of Feeling

The property’s expression of a particular time and place.

The building at 1325-1327 State Street was constructed in 1946. Designed by Soule and Murphy in a reductive interpretation of the Mediterranean style, the building reflected the growing popularity of a more schematized rendition of pre-World War II Period Revival styles during the two-decade period following the end of World War II (circa 1945-1965). Because the building at 1325-1327 State Street, retains its integrity of location, design, setting, materials, and workmanship it can convey the post-World War II period in which it was built. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street has retained its integrity of feeling.

7) Integrity of Association

The link between a significant event or person and the property.

The building at 1325-1327 State Street retains sufficient integrity to convey its historic associations. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street has retained its integrity of association.

Summary Statement of Integrity

The building at 1325-1327 State Street, has retained its integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.

9.0 SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT

The following evaluation will focus on the resources that are associated with the historic themes identified in Section 8.1 of this report. The following criteria established for historic property assessments outlined in the City of Santa Barbara MEA will be applied to the resources to assess their potential historic and architectural significance:

9.1 Criteria for Designation of City Landmarks and Structures of Merit

The following criteria are used in determining the historic and architectural significance of buildings in the City of Santa Barbara:

In considering a proposal to recommend to the City Council any structure, natural feature.
site or area for designation as a landmark, the Committee shall apply any or all of the
following criteria:

(a) Its character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City, the State or
Nation;
(b) Its location as a site of a significant historic event;
(c) Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and
development of the City, the State or the Nation;
(d) Its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City, the
State or the Nation;
(e) Its exemplification of the best remaining architectural type in a neighborhood;
(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;
(g) Its embodiment of elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design,
detail, materials or craftsmanship;
(h) Its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that
landmark;
(i) Its unique location or singular physical characteristic representing an established and
familiar visual feature of a neighborhood;
(j) Its potential of yielding significant information of archaeological interest;
(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

9.1.1 Previous Designations

The property at 1325-1327 State Street is not a listed Landmark or Structure of Merit, nor is it on
the City of Santa Barbara Potential Historic Resources List.

9.1.2 Application of the Significance Criteria to the Property at 1325-1327 State Street

The property at 1325-1327 State Street meets the following City Criteria:

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

Built in 1946 to the design of Soule and Murphy, the building at 1325-1327 State Street is a
postwar interpretation of the Mediterranean style completed toward the end of the firm’s
partnership (Winsor Soule died in 1954 and John Murphy retired that same year). This postwar
iteration of deemphasized the irregularity, “handcraftedness” and picturesque qualities of the
prewar period in favor of simplified forms, schematized ornamentation and machine-like
forms. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street, which exemplifies the postwar
iteration of the Mediterranean style, meets Criterion a.

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

The building at 1325-1327 State Street is an example of Soule and Murphy’s postwar
interpretation of the Spanish Colonial Revival/Mediterranean style. While not as appreciated
as earlier renditions of the style, this architectural type forms an important element of Santa
Barbara’s architectural heritage. Therefore, 1325-1327 State Street meets Criterion d.

(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:

Throughout their careers Soule and Murphy made a concerted effort to make Mediterranean and Spanish Colonial Revival the city’s dominant architectural styles an effort that spanned more than 30 years and substantially contributed to Santa Barbara’s architectural heritage. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street meets Criterion f.

The resource does not meet the following Significance Criteria:

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

For some 54 years, from 1874 to 1928, the block bounded by State, West Victoria, Chapala, and West Sola Streets, was the site of the Arlington Hotel and the Arlington Hotel Annex. The hotel, which was one of Santa Barbara’s premier resorts during the late 19th through early 20th century, played a leading role in the city’s social and commercial life. It was the scene of a number of important historical events, including visits by such notable figures as Princess Louise, the daughter of Queen Victoria, King Kalakaua of the Hawaiian Islands, President William McKinley, President Rutherford B. Hayes, and President Theodore Roosevelt. In 1926 the main hotel was demolished, followed by the Annex in 1928. Today, the only surviving features from the Arlington Hotel period are several large Canary Island date palms and a small pedestrian archway located at the northwest corner of the 1300 block of Chapala Street. Because only the buildings and almost all of the landscaping and features associated with the Arlington Hotel have been demolished and replaced with new construction, the project parcel can no longer effectively convey its association with significant historic events that occurred at the Arlington Hotel and Arlington Annex (1874-1928). Therefore, the property at 1325-1327 State Street, 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:

The buildings at 1325-1327 State Street is not associated with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the commercial, cultural or political life of Santa Barbara. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street does not meet Criterion c.

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

The building is an example of the postwar interpretation of the Mediterranean style of which another, better preserved example survives at 1329 State Street (this building conflates Streamline Moderne with Mediterranean motifs). Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street does not meet Criterion e.

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

The building at 1325-1327 State Street, which employs stuccoed walls, metal-framed plate glass windows doors and reductive Mediterranean style embellishments, such as the State Street façade’s finials, is an example of postwar Mediterranean commercial design and does
not embody the level of design excellence and attention to detail that would make the building at 1325-1327 State meet Criterion g.

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

The Arlington Theatre, located to the north and west of the project parcel is a designated City of Santa Barbara Landmark. However, the building at 1325-1327 State Street postdates the Arlington Theatre's period of significance and does not significantly contribute to the setting of the Arlington Theatre in regards to the pre-World War II appearance of the Arlington Theatre and its setting. Therefore, the property at 1325-1327 State Street does not meet Criterion h.

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

The building at 1325-1327 State Street is not a singular example of its postwar Mediterranean style architecture nor is it located on a prominent corner. There are a number of examples of this reductive interpretation of the Mediterranean style built in the surrounding neighborhood that reflective the popularity of this less historic and more simplified interpretation of the style. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street does not meet Criterion i.

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

The application of this criterion to the building at 1325-1327 State Street 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 property at 1325-1327 State Street and its surrounding neighborhood has been profoundly modified by human activity over the last 236 years and no longer represents an intact natural landscape. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street does not meet Criterion k.

9.1.3 Additional Criteria Listed in Chapter 2.3 (Section 5) of the MEA

The building at 1325-1327 State Street also will be assessed using the additional criteria listed in Chapter 2.3 (Section 5) of the MEA (Guidelines for Archaeological and Historic Structures and Sites, February 2002).

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.

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.

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.

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)].

**Application of the Criteria**

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.

The building at 1325-1327 State Street is not linked with a traditional lifeway associated with the community or groups associated with the historical and cultural development of Santa Barbara. Except at the very broadest level, the building is not illustrative of the cultural, social, political, economic or industrial development of Santa Barbara. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street, **does not 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.

The building of 1325-1327 State Street is one of several buildings built on the west side of the 1300 block of State Street, designed, with the exception of the Streamlined Moderne building at 1301-1303 State Street, in variations of either the Spanish Colonial Revival style or the Mediterranean style, between the 1920s and the late 1940s. The building at 1325-1327 State Street is an example of postwar Mediterranean style architecture in Santa Barbara. As an example of this style the building at 1325-1327 State Street has been a contributor to the surrounding streetscape for the last 72 years. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street **meets** 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.

Extensive examination of records on file at the City of Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara Historical Society, and the Santa Barbara Public Library did not reveal any information to indicate that the building at 1325-1327 State Street has the potential for yielding additional information relevant to historical, ethnographic, folkloric, or geographical research [The application of this criterion to archaeological deposits is beyond the purview of this report]. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street **does not meet** Additional Criterion 7.

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)].

The building is not a listed Landmark or Structure of Merit, nor is it currently on the City of Santa Barbara’s Potential Historic Resources List. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street, **does not meet** Additional Criteria 8.
Summary Statement of Eligibility for Listing as a City of Santa Barbara Landmark or Structure of Merit:

The building at 1325-1327 State Street, as well meets Criteria a, d, and f, and as well as Additional Criterion 6. The building is therefore eligible for listing as a City of Santa Barbara Structure of Merit.

Eligibility for Listing in the California Register of Historical Resources

For purposes of this section, the term "historical resources" shall include the following:

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).
2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architecturally, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:

3a Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
3b Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
3c 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; or;
3d Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criterion 1: A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).

The building at 1325-1327 State Street, is not listed in the California Register of Historic Resources. Therefore, the building does not meet Criterion 1.

Criterion 2: A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

The building at 1325-1327 State Street is not a City of Santa Barbara Landmark or Structure of Merit.
nor is it listed in the City of Santa Barbara Potential Historic Structures/Sites List. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street does not meet Criterion 2.

Criterion 3a: Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;

The building at 1325-1327 State Street is not associated with events that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street does not meet Criterion 3a.

Criterion 3b: Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

The building at 1325-1327 State Street is not associated with a historically significant person or persons. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street does not meet Criterion 3b.

Criterion 3c: 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 building retains sufficient integrity to be eligible for listing as a City of Santa Barbara Structure of Merit, it does not retain, in its altered state, sufficient significance to meet Criterion 3c.

Criterion 3d: Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The application of this criterion to 1325-1327 State Street, which pertains to archaeological deposits, is beyond the purview of this report.

9.2.1 Summary Statement of Eligibility at the State Level

The building at 1325-1327 State Street does not meet any of the criteria necessary for listing at the State level.

9.3 Eligibility for Listing in the National Register of Historic Places

Also to be considered are the criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. (MEA Technical Appendix 1 VGB-10):

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of State and local importance that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and:

(a) That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
(b) That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
(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; or
(d) That has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
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Application of the Criteria

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

As noted in the application of the City of Santa Barbara criteria in Section 9.1, and the evaluation of eligibility for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources in Section 9.2, the building at 1325-1327 State Street is not eligible for listing because of an association with historic events. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street does not meet sufficient significance for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion a.

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

As noted above in Section 9.1, under the evaluation of Criterion a, and in Section 9.2, under the evaluation of eligibility for listing the California Register of Historical Resources, the building at 1325-1327 State Street is not eligible for listing because of an association with the lives of persons significant in our past. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street does not meet sufficient significance for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion b.

(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 building retains sufficient integrity to be eligible for listing as a City of Santa Barbara Structure of Merit, it does not retain, in its altered state, sufficient significance for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under 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.

9.4 Summary Statement of Significance under the National Register of Historic Places

The building at 1325-1327 State Street does not meet any criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Resources.

9.5 Summary Statement of Eligibility for Listing as a Historic Resource

This report has determined that the building located at 1325-1327 State Street is eligible for listing as a significant historic resource at the Structure of Merit level under the following criteria: a, d, and f and Additional Criteria 6. The property is not eligible for listing at the State or National levels.

10.0 EVALUATION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

As summarized in Section 9.5 the building at 1325-1327 State Street is eligible for listing as significant historic resource at local level. Therefore, the building at 1325-1327 State Street is considered a significant resource for the purposes of environmental review. The following section of the report will identify and evaluate potential project impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed project.
10.1 Project Thresholds

This component of the study will assess the potential impacts that may result from the implementation of the proposed project. The City MEA uses State CEQA Guidelines #15064.5 for determining the significance of impacts to historic resources:

An adverse effect is defined as an action that will diminish the integrity of those aspects of the property that make it eligible for listing in a local, State or National register of historic resources. CEQA defines adverse effect in the following manner: A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment (Public Resource Code 15064.5 (b)). Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired (Public Resource Code 15064.5 (b1)).

CEQA defines material impairment of a historic resource as follows:

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

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

(C) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA. (Public Resources Code 15064.5 (b2)).

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

(4) A lead agency shall identify potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant adverse changes in the significance of an historical resource. The lead agency shall ensure that any adopted measures to mitigate or avoid significant adverse changes are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.
The following direction for applying mitigation measures is found in Section 2.5 of the MEA Guidelines for Archaeological Resources and Historic Structures and Sites (2002: 65 - 70).

These include the following:

1) In-situ preservation is the preferred manner of avoiding damage to significant historic resources.
2) Planning construction so that demolition or alteration of structures, sites and natural objects are not required; and
3) Incorporating existing structures, sites and natural objects into planned development whenever avoidance is not possible.

As noted in the guidelines the appropriateness of potential mitigation measures is dependant on the type of historic resource and its degree of importance. A resource’s significance is tied to its level of eligibility for listing at the local, state and national level (MEA 2002: 66-67). The following range of potential mitigation measures are listed in the MEA:

1) Rehabilitation without relocation on site for use as habitable space, including compliance with all State Historic Building Code requirements. The Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines would apply to this treatment.
2) Preserving the historic structure on site as non-habitable space. The Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines would apply to this treatment.
3) Relocation and preservation of the historic structure on site for use as habitable space, including compliance with all State Historic Building Code requirements. The Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines would apply to this treatment.
4) Relocation and preservation of the historic structure on site for use as non-habitable space. The Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines would apply to this treatment.
5) Compatibility incorporation of façade only of historic structure into the design of the new building on site (This treatment would not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines that would apply to this treatment).
6) Advertisements for acquisition and relocation of structures with its subsequent rehabilitation at its new site. The Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines would apply to this treatment.
7) Demolition of historic structures with recordation according to the Community Development Department’s “Required Documentation Prior to Demolition” standards.
8) Commemoration of the demolished structure with a display of text and photograph within the new building.
9) Commemoration of the demolished structure with a display of text and photograph on the exterior of the new building.
10) Commemoration of the demolished structure with an enclosed display of texts and photographs on the perimeter of the property at the primary entrance.
11) Salvage of significant materials for conservation in a historical display.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards

The following standards developed by the National Park Service to evaluate impacts to historic resources will guide the evaluation of the proposed project:

1) A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2) The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

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

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

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

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

7) Chemical and physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken by the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8) Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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

10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed, in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property will be unimpaired (36 CFR Part 68, 1995 Federal Register. Vol. 60, No. 133).

10.2 Work Plan

The work plan will focus on an evaluation of impacts of the proposed project on the historic resources identified in this report.

10.2.1 Character-Defining and Non-Character-Defining Elements of the Building at 1325-1327 State Street

**East Elevation (State Street façade)**

**Character-Defining**

- One-story massing on State Street;
- Linear façade;
- Line of plate glass window separated by recessed entries; and
- Parapet with its diapering, finials and attenuated Plateresque style detailing.

**Non-Character-Defining**

- Existing glazing and doors; and
- Tile coping.

**West Elevation (paseo elevation)**
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- Two-story massing and side gable roof covered in terra cotta tiles;
- Linear façade divided into three storefronts;
- Sash windows and metal grilles on first floor;
- 2nd floor fenestration including shutters and metal grilles; and
- Second floor balcony.

Non-Character-Defining

- Replacement glazing, tile coping, and newer doors on first floor; and
- The northernmost store front’s existing configuration which postdates the construction of the building.

10.3 Proposed Project

The building at 1325-1327 State Street is within the City of Santa Barbara El Pueblo Landmark District (EPV). Design Guidelines for buildings within the EPV are found in "Guidelines: El Pueblo Viejo District, Santa Barbara, California" (Revised 2009).

The applicant proposes to convert 1,494 square feet (net) of existing second story office to a two-bedroom residential unit. The existing roof structure and assembly will be remodeled within the building's existing envelope, including the replacement of the existing skylights. Interior structural posts will be replaced in same location. One of the two existing access stairs to the paseo will be demolished and the opening between the floors will be enclosed. Changes to the first floor of street façade (east elevation) would include the removal of the existing awnings and the remodeling of the area around the exit door at the north end if the elevation by replacing it with a new wall, door and glazing (see Appendix A for project plans).

![Figure 17, Existing and Proposed West Elevation](image-url)
2 PROPOSED PASEO REAR ELEV.

Figure 18. Detail of Proposed West Elevation

11 EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN

Figure 19. Existing First Floor Plan
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10.3.1 Analysis of Project Impacts

The standards outlined in Section 10.1 of the report will guide the analysis of the proposed project on historic resources.

1. A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
The project would convert the rear second floor of the commercial building into a residential unit. This change in use does not encompass alterations to the street façade (east elevation) or to surviving historic fabric on the rear elevation (west elevation) (see Figures 17-21). The doors and exterior staircases on the south elevation’s first floor that are proposed for removal, which were added in the 1980s, do not date to the period of significance (1946). The replacement door and glazing is in character both in design and materials with the rear elevation’s existing first floor. Therefore, their removal would not impair the ability of the rear elevation or the building as a whole to convey its Mediterranean style architecture and to contribute to the character of the existing paseo. Therefore, the proposed alterations meet Standard 1.

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

The project does not propose alterations to the State Street façade which will retain its existing appearance. Alterations to the rear elevation are confined to the first floor of the northernmost storefront where non-original doors and windows will be replaced. Therefore, the proposed project, which would not alter or character-defining building fabric or alter historic spatial relationships meets Standard 2.

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

The project does not propose incorporating historic architectural features or materials from another property. Therefore, Standard 3 does not apply to the project.

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

Changes to the property that have occurred since 1946 have not achieved historic significance in their own right. Therefore, Standard 4 does not apply to the project.

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

The project does not propose the removal of character-defining historic fabric, finishes, or construction techniques on the exterior of the building. Therefore, the proposed project, which would not alter or character-defining building fabric meets Standard 5.

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

The project does not propose the repair of the building’s character-defining historic fabric. If such interventions are required during construction, the project shall retain and repair historic fabric to the maximum extend feasible. If replacement material is required, it shall match the original to the maximum extent feasible in regards to materials, design, dimension and appearance following the
guidance of a City-qualified historian or the City’s Urban Historian. Provided this guidance is followed, the proposed project meets Standard 6.

7. Chemical and physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken by the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

The project does not propose chemical or physical treatments to the building. If paint removal is proposed, methods shall avoid the use harsh chemicals or surface treatments that could damage historic building materials. National Park Service Preservation Brief #9 will guide the repair (if necessary) of the wood windows and will follow the guidance in Preservation Brief #33 in regards to glazing. Provided this guidance is followed the proposed project would meet Standard 7.

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

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

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

As noted above, the project would convert the rear second floor (west elevation) of the commercial building into a residential unit. This would not encompass alterations to the State Street façade (east elevation) or to surviving historic fabric on the rear elevation (west elevation). The door and exterior staircase on the south elevation’s first floor proposed for removal, do not date to the period of significance (1946) therefore their removal would not impair the building’s integrity of materials, workmanship or design. The alterations would employ the same materials currently found on the west elevation which would preserve the design cohesiveness of the Paseo elevation (west elevation). Therefore, the proposed alterations meet Standard 9.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed, in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property will be unimpaired (36 CFR Part 68, 1995 Federal Register, Vol. 60, No. 133).

The proposed door and glazing could be removed in the future with no impairment of historic materials or design features. Therefore, the proposed alterations to the west elevation, which are reversible, meet Standard 10.

10.3.2 Cumulative Impacts

As noted in Section 10.3.1 of this report, implementation of the proposed project at 1325-1327 State Street, which meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, would not significantly “effect” character-defining elements of the building. The existing paseo linking West Sola Street to the entrance to the Arlington Theatre would remain in place and the rear storefront (west elevation) of 1325-1327 State Street would continue to contribute to the visual character of the paseo and adjacent historic resources such as the Arlington Theatre.
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Consequently, after implementation of the proposed project, the significant historic resources on or adjacent to the project parcel would maintain their eligibility for listing as significant historic resources at the City, State and National level. The incremental contribution of these changes to cumulative impacts resulting from this project and the project currently being constructed at 1330 Chapala Street and the recently completed project at 34 West Victoria Street, are not significant because they are relatively minor in nature and would not contribute to obscuring character-defining views towards the Arlington Theatre or the visual integrity of the paseo behind the building or the streetscape of the 1300 block of State Street.

11.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Post/Hazeltine Associates evaluated the property at 1325-1327 State Street. The report determined that the building, which retains its overall integrity of design and materials and represents the work of Soule and Murphy, a significant architectural firm that has contributed to the architectural heritage of the City, is eligible for listing as a City of Santa Barbara Structure of Merit. Because the proposed project would not significantly impair the ability of the building to convey Mediterranean style architecture or the visual integrity of the 1300 block of State Street or the paseo extending along the rear of the building, the proposed project impacts to significant historic resources would be less than significant (Class III).
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Project Plans