



July 28th, 2018

Susi Murray
City Planner, Planning & Economic Development
100 Santa Rosa Avenue, Room 3
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Subject: 1120 McDonald Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA

Ms. Murray:

This report describes the scope of work proposed for the Bean Residence, a Minor Landmark Alteration Application, as it applies to preservation issues identified in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.¹ The use of these guidelines is generally to provide guidance to preservation specialists and planners for work on historic buildings. The City of Santa Rosa references these Standards in its *Processing Review Procedures for Owners of Historic Properties*² and *Design Guidelines for Historic Properties and Districts*.³

Residence History

The Petaluma Daily Morning Courier (Petaluma, California) notes on page 3 of the Friday, September 11, 1908 edition --

"Fire at County Seat. The home of Mr. and Mrs. G. L. Ayers at 1120 McDonald Avenue was totally destroyed by fire Wednesday evening about 7:00. The Loss is estimated at \$3,000.00. The cause of the fire is a mystery and will probably never be known. The Insurance carried on the property was \$1,000 and the household effects, \$750.00; this is barely more than half the loss sustained."

The likely supposition is that the current residence was constructed or moved on the property circa 1909-1912. The Press Democrat also included a similar article on the loss.

In the 1911 Santa Rosa City Directory, page 13 notes Bert H. Baker as the Grt. Am. Imp. Tea Co., residing at 1120 McDonald Ave.

¹ National Park Service, 1995

² City of Santa Rosa, 2006

³ City of Santa Rosa nD. 4.7III

The 1970 hand-typed book, "A Century of Elegance," by Ann M. Conner (with a copy in the Sonoma County Library History Annex in Santa Rosa) is the definitive history for the district. Mrs. Conner lived on McDonald Avenue, was a member of the Santa Rosa Women's Club, and personally interviewed its members and her McDonald Avenue neighbors. 1120 McDonald Avenue has the following entry --

"It is thought that there was an owner previous to Mrs. Julia Jordan, and that perhaps the home had been moved there from another location. Mrs. Jordan was one of four children of the O'Meara family, Frances, Poly (Mrs. Frank Doyle), and James, who was on the staff of the Sonoma Democrat. (the senior O'Mearas had lived on the corner of Mendocino and College Avenue). Julia O'Meara taught the fifth and sixth grade at the Burbank E1 school in the early 1900s, Mrs. Walter Nagal (Liota Pedigo) being one of her fellow teachers. Ms. Meara guided Liotta in keeping track of her workdays and to obtain her life certificate."

"After her marriage, Julia and her husband lived at 1120 McDonald Avenue, and were the parents of a son, and a daughter, Frances (Mrs. Allan Bress, of Washington D.C.). The present owner is J. Journeay Smith, formerly of Ukiah."

Regulatory Context

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires taking into consideration cultural resources during the environmental review process. One may accomplish this with an inventory of resources within a study area, and by assessing the cultural resources potentially 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 potentially 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 1120 McDonald Avenue is included 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 November 3, 1998.⁴ While there has not been a formal evaluation of the subject property on its own, it was included in Dan Peterson's 1977 survey.⁵

⁴ City of Santa Rosa, 1998

⁵ Dan Peterson, 1977

The survey is a noted 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 absolutely minimal changes.
2. Reconstruction of a rotted and termite-infested front porch, expanding the existing footprint to approximate the area of the soffit at the roof overhang above it. The flooring will be a fir tongue and groove to match the existing, with a brick skirt and steps. These reflect character-defining materials throughout the district.
3. The addition of a faux hipped roof dormer at the center of the existing roof. This, too, is a typical character-defining element of homes of this era within the McDonald district. Construction of the dormer will consist of scalloped cedar shingles, with a true divided light wood frame window glazed with restoration glass. The window shape reflects the half round moon windows in the existing front door.

Preservation, Rehabilitation, Standards Considerations and Evaluation

The City of Santa Rosa (the City) has not codified the character-defining elements of the multi-period McDonald Historic Preservation District, however. This home is a Transitional style, a close relation to the Craftsman style houses, and a distant relation to the Folk Victorian houses around it. This home does have identifiable features, such as low roof pitch, shed-roof dormers, or hipped roof dormers consistent with the Craftsmen era. The window proportions and interior trim conditions are consistent with Folk Victorian residences. The curved front roof overhang with its distinctive triple 4x4 rafter tails, (likely an ode to Craftsman architect, Brainerd Jones) are the most prominent character-defining elements, akin to the Craftsmen, but not the Folk Victorian.

The building's proportions and trim conditions are more in keeping with the Folk Victorian predecessors. The proposed changes will maintain these features, and conform to the City's *Design Guidelines* for historic properties.⁶

The following section addresses the proposed project within the context of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, as adopted by the City of Belvedere. The Standards, presented in black, below, and AA's (Artisan Architecture) analysis of the proposed project, as it relates to the Standards, presented in blue, below.

⁶ City of Santa Rosa nD. 04.7

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

AA Response: The project maintains its historic use as a single-family residence.

Evaluation: The proposed project complies with Standard 1.

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

AA Response: The only removal of historic fabric is a rotted wood porch, slated for reconstruction in identical materials. No other alteration of features or spaces is proposed. The character-defining features that remain on the building are unchanged. The proposed work does not actually affect the 1909 residence. The addition of the Faux Dormer is not inconsistent within the district.

Evaluation: The proposed project does not adversely affect the original portions of the 1909 residence. The proposed work complies with Standard 2.

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

AA Response: No plan to add conjectural features from other buildings. The dormer addition is reverse readily reversible and will be distinctive of its own era.

Evaluation: The proposed project complies with Standard 3.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

AA Response: There are no significant changes to the 1909 house that have become "significant in their own right" that the proposed project will affect.

Evaluation: The proposed project complies with Standard 4.

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

AA Response: The project preserves the distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques associated with 1909 residence and its architectural details. The new work does not affect adversely the historic home.

Evaluation: The proposed project complies with Standard 5.

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

AA Response: The project repairs, rather than replaces, all historic features. The rotted damaged and deteriorated porch is reconstructed it is enlarged. This work matches the pervious design in color, texture and other visual qualities.

Evaluation: The proposed project complies with Standard 6.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

AA Response: The project will not damage historic materials via use of chemical or physical treatments during the proposed changes to the building.

Evaluation: The proposed project complies with Standard 7.

8. Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

AA Response: There are no known archaeological resources within the project Area. Ground disturbing activities include minimal surface grading and above grade concrete removal does not impact as best can be determined by observation any historic elements.

Evaluation: The proposed project complies with Standard 8.

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

AA Response: The proposed project calls for the removal of only rotted and termite damaged wood and the replacement of it in kind and location. The project will preserve and restore or replaced "in-kind" the materials as they interact with the existing structure.

Evaluation: The proposed project complies with Standard 9.

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

AA Response: The project will undertake the new proposed additions in a manner that ensures compatibility with the original residence design, thus distinctively differentiating the new proposed additions from the original residence.

Evaluation: The intent of the Standards is not to prevent change. Rather, they represent a sophisticated and nuanced framework for managing change. The Standards do not require that every feature of a historic property be preserved, but do seek to preserve the most significant, character-defining features of a historic site. The standards are not in place to hinder or halt the work of repair, or rehabilitation, but rather to assure sensitively and appropriately executed work. The proposed project complies with Standard 10.

Conclusion

We did preliminary historic research and reviewed historic document provided by the applicant. In our research and project review, we found no significant historic evidence or suggestion in the records provided to suggest the proposed work will adversely affect this historic property. Our analysis of the proposed design we found no significant elements that would detract or diminish the significance of the property. The elements added are distinct from the historic property and easily reversible should subsequent restoration efforts be undertaken.

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 the rotted damaged materials are replaced and those in kind. The proposed additional porch area and dormer are sympathetic to the historic residence.

We wish you well.



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

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.

History Annex, Sonoma County Public Library, Santa Rosa, CA

Sanborn Map Company

1908-1950 *Santa Rosa, California*

Sanborn Map Company, New York