



ARCHIVES
&
ARCHITECTURE

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS REVIEW

PROPOSED REHABILITATION, BASEMENT ALTERATION, AND REAR ADDITION PROJECT

at the

HISTORIC HARRIET B. ROBERTS HOUSE

Mazareeb Residence

1393 Santa Clara Street
(Parcel Number 269-26-112)
Santa Clara, Santa Clara County, California

For:

Seif & Lauren Mazareeb
1393 Santa Clara Street
Santa Clara, CA 95050

Prepared by:

ARCHIVES & ARCHITECTURE LLC
PO Box 1332
San Jose, CA 95109
408.369.5683
www.archivesandarchitecture.com

Leslie A. G. Dill, Partner and Historic Architect

October 15, 2019

INTRODUCTION

Executive Summary

This proposed residential addition project meets the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties – Rehabilitation Standards* (Standards), so the project can be found to be mitigated to a less-than-significant impact under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and in conformance with the intent of the proposed Mills Act contract. The analysis is described more fully in the report that follows.

Report Intent

Archives & Architecture LLC was retained by Seif and Lauren Mazareeb to conduct a Secretary of the Interior's Standards Review of the proposed rehabilitation and alteration of the basement, alteration and expansion of the right (east) elevation, and rehabilitation of the interior of the residence at 1393 Santa Clara St., Santa Clara, California. Archives & Architecture was asked to review the exterior elevations, plans, and site plan of the project to determine if the proposed design is compatible with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* (Standards). The Standards are understood to be a common set of guidelines for the review of historic buildings and are used by many communities during the environmental review process to determine the potential impact of a project on an identified resource.

Qualifications

Leslie A. G. Dill, Partner of the firm Archives & Architecture, has a Master of Architecture with a certificate in Historic Preservation from the University of Virginia. She is licensed in California as an architect. Ms. Dill is listed with the California Office of Historic Preservation as meeting the requirements to perform identification, evaluation, registration, and treatment activities within the professions of Historic Architect and Architectural Historian in compliance with state and federal environmental laws. The state utilizes the criteria of the National Park Service as outlined in 36 CFR Part 61.

Review Methodology

For this report, Leslie Dill referred to the State of California Department of Parks & Recreation Form 523 (DPR523) that documents the residence. The DPR523 form was written by Lorie Garcia of Beyond Buildings and is dated June 25, 2018. The proposed plans were prepared by Robert Mayer, Architect. For this report, Archives and Architecture evaluated, according to the Standards, a set of twelve sheets (Sheets A-1, A-2, A-2.1 through A-2.4, A-3, A-3.1 & 3.2, A-4, A-5, and HP-1). Information on two sheets was discussed via email during the review process, and the final updated design sheets were reviewed, dated 09/16/19.

Disclaimers

This report addresses the project plans in terms of historically compatible design of the exterior of the residence and its setting. The consultant has not undertaken and will not undertake an evaluation or report on the structural conditions or other related safety hazards that might or might not exist at the site and building, and will not review the proposed project for structural soundness or other safety concerns. The Consultant has not undertaken analysis of the site to evaluate the potential for subsurface resources.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Historic Context

The DPR523 form evaluated the property for significance under the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places, of the California Register of Historical Resources, and of the City of Santa Clara as a Qualified Historic Resource. Per the Historic Evaluation in the DPR forms:

...As a fine example of the Shingle architectural style that was constructed circa 1904, under National Register Criterion C the residence at 1393 Santa Clara Street does “embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction” and “represent[s] a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction” and does contribute to a potentially eligible Historic District. Therefore, it does appear that the building may be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C.

...Criterion 3 [of the California Register of Historical Resources] addresses the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction. Characterized by the use of simple lines, broad gables, gentle curves, and rustic materials in reaction against the excessive decoration of the Queen Anne style, the Shingle style was a transitional style for domestic building from 1880-1910. Constructed circa 1904, the subject building is a fine example of the Shingle architectural style. The property remains as designed with only a minimal modification at the rear, and the integrity of the residence is intact. Thus, it appears to reach the level of significance necessary to be eligible individually for the California Register under Criterion 3.

Prominently located on a corner lot, this building was among the first constructed on its block’s newly developed residential lots. While it is not associated with a historical event or important individual or group, it does have a direct association with the broad patterns of Santa Clara history. It has interest, integrity, and character and reflects the type of substantial homes built in Santa Clara in the last part of the 19th Century and first part of the 20th Century for owners who were people of means with a solid center and traditional values. [Criterion 1 for Historically or Cultural Significance in the City of Santa Clara Criteria for Local Significance]

In the evaluation, the property is found to meet Criteria 1, 3, 5, and 7 of the City of Santa Clara Criteria for Architectural Significance, for its characterization of an architectural style, unusual within the City, has visual symbolic meaning or appeal for the community, and notable or special attributes of an aesthetic or functional nature.

The evaluation in the DPR form also identifies the property as meeting Criteria 1 and 2 for Geographic Significance as a contributing building in the “Old Quad” neighborhood and for its “continuity and compatibility with adjacent buildings and/or visual contribution to a group of similar buildings.”

Character of the Existing Resource

For the review in this report, a summary of the character-defining features from the DPR523 form was developed. The list used in this report is as follows:

- *asymmetrical, compact plan with rectangular footprint*
- *prominent gambrel roof with gabled-hip dormers*
- *shallow rake eaves with shingle frieze band*
- *hipped-roof belly band with flat soffit at south façade*

- *projecting second-floor gable on north elevation*
- *massive cobblestone support column at recessed front porch*
- *low, cobblestone-clad foundation (note: concealed foundation is brick)*
- *cobblestone curved perimeter wall at the porch*
- *original front door with high accent window with beveled diamond panes ("XX"), over a large flat panel; operable wood shutters flanking door*
- *shallow, semi-recessed angled bay window facing south, featuring cobblestone base raised to sill height, featuring three individually placed multi-lite/1 windows with "XX" muntins.*
- *multi-pane top sash, in the same "XX" pattern, over single-lite sash windows in pairs and individually at the first floor, and paired accent windows with the same multi-lite pattern facing west and south*
- *arched saw-tooth-shingle header trim over second-story windows, with lozenge upper sash at the second floor facing south and west*
- *arched saw-tooth-shingle header trim over attic vents*
- *the 1/1 double-hung windows that face north and east are part of the overall composition, but are not individually character-defining features*
- *square-cut shingle siding with no corner trim*
- *plain window and door surround trim*

The brick chimney is noted in the DPR form; however, it was not specifically identified as a contributing character-defining feature. For the purposes of this review, Archives & Architecture does not include the chimney as a significant feature. Its plain brick material, low visibility due to its central location and short stature, its plain cap style, and minimal workmanship do not, for example, match the significance of the cobblestone foundation, or provide design interest in a way that would make it a character-defining feature.

Alterations noted in the DPR523 form include the enclosed rear porch and "...The rear [sic] of the property has been altered with the 1980s demolition of the original detached garage and subsequent construction of a new detached garage with office space and driveway relocation. However, the home is in excellent condition and, with the exception of the circa 1970 addition of a contemporary raised rear deck and subsequent alteration of the rear [sic] entry steps, appears to have had minimal to no external alteration since its construction circa 1904."

Summary of the Proposed Project

The proposed scope of work includes:

- Enlargement of the existing partial basement into a full basement with the addition of a secondary unit; addition of new windows and door; addition of light wells, guardrails, and stair access to basement on north side of house.
- Rehabilitation of existing foundations for structural stability and to accommodate the basement retaining walls; this includes removal and reinstallation of character-defining exterior stone.
- Alteration and expansion of non-original rear addition (enclosed former porch) to include new living space and including a new recessed porch; addition of new door and windows.
- Expansion of existing historic right-side dormer to increase second-story living space; relocation of one paired original window unit from a demolished wall to the replacement wall; addition of a new window on the north and south side of the dormer.
- Relocation of one original window on the north wall to accommodate interior room changes.

- Removal and storage of one “vintage” window from the north elevation (from its original location).
- Removal and storage of one “vintage window from the east elevation (previously relocated).
- Removal of chimney.

SECRETARY’S STANDARD’S REVIEW:

The *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* (Standards), originally published in 1977 and revised in 1990, include ten standards that present a recommended approach to repair, while preserving those portions or features that convey a resource’s historical, cultural, or architectural values. Accordingly, Standards states that, “Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.” Following is a summary of the review with a list of the Standards and associated analysis for this project:

1. “A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.”

Analysis: There is no effective change of use proposed for this residential property, although there is some intensification of use with the inclusion of a secondary unit within the building.

As a rule of thumb, a project that meets the subsequent nine Standards can be considered to meet this Standard as well. A proposed project that preserves significant historic fabric, provides a compatible new design, and is potentially reversible in the future can be considered to have a compatible use. In this case, the basement alteration requires minimal change to the historic fabric and does meet the remaining Standards, so the intensification of use can be considered compatible as well. The project meets this Standard.

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

Analysis: No historic massing or primary materials are proposed for removal; the forms and footprint of the historic property will be substantially preserved. The proposed new east-side addition maintains the spatial relationship of the house to its setting. Although there was historically a porch on the east side of the house, this had previously been altered, so there is no loss of historic materials how the addition is designed. The currently proposed project reintroduces a recessed porch to the house design, compatible yet differentiated as noted in the Standard 9 analysis.

The chimney is proposed for removal, but the consultants for this report do not identify it as a character-defining feature (See also Standards 5 and 9).

The removal of the non-historic east-side deck could be considered an improvement to the property with regard to the historic spatial composition of the former porch location, existing house footprint and form, and the immediate landscaped setting of the house.

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 architectural elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.”**

Analysis: There are no proposed changes are that might be mistaken for original features. The addition will have a roof form and foundation cladding that indicate the original footprint of the house, and the new addition will include windows that will be adequately differentiated (See also Standard 9).

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

Analysis: It is understood that no elements of the property affected by the project have acquired historic significance in their own right. The project is compatible with this Standard.

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

Analysis: Distinctive features and finishes that identify the property are shown as preserved on the proposed drawings. From the list of character-defining features, the preserved elements include the following:

- *asymmetrical, compact plan with rectangular footprint*
- *shallow rake eaves with shingle frieze band*
- *hipped-roof belly band with flat soffit at south façade*
- *projecting second-floor gable on north elevation*
- *massive cobblestone support column at recessed front porch*
- *cobblestone curved perimeter wall at the porch*
- *original front door with high accent window with beveled diamond panes (“XX”), over a large flat panel; operable wood shutters flanking door*
- *shallow, semi-recessed angled bay window facing south, featuring cobblestone base raised to sill height, featuring three individually placed multi-lite/1 windows with “XX” muntins.*
- *multi-pane top sash, in the same “XX” pattern, over single-lite sash windows in pairs and individually at the first floor, and paired accent windows with the same multi-lite pattern facing west and south*
- *arched saw-tooth-shingle header trim over second-story windows, with lozenge upper sash at the second floor facing south and west*
- *arched saw-tooth-shingle header trim over attic vents*
- *square-cut shingle siding with no corner trim*
- *plain window and door surround trim*

The following character-defining features will be substantially preserved or partially preserved in keeping with the entire composition and building design significance. These altered or removed features include the following:

- *prominent gambrel roof with gabled-hip dormers*—One gabled hip is preserved as-is, and the other is partially preserved. It is expanded and altered into a larger gabled-hip roof per the analysis in Standard 9

- *low, cobblestone-clad foundation*-Cobblestone cladding is proposed to be removed and replaced after structural stabilization of the foundation
- *the 1/1 double-hung windows that face north and east provide consistency for the overall composition of the historic design, but these windows are not individual character-defining features*-Two of these 1/1 window units are proposed to be relocated; this is reviewed in Standard 9. Two windows are proposed to be removed and stored. These two windows are not identifiable as “distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship” individually. They are part of the overall composition. The overall composition that is proposed to remain after their removal will continue to be compatible with the historic proportions, materials, and other design forms, elements, and spatial characteristics of the house.

The chimney is proposed for removal, but the consultants for this report do not identify it as a character-defining feature (See also the introduction and Standards 2 and 9).

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.”**

Analysis: The historic foundation is proposed to be replaced and/or repaired in this project. The concealed elements will be replaced with new concrete foundations that will seismically stabilize the historic house. The exterior stone will be removed and replaced to match. Photographic documentation of the stonework is included in the drawing set.

The house appears from observation and from the drawing set to be in reasonably good condition. Some deck boards are identified for replacement-in-kind. No other historic features are shown as requiring extensive repair. The project is in keeping with this Standard.

7. **“Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.”**

Analysis: No substantial chemical or physical treatments at the historic fabric of the property are shown as proposed in this project other than preparation for painting. The project is compatible with this Standard.

8. **“Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.”**

Analysis: Archeological resources are not evaluated in 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 shall 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.”**

Analysis: The proposed additions and alterations are compatible with the historic character of the house and will be differentiated by their detailing and forms.

The proposed right-side (east) addition and alterations are compatible in size, form, and materials, and differentiated in plan and massing. The footprint is set back from the south (Santa Clara Street) elevation, and the north wall opens into a recessed porch at the northeast corner of the house, allowing the historic main house to remain “readable” and predominant in the composition. In particular, the set-back addition allows the shallow bay window on the front (south) façade to remain prominent. The proposed recessed side/rear porch is in keeping with the main front porch that is also asymmetrical and recessed; however, the proposed new porch has wood guardrail elements and trim that would be differentiated from the historic stonework of the original front porch. The addition is stepped in form, reducing the visible massing and preserving the overall balance of the historic massing of the house. The proposed second-story roof design preserves the original gable end; the dormer will be differentiated from the historic house roof and original dormers by having a larger proportion of hip-to-gable but compatible in its gabled-hip form. Although the siding at the addition is proposed to match the historic siding, the pony wall will not be clad in stone, providing visual cues to the understanding of the addition, along with the roofline forms. The proposed new window/wall proportions are similar to the historic house. The new windows are of a similar size, shape, and operation to the historic windows. The proposed new units are simplified in their muntin design; the historic windows include diamond-shaped multi-lite upper sash, and the new windows will feature 1/1 units. The windows will also be differentiated by their modern manufacturing materials and operation. The proposed window and door trim is very similar to the original house trim, but subtly differentiated in size per the drawing notes.

The proposed rear (north) alterations that provide access, egress, light, and air to the proposed basement dwelling unit are also compatible and differentiated from the historic house. The placement of the access on the north elevation, a narrower setback with less street frontage, makes the changes inconspicuous. The new windows, as for the right-side addition, are proposed to be a similar size, shape, and operation to the historic windows, but differentiated by their simplified muntin design. The guardrails at the light wells are shown to have heavier outer posts and a slender baluster design; this is traditional in form and breaks up what might otherwise be a modern visual repetitiveness of the metal railing. The metal railing material is differentiated from the stone front porch wall and from the wood rear porch railing, and its proportions are compatible with the historic design.

The proposed relocation and removal of four windows appears compatible with the guidelines for this Standard. The relocation of the windows will be within the same elevations; the relocated second-story east windows will remain symmetrically placed, and in a wall that is identified as new by its roof form. The relocated window in the north wall retains a rhythm of wall-to-window in a wall where the windows were relatively large wall segments between them. The removal of two windows is reviewed in Standards 5.

The removal of the chimney is reviewed in the introduction to this report, as well reviewed using Standards 2 and 5.

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 and its environment would be unimpaired.”**

Analysis: The proposed design would preserve the essential form and integrity of the historic property. The critical character-defining features of the main house would be unimpaired in this project, and the proposed east-side wing and basement alterations could be removed in the future without impact to the significance of the property.

CONCLUSION

The proposed rehabilitation project meets the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.

The historic resource would retain its integrity of historic location at the corner of Madison and Santa Clara Street, its integrity of historic setting in the Old Quad neighborhood and with compatible landscaping setbacks, its integrity of historic materials, , and design, and the house would retain the feeling of an early-nineteenth-century Shingle-style single-family residence, and would preserve the associations of the house with the design of the Old Quad neighborhood, and associations with the original architectural design. It would lose some historic integrity of artisanship where the stone is required to be removed and reinstalled; however, the structural condition warrants an approach that will preserve the materials and replicate the original installation work. The impacts would be mitigated to a “less than significant” level, and the project can be found in conformance with the intent of the proposed Mills Act contract for the exterior of the historic residence.