



ARCHIVES
ARCHITECTURE

ATTACHMENT 7
2021-7340
1029 Ranere Ct
Page 1 of 10

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS REVIEW

PROPOSED REHABILITATION AND ADDITION PROJECT

at a

HISTORIC RESIDENCE

1029 Ranere Ct.
(Parcel Number 201-03-041)
Sunnyvale, Santa Clara County, California

For:

Attn: Gary Kohlsaat
Kohlsaat & Associates Architecture
51 University Ave, Suite L
Los Gatos, CA 95030

Prepared by:

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

Leslie A. G. Dill, Partner and Historic Architect

June 15, 2021

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The currently proposed rehabilitation project for the main house addressed at 1209 Ranere Ct. in Sunnyvale can be found to be substantially compatible with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties – Rehabilitation Standards* (Standards). The project is also reviewed as compatible with the Standards when considering potential cumulative alterations of the property since the original listing and evaluation (see Cumulative Effect), and as analyzed for the preservation of Historic Integrity.

The following is a recommendation for the building permit phase of work, based on Standard 6:

General notes should be included in the Building Permit Plans that identify the historic significance of the property and indicate that all changes to the project plans must be reviewed, as well as identifying that the approach to deteriorated elements should be to preserve and repair, and to replace in-kind only if necessary.

INTRODUCTION

Report Intent

Archives & Architecture LLC was retained by the architect for the project applicant to conduct a Secretary of the Interior's Standards Review of the proposed alterations to the exterior of the historic two-story main house at 1029 Ranere Ct., Sunnyvale, California. Qualified professionals from Archives & Architecture were asked to review the site plan, plans, and exterior elevations of the project, as well as some details, to determine if the proposed design is compatible with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation for the Treatment of Historic Properties – Rehabilitation Standards* (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. The report is also intended to analyze the potential for cumulative negative effects based on previous alterations at the property, including a demolition of a non-character-defining 1966 ancillary building and lot split reviewed in the 2005 evaluation report by Archives & Architecture Heritage Resource Partners, as well as a detached garage addition built in 2008, also reviewed by Archives & Architecture Heritage Resource Partners.

Qualifications

Leslie A. G. Dill, Partner of Archives & Architecture LLC, has a Master of Architecture with a certificate in Historic Preservation from the University of Virginia and a Bachelor of Arts in Architecture from Princeton University. 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

At the end of May 2021, review services for the current project commenced with the forwarding of electronic plans dated 05/05/21, designed by architectural firm Gary Kohlsaat & Associates. An initial review was undertaken by Archives & Architecture, and some comments were sent to the architect with suggestions for minor revisions and clarifications. Revised plans were returned along with a response page. This revised drawing set consist of nine sheets (A-0 through A-8) and contains the same May date while the pdf was generated 06/03/21. The Standards review in this report is based on this revised plan set as of that date.

For this report, Leslie Dill referred to the *Historical and Architectural Evaluation*, and State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Form 523 (DPR523) written by Franklin Maggi,

Bonnie Montgomery, and herself as Archives & Architecture, Heritage Resource Partners, dated July 25, 2005; she referred to information from past site visits and augmented her work remotely via photographs from the architect, and consulted the May 7, 2008, *Secretary of the Interior's Standards Review: Proposed Addition Project at the Historic Caviglia Ranch House* by herself with Archives & Architecture for Mildred Citraro.

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 the consultant 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

Historical and Architectural Background

Per the 2005 evaluation:

The City of Sunnyvale first conducted a survey of cultural resources within the city in 1979, and later adopted a Cultural Resources Inventory that recognizes properties which have architectural or historic significance, and adopted a subset of Heritage Landmarks which are now protected by regulations in Chapter 19.96 of the City of Sunnyvale Municipal Code. Under the present Sunnyvale Municipal Code, the Cultural Resources Inventory is now called the Heritage Resources Inventory...

The property was listed on the City of Sunnyvale's Heritage Resource Inventory July 28, 1981. It was originally identified for associations with the patterns of agricultural development of the area during its period of horticultural significance (from the 1870s to early 1960s). When the property was evaluated in 2005, it was determined that the property no longer embodied strong associations with the horticultural past, but was described as significant "...based upon its distinctive architectural design, a distinguished example of Depression-era residential architecture..." and as an "...unadulterated representation of its original residential scale, style, and feeling, Spanish-eclectic design, materials, and workmanship."

The report concludes that: "The house would appear to qualify for both the National Register under Criterion C and California Register under Criterion (3) based upon its distinctive architectural design, a distinguished example of Depression-era residential architecture that was specifically adapted to a rural agricultural setting. Although the ranch no longer exists, the house as a distinct entity retains enough of its yard to retain its historic setting. The period of significance for the house is 1934, and the historic period of use is 1934 to 1964."

Character and Character-defining Features of the Existing Resource

The evaluation report describes the residence as: "The one- and two-story main house, raised above a high basement, is a representation of the Mediterranean-style from the 1930s. The style is evident in its asymmetrical, blocky massing, its mixture of roof forms and rooflines, its red tile roof and stucco walls, and its detailing that includes wrought iron grillwork and balconettes. Also typical of the style is its variety of fenestration, including arched windows and narrow accent windows as well as standard rectangular casements."

To review the design of the proposed rehabilitation and addition project, Archives & Architecture, LLC reviewed the character-defining features presented in the evaluation and DPR523 forms. The description:

The... house is representative of Spanish-eclectic-style residential architecture with features associated with Mediterranean Revival architecture from the 1930s. Typical features of the style include the house's blocky, asymmetrical massing, its hipped, red-barrel-tile roof, its heavily textured stucco walls, and its wrought-iron grills and balconettes. Characteristic of the period of construction, as well as in keeping with its style, is its variety of fenestration, including arched windows, narrow, grilled, accent windows, and more standard casements, all fabricated of steel...

...The arched front door is recessed into a pattern of archways; it features heavy boards, iron strapping, and a small lite protected by a decorative grill. The entry tower has narrow windows with wrought-iron grills; the main level includes a series of French doors with balconettes, as well as more standard steel casements with horizontal lites. The arched transoms in the center of the front façade have steel fanlights. The windows are recessed into the stucco with curved jambs and simple sills. The windows in the northern wing and along the rear façade are stacked vertically.

Character-defining features, therefore, include:

- blocky, asymmetrical massing,
- hipped, red-barrel-tile roof with shaped stucco soffits and shallow eaves
- heavily textured stucco walls
- wrought-iron grills and balconettes
- variety of fenestration, including arched windows, narrow, grilled, accent windows, and more standard casements
- windows fabricated of steel and horizontal lite patterns
- arched front door
- entry windows with wrought-iron grills
- French doors with balconettes
- arched transoms with steel fanlights
- curved jambs and simple sills

The recently built detached garage is not a character-defining feature or contributing feature of the property, and it is not proposed for alteration.

Summary of the Proposed Project Scope

The scope is described on the Cover Sheet as follows:

“Proposed interior remodel of an existing 2 story home with new Trellis, deck and minor exterior changes. Exterior modifications summary:

- 1) new deck with steps down at side yard
- 2) new wood trellis at side yard
- 3) new bay with windows at side of house
- 4) new steps down at entry
- 5) replace existing windows
- 6) modify existing patio doors at back of house
- 7) upgrade existing metal guardrail at back of house”

Included in the related, but slightly different scope Sheet A2 is:

- [8]) Modify exterior steps to basement

SECRETARY'S STANDARDS 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 single-family residential property.

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: The primary historic character, massing, and spatial relationships of the property are proposed for preservation in this project: the footprint and tripartite historical roof forms, the red tile roof, the shaped eaves and cornice detail, a substantial and representative quantity of character-defining window and door openings, all but one of the distinctive ironwork balconettes, the arched front door, as well as other historic elements of the composition are shown as preserved. The house will remain in its existing location facing the cul-de-sac, and the house will not be expanded so will preserve the remaining open space around it, either as the existing landscaped yards or as a new open deck and terraced area.

All the original steel windows are shown and noted in this project to be replaced in-kind. In the technical guidelines that accompany the Standards, it is generally not recommended to replace all windows; however, the drawings illustrate that the majority of the proposed replacement windows will be installed within the original openings with matching window-lite patterns and similar profile. The dimensions and materials are called out on Sheet A7, accompanied by photographs documenting the window frame and sash proportions, operating type, and materials. A small portion of the original window openings are proposed to be removed, relocated, or resized; see Standard 5 analysis.

Related property features identified on the DPR form include: ancillary structure at rear, rock grotto at terminus of driveway, large tree at front property line. Only the tree remains at this time, contributing to the visual setting of the house within the larger context of the City of Sunnyvale.

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: All proposed new elements are shown and noted to have subtle differentiation and would not create a false sense of historical development. (See Standards 2 and 9).

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

Analysis: No changes to the building(s) have yet been identified as having acquired historic significance in their own right, so this Standard is not used.

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

Analysis: The primary composition of original materials, features, and finishes that characterize the house is shown as preserved on the proposed drawings. There are some historic elements or materials proposed for removal or alteration. Most of these elements can reasonably be considered repetitive, not individually character-defining, and not primary/essential parts of the elevations of the house. The windows proposed for alteration do not represent a high proportion of the original, and the ratio of wall to window area remains similar. The removal or replacement of these elements, therefore, can be seen as substantially meeting the intent of this Standard in the overall context of the design. The following are the features and materials proposed for alteration or removal:

- Alter plain stucco wall segment on east (front) for stair addition at front porch landing
- Alter plain stucco wall segment on south side for deck addition
- Remove or alter windows:
 - Two south side windows removed and replaced by bay window
 - West rear upper level one resized and one removed and filled in
 - Two west rear lower-level windows removed and replaced by door (see below)
 - West courtyard facing north one resized and one removed and filled in
 - One west courtyard facing south resized
- Replace or alter doors:
 - One south-side door and balconette replaced by wide doorway (see below)
 - Two west rear lower level doors (and adjacent windows, see above) removed and replaced by wide doors
- Replace and alter guardrail at stairs to upper level
- Replace existing basement access with new stairs and handrail

One of the tall focal windows and its balconette are proposed to be removed at the south side, to accommodate the deck. Although the tall focal windows are clearly considered a character-defining feature, they are also a repetitive element, and this one is located by itself on a relatively modest elevation. Its removal, therefore, can be understood as meeting the intent of this Standard in the overall context of the design, as the other doors with balconettes, on the front and rear elevations, continue to exemplify this distinctive design feature.

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 current physical condition of the house appears, from recent photographs, to be very good to excellent. The proposed rehabilitation project is primarily focused on alterations to the interior plan and resulting changes to the exterior elevations, not on repair of deteriorating materials or elements; therefore, most of the historic features are shown as substantially preserved in the project drawings.

It is always recommended that general notes be added to the building permit drawing set, which would specify that deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced, and, if replacement is necessary, the replacement feature shall match in design,

color, texture, and, where possible, materials. To this same end, it is also recommended that general notes be included in the building permit documents that identify the historic significance of the property and indicate that all changes to the project plans must be reviewed.

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 chemical or physical treatments are shown as proposed in this project, or expected, other than preparation for painting. It is recommended that all potential construction techniques that will affect historic materials be identified prior to the building permit submittal phase.

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:

Scope Item 1 – The proposed new deck requires the removal and replacement of one original raised door and balconette (see Standard 5 analysis). The proposed deck is compatible with the historic house for its matching stucco finish and simple rectilinear form. It will be primarily differentiated by its offset plan (it projects to the rear slightly and is set in from the front façade plane) and by the proposed trellis (see Scope Item 2, below).

The handrails at the deck stairs are shown as open rails atop stepped stair walls, and the stairs are noted to have tile risers and treads. These details are repeated from the proposed new front porch entrance, using a consistent vocabulary for these relatively prominent new elements (see Scope Item 4, below).

Proposed at the west side of the deck is a set of three decorative iron pieces that echo the front tower window bars. They are used in a new and distinctive way (potentially as trellises for vines). The design is compatible, and the use (not covering windows) is differentiated.

Scope Item 2 – The south-side trellis is proposed to be wood, compatible as a traditional building material and designed in a traditional configuration and with shaped detailing that is similar to many of the stucco curves of the original house. It is differentiated because of the materials; wood is used only sparingly in the original residential design where the focus is on stucco, red tile, and wrought iron. It will be also differentiated because of its design association with the proposed new offset deck footprint.

Scope Item 3 – The removal and alteration of the two south-side window openings for the installation of an angled bay window is substantially in keeping with the Standards as noted in Standard 5. The windows being replaced are reasonably repetitive features and not individually character-defining. The bay window form might have been problematic per Standard 3 for introducing a “borrowed” traditional form to create a false sense of history; however, the proposed element is compatible and differentiated adequately to be recognizable as a new element. It is compatible with its integrated roof and stucco wall

finish. It is differentiated by its square focal window shape and slightly elongated horizontal windowpanes (in the same architectural “vocabulary” as other replacement doors, see below). It is further differentiated by its recessed wall panels, a detail not used elsewhere on the house (although stucco shaping is part of the original design).

Scope Item 4 – The location of the new set of front entry steps and their proposed design appear to be substantially consistent with Standard 9. The stairs are similar to the original front entry stairs (that will remain), with each staircase having a stepped stucco wall. They are proposed to be differentiated by their low iron handrails and through the installation of decorative tile risers and treads. The handrails and tile step design are consistent with the proposed new deck stairs as noted above in Scope Item 1.

Scope Item 5 –A consistent “vocabulary” of sash and lite patterns is illustrated for the altered and proposed new window and door units, to differentiate the new windows in new openings from the replacement windows in their original openings. Modern manufacturing will also provide differentiation. These windows include:

- Three windows in the proposed new bay window
- Three wide replacement doors
- Two proposed windows at the upper-level west rear
- Three windows that face the west courtyard

Scope Item 6 – The alteration of the openings for the installation of three larger French doors (two at the west/rear downstairs and at the south upper-level side at deck) are in keeping with the Standards. The smaller windows and smaller doorways being replaced at the rear lower level are reasonably repetitive features and not individually character-defining per Standard 5 analysis. The double-wide doors are differentiated from the paired individual doors of the historic balcony areas by their overall size and because their subtly elongated lites interpret the horizontal 1930s window patterns in a new way. (See also Scope Item 3)

Scope Item 7 – The replacement guardrail at the rear steps (connecting grade to the upper level) is proposed to be compatible with the original historic balconettes by using a similar vertical baluster spacing, but the feature is proposed to be differentiated and subordinate to these significant elements by being simplified ironwork, omitting the scrollwork.

Scope Item [8] – The proposed alterations to the basement entrance reflects changes in the use of the house over time. The existence and use of the basement during the horticultural era for storage is supported by historical convention and by documentation of similar properties rather than by written or photographic documentation of this particular property feature. The replacement of the existing feature with new steps is compatible with the significance of the house as an example of 1930s architecture. The new basement stair is compatible with the house for its simplified and utilitarian curb form and materials; it is differentiated by its new handrail that matches the new handrail at the adjacent upper staircase.

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. Some reconstruction of the exterior stucco wall would be required, and a few windows would need to be reinstalled, along with one balconette. The remaining significant character-defining features of the exterior of the house would remain substantially unimpaired in this project.

Cumulative Effect

When a listed property has undergone a series of rehabilitation, alteration, and/or addition projects, it is important to identify and analyze the whole of these changes as a part of the current project design review.

In 2005, the property was larger (although much smaller than the original horticultural property acreage). The lot at that time was subdivided into two parcels, and a new house was built on the separate property to the rear of the existing house (facing a parallel street). Around 2008 a two-car detached garage was added at the street frontage of the property, to the south side and in front of the main house. Each of these alterations was reviewed at the time as meeting the Standards.

These projects did not alter the house directly, so did not impact the significant architectural design or character-defining features, but both changes did alter the setting. Integrity analysis provides the framework for an understanding of the changes in setting, and it will provide a summary evaluation of the project's potential impacts on the historic resource.

HISTORIC INTEGRITY ANALYSIS

Historic integrity analysis is useful as a summary component of the design review process. It relates to the criteria for National Register and California Register eligibility. A project that might impact the integrity of a historic resource could impact the significance of that resource. According to the California Office of Historic Preservation Technical Assistance Series #6:

*Integrity is the **authenticity** of a historical resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance. Historical resources eligible for listing in the California Register must meet one of the criteria of significance described above and retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance. Historical resources that have been rehabilitated or restored may be evaluated for listing. Integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of **location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association**. It must also be judged with reference to the particular criteria under which a resource is proposed for eligibility. Alterations over time to a resource or historic changes in its use may themselves have historical, cultural, or architectural significance. [Emphasis added]*

The following analysis is intended to address how the proposed residential rehabilitation and addition project might potentially preserve or impact the historic integrity of the subject property. The analysis utilizes the seven aspects of historic integrity indicated by the National Register and State of California's definition of authenticity of a resource.

Location: The project does not propose a relocation or alteration to the position of the house. The location of the contributing historic resource has been and would be preserved.

Setting: Along with the cumulative changes in the setting of the house since the listing of the property, the current project preserves a basic compatible setting for the historic house design to be viewed and understood. The property was listed after the subdivision and development of its surrounding horticultural lands, and the house is considered significant for its architectural design, so the important aspect of the setting is to provide an adequate immediate setting for the historic architectural design. The dimensions of the parcel will not be changed with this project, and the footprint of the living space is not proposed for addition. The rear and side yards are not overly generous, but there is space to view and understand the house. The front yard is large and includes a large mature tree that provides visual "weight" to the historic setting (although part of a late-twentieth-century landscape design, not directly related to the 1930s significance).

Design: The project would preserve the historic integrity of the design of the house at 1209 Ranere Ct, as analyzed in the Standards review, above. The proposed design would preserve the footprint, the stucco finish, the massing forms, the roofline and roofing materials, the eaves, the front door, the balconettes, and stairs. The replacement windows, the altered doors, the altered front steps, the added deck and side stairs, the altered basement steps, and the added bay window are compatible yet differentiated from the historic design. The house would remain a “...distinguished example of Depression-era residential architecture...” and a mostly “...unadulterated representation of its original residential scale, style, and feeling, Spanish-eclectic design, materials, and workmanship.”

Materials: The project shows the preservation of most of the character-defining house materials, including the tile roof, the stucco walls and relief work, and the decorative ironwork. The window materials would be replaced in kind. The materials would retain substantial integrity.

Workmanship: The historic integrity of workmanship, including the ironwork, heavily textured stucco, and the front door, among other elements, would be preserved.

Feeling: The main house would continue to convey a feeling of historic 1930s residential architecture. Its age and significance would continue to be apparent.

Association: The significant association of the property, as a distinguished example of Depression-era residential architecture from 1934, will continue to be conveyed by the proposed overall architectural forms and detailing after the proposed project is completed.

The property, as a whole, reflects changes in the use of the property over the last century, from ranch or farmhouse to a solely residential property. With this rehabilitation project, the proposed design of the house can be found to continue to convey its authentic 1930s architectural style, methods and materials of construction, feelings, and associations.

CONCLUSION

The proposed project can be found substantially compatible with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties – Rehabilitation Standards*. A project that meets the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* can be found to be mitigated to a less than significant impact under the California Environmental Quality Act.

The proposed project can also be found to preserve the Historic Integrity of the significance of the property.

The review includes one “boilerplate” recommendation (from Standard 6 analysis) that can be incorporated into the design during the City’s planning and building approval process.