



Staff Report and Recommendations Agenda of June 24, 2024, Item 6a

County of Ventura • Resource Management Agency

800 S. Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009-1740 • (805) 654-2478 • www.vcrma.org/divisions/planning

I. APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER:

Applicant: Michael Sanchez
1130 Osa Court
Oxnard, CA 93035

Property Owner: Anthony and Edna Salas
152 S G Street
Oxnard, CA 93030

II. REQUEST:

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Cultural Heritage Board (CHB) (Ventura County Cultural Heritage Ordinance Section 1371) for a two-story addition of 1,120 square feet to an existing one-story, single-family residence located at 152 G Street, Oxnard, CA 93030 (Henry T. Oxnard Historic District and Landmark Area #161) (Case No. CH24-0025).

III. LOCATION AND PARCEL INFORMATION:

152 S G Street, Oxnard, CA 93030
Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): 202-0-030-210
Historic Designation: Henry T. Oxnard Historic District and Landmark Area
Common/Historic Name: Albert E. Liddle House

The property consists of 0.16 acres within the Henry T. Oxnard Historic District and currently contains an existing 1,328-square-foot residence, a 173-square-foot detached accessory shed, and a 480-square-foot detached accessory garage.

IV. PROJECT SCOPE:

The proposed project involves the construction of a two-story, 1,120-square-foot addition to the existing residence and construction of a 218-square-foot covered, attached porch at its rear. The views of the main residence from the public right of way are proposed to change substantially with the addition and increase of the overall height of the residence to approximately 25 feet. The proposed design reflects some aspects of the existing residence's American Colonial Revival architectural style and matches some materials such as the asphalt shingle roof and lap siding exterior. Proposed windows consist of wood-clad windows to match existing on the primary elevation, with fiberglass clad windows proposed elsewhere. In addition, a metal railing is proposed to be installed at the front porch. Refer to Exhibit 1 for full project

details and specifications. Figures 1 and 2 show the residence's existing and proposed primary elevations, respectively.

Figure 1 – Street View of Existing Property, 2023



Credit: Google Maps, 2023

Figure 2 – Proposed Profile



Credit: Sanchez Planning & Design

V. PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:

The subject property was documented in the *1981 Oxnard - Santa Paula Historic Resources Survey (Phase I Part II)* (“historic survey”) prepared by Ms. Judith P. Triem. The residence was described as a single-story American Colonial Revival bungalow built around 1924 for Albert E. Liddle, a jeweler. The residence has narrow clapboard siding and is symmetrically balanced with a porticoed gable entrance. It is similar in style to the residence next door at 142 South G Street, but has a pergola on its north side and a large Deodar cedar tree in the front yard. Windows on the residence’s primary elevation are wood clad. Various later additions have been made to the rear of the residence.

According to the historic survey, within the Henry T. Oxnard Historic District, G Street features “wide tree-lined streets, raised lawns and low walls, and alleys with rear parking. Lots are mostly 50 feet by 140 feet and some have additional dwellings in the rear. Houses maintain even setbacks and are well landscaped with many mature trees including palms, pines, cedars and other varieties.” The majority of houses maintain their original style with relatively few alterations.

VI. CULTURAL HERITAGE ORDINANCE ANALYSIS:

The Ventura County Cultural Heritage Ordinance (Ordinance) Section 1371 requires that the Cultural Heritage Board issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for an application to construct, change, alter, modify, remodel, remove, or significantly affect a County Landmark.

CHB staff determined that the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* (Secretary’s Standards)¹ may be helpful to the CHB in conducting its analysis of the subject property. Additionally, the National Park Service’s *Preservation Brief 14: New Exterior Additions to Historic Building: Preservation Concerns*² may be of use during the CHB’s review. CHB staff determined the standards for rehabilitation are appropriate for this request and evaluated the proposed scope of work against the relevant standards below.

Standards	Staff Comments
#1 A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its	The subject property will continue to be used for residential purposes and the main residence will continue to be used as a residence.

¹ National Park Service, *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, <https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards.htm>.

² National Park Service, *Preservation Brief 14: New Exterior Additions to Historic Building: Preservation Concerns*, August 2010, <https://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs/14-exterior-additions.htm>.

Standards	Staff Comments
distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.	Staff determined this Standard has been met.
<p>#2 The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.</p>	<p>The Secretary’s Standards³ encourage the retention of historic features that contribute to the interpretation of the significance of a historic property and, when appropriate, repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts rather than full replacement.</p> <p>The main residence would retain a majority of its character-defining features. The addition is proposed to be located behind and above the existing residence and its primary façade (with exception of the roofline) is not proposed to be modified. A substantial portion of the existing residence is proposed to be removed to accommodate the addition. The proposed addition would substantially reduce the ability of the residence to convey its identity as a modest American Colonial Revival bungalow.</p> <p>Staff determined this Standard has not been met.</p>
<p>#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 elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.</p>	<p>Conjectural design features are not proposed to be added to the historic property (i.e. changes that are intended to make the new construction look more historic than it actually is).</p> <p>The proposed addition would continue the existing siding and roofing materials used on the main residence and utilize wood-clad windows on the primary elevation. Based on this, the proposed addition would be similar in character to the house but will be differentiated using contemporary building materials.</p> <p>Staff determined this Standard has been met.</p>
<p>#4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.</p>	<p>There do not appear to have been changes to the property that have gained significance in their own right.</p> <p>Staff determined this Standard has been met.</p>

³ Weeks, Kay D., *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties: with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring & Reconstructing Historic Buildings*, U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, revised 2017, pg. 140.

Standards	Staff Comments
<p>#5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.</p>	<p>The main residence would retain many of its character-defining features. The addition is proposed to be located behind and above the existing residence and the primary façade (with exception of the roofline) is not proposed to be modified.</p> <p>Staff determined this Standard has been met.</p>
<p>#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.</p>	<p>Staff determined this Standard is not applicable to the proposed scope of work.</p>
<p>#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.</p>	<p>No such treatments are currently proposed. Therefore, Staff determined this Standard is not applicable to the proposed scope of work.</p>
<p>#8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.</p>	<p>Staff determined this Standard is not applicable to the proposed scope of work.</p>
<p>#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.</p>	<p>A new addition is most appropriately located where its visibility from the primary views of the historic building is minimized.⁴ This is often a rear or obscure elevation. Inherent in all of the guidance is the concept that an addition needs to be subordinate to the historic building. The size, scale, and massing of a new addition all pertain to the addition’s overall volume and three-dimensional qualities.⁵ Taken together, size, scale and massing are critical elements for ensuring that a new addition is subordinate to the historic building, thus</p>

⁴ National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, “New Additions to Historic Buildings,” <https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/applying-rehabilitation/successful-rehab/additions.htm>.

⁵ Ibid.

Standards	Staff Comments
	<p>preserving the historic character of a historic property.⁶</p> <p>The existing main residence is an American Colonial Revival bungalow of approximately 15 feet in height. The proposed addition would substantially increase the amount of habitable square footage and increase the maximum height of the structure to approximately 25 feet. Based on this, the views of the main residence from the public right of way are proposed to change substantially. It should be noted that a few residences in the vicinity of the subject property presently contain two-story, rear additions.</p> <p>The exterior of the addition would be in keeping with the architectural style of the main residence. However, the design of the proposed addition would follow and enlarge the existing massing of the residence, and enlarge and extend the northern and southern wall planes, risking unification of the two volumes into a single architectural whole. Moreover, the existing residence would be substantially insubordinate to the proposed addition.</p> <p>In some cases, separating the addition from the historic building with a simple, small-scale architectural hyphen⁷ or connector can reduce the visual impact of large addition to a historic building.⁸ Another way of minimizing the impact of a new addition to an historic building is to offset it or step it back from the mass of the historic building. It is important that the new structure is clearly differentiated and distinguishable as a new addition so that the identity of the historic structure is not lost altogether in a new and larger composition.⁹ The historic building must be clearly identifiable and its physical integrity must not be compromised by the new addition.</p>

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ A hyphen is defined as the connecting link between a main building and an outlying wing. (*Dictionary of Architecture*).

⁸ National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, “New Additions to Historic Buildings,” <https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/applying-rehabilitation/successful-rehab/additions.htm>.

⁹ Ibid.

Standards	Staff Comments
	Based on these considerations, the proposed addition appears inconsistent with this Standard.
<p>#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.</p>	<p>The design of the proposed addition extends the wall plane of the existing building and risks unification of the two volumes into a single architectural whole. Such a design may preclude the ability to remove the addition in the future while maintaining the essential form of the residence as the identity of the historic structure may be lost in a new and larger composition.</p> <p>Based on these considerations, the proposed addition appears inconsistent with this Standard.</p>

VII. STAFF CONCLUSION:

Based on the above considerations, the proposed scope of work appears partially inconsistent with the Secretary’s Standards. Following implementation of the project, the residence would retain distinctive features of its American Colonial Revival bungalow style. However, of notable exception, the proposed addition risks unification of the two volumes into a single architectural whole. Moreover, the main residence would be substantially in subordinate to the proposed addition.

In some cases, separating the addition from the historic building with a simple, small-scale architectural hyphen or connector can reduce the visual impact of large addition to a historic building. Another way of minimizing the impact of a new addition to an historic building is to offset it or step it back from the mass of the historic building. It is important that the new structure is clearly differentiated and distinguishable as a new addition so that the identity of the historic structure is not lost altogether in a new and larger composition. The historic building must be clearly identifiable, and its physical integrity must not be compromised by the new addition.

Based on the above, staff recommends the CHB adopt the following recommendation related to the scope of work in order to better conform to the Secretary’s Standards:

- **Recommendation #1: Rear Addition.** The proposed design should separate the addition from the historic building by offsetting the addition or stepping it back from the mass of the historic building, or minimizing visual impacts through other similar means. With implementation of this recommendation, the addition should be clearly differentiated and distinguishable as a new addition

so that the identity of the historic structure is not lost altogether in a new and larger composition.

VIII. OPPORTUNITY TO SHOW HARDSHIP:

At the CHB public hearing on this matter, if desired, the property owner is provided the opportunity to present facts and evidence demonstrating a failure to grant the requested Certificate of Appropriateness would cause an economic hardship as provided by Ordinance §1371.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

No public comment regarding this item has been received to date.

X. RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

Pursuant to Ordinance Section 1371, the CHB may identify project modifications for the applicant's review and consideration. Staff is recommending the CHB take the following actions regarding the request:

1. **CONDUCT** public hearing, **RECEIVE** oral and written testimony, and **CONSIDER** the Planning Division staff report and all exhibits and attachments hereto;
2. **FIND** that the proposed project, with any project modifications determined necessary, meets the requirements of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*;
3. **FIND** that the proposed project will not reduce the integrity of the site, in accordance with Ventura County Cultural Heritage Ordinance Section 1371-4(b);
4. Based on the preceding evidence and analysis, **APPROVE** the Certificate of Appropriateness (Ordinance Section 1371) with any project modifications determined necessary to conform to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* and Ordinance Section 1371-4(b).

Prepared by:



Dillan Murray, Associate Planner
Ventura County Planning Division
(805) 654-5042

Reviewed by:



Tricia Maier, Manager
Planning Programs Section
(805) 654-2464

Exhibits:

Exhibit 1 – Proposed Plans and Elevations