

CITY OF SANTA ROSA
PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
STAFF REPORT FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD
OCTOBER 17, 2018

PROJECT TITLE

Bean Front Façade Modification

APPLICANT

Jeffrey and Shelly Bean

ADDRESS/LOCATION

1120 McDonald Avenue

PROPERTY OWNER

Jeffrey and Shelly Bean

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER

180-640-056

FILE NUMBER

LMA18-013

APPLICATION DATE

June 6, 2018

APPLICATION COMPLETION DATE

June 28, 2018

REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS

Landmark Alteration

FURTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED

None

PROJECT SITE ZONING

PD 0005-H (Planned Development, within
the Historic Combining District)

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION

Low Density Residential

PROJECT PLANNER

Susie Murray

RECOMMENDATION

Approval

Agenda Item #6.1
For Cultural Heritage Board Meeting of: October 17, 2018

CITY OF SANTA ROSA
CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD

TO: CHAIR DE SHAZO AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

FROM: SUSIE MURRAY, SENIOR PLANNER
PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: BEAN FRONT FAÇADE MODIFICATION

AGENDA ACTION: RESOLUTION

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended by the Planning and Economic Development Department that the Cultural Heritage Board, by resolution, approve a Landmark Alteration Permit for modifications to the front façade for the residential structure located at 1120 McDonald Avenue.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Bean Front Façade Modification project (Project) proposes the addition of a faux dormer; the expansion of the footprint of the front deck; the replacement of the front steps; and the addition of a picket fence at the front of the home. The Cultural Heritage Board is being asked to grant a Landmark Alteration Permit.

BACKGROUND

1. Project Description

The Project proposes the addition of a faux dormer, which will be centered above the front door; the replacement/enlargement of the front entry porch, which will match the line of the porch ceiling; the replacement of the front steps with a brick stairway including an iron hand railing on one side; and the addition of a picket fence adjacent to the sidewalk.

The Project site is located along the east side of McDonald Avenue, in the McDonald Preservation District, and is surrounded by similar residential development. The site is currently developed with a single-family dwelling, which

has been identified as a contributor to the district.

2. Surrounding Land Uses

North: Low Density Residential (2-8 units per acre)
South: Low Density Residential (2-8 units per acre)
East: Low Density Residential (2-8 units per acre)
West: Low Density Residential (2-8 units per acre)

All surrounding properties are developed with single-family residences.

3. Existing Land Use – Project Site

The subject site is currently developed with a single-family dwelling, and a detached garage/guest unit.

4. Project History

On March 21, 2018, the Cultural Heritage Board (Board) reviewed the proposed project as a concept item. The Board provided comments, but generally seemed to support the plan.

On June 7, 2018, the subject Landmark Alteration Permit application was submitted to Planning and Economic Development.

PRIOR CITY COUNCIL REVIEW

Not applicable.

ANALYSIS

1. General Plan

The General Plan land use designation for the site is Low Density Residential, which allows development at 2-8 units per acre. The 0.17-acre site is developed at a density of six units per acre, which is consistent with the General Plan.

2. Other Applicable Plans

Not applicable.

3. Zoning

The subject site is within the PD-H zoning district (Planned Development, within the Historic combining district), which is consistent with the General Plan land use designation. The following Zoning Code sections are relevant to the proposed project:

Zoning Code Table 3-4 provides parking requirements. The subject property is required to provide four parking spaces, of which one must be covered. The Project is consistent with the Zoning Code.

Pursuant to Zoning Code Section 20-58.060(F), the Board should consider the following criteria to the extent applicable in their discussion:

1. The consistency, or lack thereof, of the proposed change with the original architectural style and details of the building;
2. The compatibility of the proposed change with any adjacent or nearby landmark structures or preservation district structures;
3. The consistency and/or compatibility of the proposed colors, textures, materials, fenestration, decorative features and details with the time period of the building's construction, and/or adjacent structures;
4. Whether the proposed change will destroy or adversely affect an important architectural feature or features;
5. The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1983 Revision); and
6. Other matters, criteria and standards as may be adopted by resolution of the CHB.

Staff response: The site is located within the McDonald Preservation District and has been identified as a contributor to the district. The proposed façade changes incorporate materials that will match or compliment the original materials, including wood siding, brick steps with an iron railing, scalloped cedar shingles, etched windows with true divided light, and roofing materials to match the existing roof.

A historic evaluation, prepared by Mark Parry, Artisan-Architecture, dated July 28, 2018, addresses the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Mr. Parry's research found no significant historic evidence to suggest the proposed Project would adversely affect this property. A copy of the evaluation is attached to this report.

4. Design Guidelines

The following goals and policies, from the Santa Rosa Design Guidelines Section 4.7, Historic Properties and Districts, are applicable to the proposed project:

GOALS

- To preserve Santa Rosa's historic heritage.
- To encourage maintenance and retention of historic structures and districts.
- To ensure that alterations to historic buildings are compatible with the character of the structure and the neighborhood.

POLICIES

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Additions | Use historic materials that are compatible with the materials of the original building. |
| Porches | Do not remove a porch, as it is one of the main defining features of a house. Do not replace wood porches and porch steps with brick, ironwork, concrete, or concrete blocks. |

Staff response: The Project proposed to replace most materials in kind, with the exception of the wood steps, which will be replaced with brick. A historic evaluation, prepared by Mark Parry, Artisan-Architecture, dated July 28, 2018, found the new material to "reflect character defining materials found throughout the district."

5. Historic Preservation Review Standards

As mentioned previously in this report, the subject site is located within the McDonald Preservation District (District), and has been identified as a contributor to the District. Zoning Code Section 20-28.040 advises that the District was established in 1998, and the period of significance ranges from 1878-1940. The Zoning Code is silent in terms of character defining elements for this District. On March 15, 2006, the Cultural Heritage Board adopted Resolution 209 (attached), which does provide that information.

Following is review of the City's Processing Review Procedures for Owners of Historic Properties and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Processing Review Procedures for Owners of Historic Properties

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Additions | Construct additions so there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and ensure that character defining features of the historic building are not obscured, damaged or destroyed. |
|-----------|---|

Design additions so that they are compatible with the historic building in mass, materials, color, and proportion and spacing of windows and doors.

Design the roof form to be compatible with the historic building and consistent with historic roof forms in the neighborhood.

Fences Fencing in the front yard setback cannot exceed three feet in height unless approved by Conditional Use Permit or Variance. Fencing materials and design should be compatible with the architectural style of the primary structure on the lot.

Wooden fences should be painted or stained to match or to be compatible with the house and the neighborhood. Fencing should not obscure the front elevation of the primary structure on the property.

The finished side of the fence should be presented to the street, with structural members turned to face the property.

Porches Porch elements which are deteriorated should be repaired or replaced with matching materials, wherever possible. The original porch railings should be retained, wherever possible. If additional railing height is required, simple metal or wooden extension should be utilized so that the original historic configuration can be maintained.

Secretary of the Interior provides ten Standards for Rehabilitation:

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

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
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.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials 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.
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.

Staff response: The proposed dormer addition mimics the slope of the roof line and is proposed with the same colors and materials as the historic building, including roofing materials and windows. The white picket fence does not exceed a height of three feet at its tallest point.

The porch and porch steps need repair/replacement due to rotting materials. The Project proposes to enlarge the footprint of the porch to match the roofline of the porch ceiling, and to change the material of the steps from wood to brick.

A historic evaluation, prepared by Mark Parry, Artisan-Architecture, dated July 28, 2018, found that the Project generally conformed to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

6. Neighborhood Comments

No public comments have been received as of the date this report was written.

7. Public Improvements/On-Site Improvements

None required.

FISCAL IMPACT

Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The project has been found in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15301, the project is categorically exempt as it involves a minor alteration to an existing residential structure.

A historic evaluation, prepared by Mark Parry, Artisan-Architecture, dated July 28, 2018, concluded that the project generally conforms to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The analysis further concluded that the elements added are distinct from the historic property and easily reversible should subsequent restoration efforts be undertaken.

BOARD/COMMISSION/COMMITTEE REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On March 21, 2018, the Board reviewed the proposal as a concept item. The Board provided comments regarding the architectural style of the home; proposed materials, including railings, decking, roofing, dormer windows, etc.; the potential requirement of a rain gutter over the front porch; requested any historic photos if available; and requested the preservation of any existing historic materials. The Board was generally supportive of the project, but expressed concern about the size of the porch and the

NOTIFICATION

Pursuant to Zoning Code Chapter 20-66, all public noticing has been done including a public hearing sign on the project site, a Public Hearing Notice mailed to property owners within 400 feet of the site, and Public Hearing Notice published in the Press Democrat.

ISSUES

During the March 2018 concept review meeting, the Board raised concern about the proposed changes to the deck. In response to Board comments, the applicant reduced the size and modified the shape of the deck. The plans originally presented to the Board are attached this report for reference.

There are no unresolved issues.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Disclosure Form
- Attachment 2: Location Map
- Attachment 3: Neighborhood Context Map
- Attachment 4: Plans presented for Concept Review, prepared by DM Design, dated February 8, 2018
- Attachment 5: Project Plans (actual), stamped received on August 24, 2018
- Attachment 6: Historic Analysis, prepared by Mark Parry, Artisan-Architect, dated July 28, 2018
- Attachment 7: Cultural Heritage Board Resolution 209, dated March 15, 2006
- Attachment 8: State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, Historic Resources Inventory

Resolution: Landmark Alteration

CONTACT

Susie Murray, Senior Planner
smurray@srcity.org
707-543-4348