

Nov. 26th 2018

Kristinae Toomians | Senior Planner

Planning & Economic Development | 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3 | Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Tel. (707) 543-4692 | Fax (707) 543-3269 | KToomians@SRCity.org

Subject: Hibbard MLA, 629 Monroe Street, Santa Rosa CA

This report describes the scope of work proposed for the Hibbard Major Landmark Alteration Application and addendum to the approved application to remove the ADA as it applies to preservation issues identified in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.¹ The guidelines are generally used to provide guidance to preservation specialists and planners for work on historic buildings. The City of Santa Rosa references the Standards in its *Processing Review Procedures for Owners of Historic Properties*² and *Design Guidelines for Historic Properties and Districts*.³

REGULATORY CONTEXT

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that cultural resources be considered during the environmental review process. This is accomplished by an inventory of resources within a study area and by assessing the potential that cultural resources could be affected by development.

This report satisfies environmental issues specified in the CEQA and its guidelines (Title 14 CCR §15064.5) by: (1) identifying all cultural resources within the project area; (2) offering a preliminary significance evaluation of the identified cultural resources; (3) assessing resource vulnerability to effects that could arise from project activities; and (4) offering suggestions designed to protect resource integrity, as warranted.

Significance Criteria

When a project might affect a cultural resource, the project proponent is required to conduct an assessment to determine whether the effect may be one that is significant. Consequently, it is necessary to determine the importance of resources that could be affected. The importance of a resource is measured in terms of criteria for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources (Title 14 CCR, §4852). A resource may be important if it meets any one of the criteria, or if it is already listed on the California Register of Historical Resources or a local register of historical resources.

The property at 629 Monroe Street has already been listed on the California Register of Historical Resources by virtue of its listing as a contributor to the McDonald Historic Preservation District designated by the City Council on

¹ National Park Service 1995

² City of Santa Rosa 2006

³ City of Santa Rosa nd: 4.7 III

November 3, 1998.⁴ It has not been formally evaluated on its own but was included in Peterson's 1977 survey.⁵

As a contributor it is considered to be an historical resource and is subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). However, under CEQA Guidelines Section 15331, Class 31, projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation, or reconstruction of historical resources that are conducted in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* are exempt from a comprehensive EIR and may be allowed.

Scope of proposed work

The applicant proposes the following scope of work:

1. Preservation of the existing landscape and main residence with minimal changes.
2. Re-construction of the emergency exit stair systems on the south elevation of the residence.
3. The addition of a master bedroom and bath at the southwest corner of the building.
4. Demolition of a post-1924 rear porch and utility area at rear of residence.
5. Demolition of a post-1924 garage.
6. The construction of a new garage within the approximate foot print of the demolished garage.
8. The reconstruction of the gallery space between the residence and the new ADU/garage approximating the proportions of the current breezeway that ties the residence to the garage. Colors and finishes to match the original.

Preservation, Rehabilitation, Standards considerations and evaluation

Most of the c. 1924 Craftsman residence is intact. The north picture window on the east (front) façade may have been altered from a more typical fixed picture-with-flanking-hung-windows, as is its counterpart on the south side of the east façade. The current owner asserts that the attic was finished as a living space in 1937 as he has the original plans that came with the house. The garage was added after 1950 as the circa 1951 Sanborn Fire Insurance map depicts the current dwelling on a lot with a small outbuilding and no garage.⁶ The garage and rear utility additions were not described in Peterson's survey. Certain features of the garage and utility spaces, such as the thick canted fascia boards, suggest a late 1950s to 1960s design. The date of the breezeway linking the garage to the house is unknown.

The City of Santa Rosa (the City) has not codified the character-defining elements of the multi-period McDonald Historic Preservation District, however, Craftsman-style houses do have identifiable features, such as low roof pitch, shed-roof dormers, and window proportions. Proposed changes will maintain these features and conform to the City's *Design Guidelines* for historic properties.⁷

The extension of the west (rear) façade and the reconfiguration of stairs and landings will not be easily visible from the street. The original historic fabric will be treated in minimal, noninvasive ways, for example, by matching it with like materials as practical, including the existing door and window trim and finish materials. Historically appropriate windows proportions will be maintained. The reconstruction of the gallery space between the

⁴ City of Santa Rosa

⁵ Peterson 1977

⁶ Sanborn Map Company 1908-1950: Sheet 13. The map had a major revision in 1937; the last correction was logged in "10/15/51" (Sheet 0a).

⁷ City of Santa Rosa nd: Section 04.7

residence and the new ADU/garage will add appreciable volume so that it ties the proportions of the residence to the new garage and ADU without diminishing the stature of the residence or exalting the ADU. While the new addition and garage will be major alterations, their design is sympathetic to the character-defining elements of the home and other similar district properties but sufficiently distinctive to be differentiated from the original historic structure.

Conclusions and recommendations

The proposed project generally conforms to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The original use and materials of the historic house will be retained as much as possible and additions will be limited to the rear of the house and property. Proportions and finishes will be sympathetic to the historic residence.



Wm. Mark Parry AIA,CSI,SAH
Historic Architect & Architectural Historian

Ideastudios.com
707.544.4344

artisanarchitecture.com
α υ

mark@ideastudios.com
419 Benton Street Santa Rosa California 95401

References

City of Santa Rosa

2006 *Processing Review Procedures for Owners of Historic Properties*. <https://srcity.org/DocumentCenter/View/3259>. Accessed 1/16/18.

nd *Design Guidelines: 4.7 Historic Properties and Districts*. <https://srcity.org/DocumentCenter/Home/View/3054>.

2004 *City of Santa Rosa Zoning Codes: 20-28.040 Historic (-H) combining district*.
http://qcode.us/codes/santarosa/view.php?topic=20-2-20_28-20_28_040

National Park Service

2017 *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.
<https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards.htm>. Accessed 1/16/18.

Peterson, Dan

1977 *Santa Rosa Historic Resource Survey*. City of Santa Rosa. On file at History Annex, Sonoma County Public Library, Santa Rosa, California.

Sanborn Map Company

1908-1950 *Santa Rosa, California*. Sheet 13. Sanborn Map Company, New York.