# Juliana Inman AIA ARCHITECT

4 June 2007

John McDowell
Trish Hornisher
Napa County Conservation Development and Planning Department
1195 Third Street, Room 210
Napa, California 94559

Re: Tilley Property

3199 St. Helena Highway Napa County, California APN:22-080-025

Dear Mr. McDowell and Ms. Hornisher:

I have reviewed plans prepared by Mary Sikes and Associates dated May 3, 2007 for the replacement barn at the Tilley property. This barn is designed to replace the existing altered wood barn that encroaches into the creek setback. Relocation or replacement of this structure was a condition of the original Use Permit for the project. Small scale plans of the structure are included as Exhibit A. At the recommendation of County staff and this consultant, schematic plans for a previous design utilizing stone veneer have been superseded.

# Description, significance and evaluation:

Documents reviewed for this report include schematic drawings for a replacement barn. The existing main house (with stone wine cellar) and historical cottages have no proposed alterations.

# California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis:

According to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regulation, historic resources are automatically eligible for the California Register if they have been listed in and determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places or the California Historic Landmarks program. Historic resources included in historic resource inventories prepared according to the California State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO) guidelines (and included in the State Inventory of Historic Resources) or designated under county or city historic landmark ordinances are presumed eligible if the designation occurred during the previous five years. Designations and surveys over five years old must be updated before their eligibility can be considered.

The California Register regulations define "integrity" as "the authenticity of an historic resource's physical identity, evidenced by the survival of characteristics

that existed during the resource's period of significance" (State Office of Historic Preservation, 1997). These regulations specify that integrity is a quality that applies to historic resources in seven ways: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. A property must retain most of these qualities to possess integrity.

The criteria for eligibility for listing in the National Register are virtually the same as for the California Register. To meet the National Register standards, a property must meet these same criteria, be associated with an important historic context, and retain the historic integrity of features that convey significance (National Park Service, 1991).

The site and district retains integrity.

# Secretary of the Interior Standards and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis:

According to current CEQA regulation:

Title 14. California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act Article 5. Preliminary Review of Projects and Conduct of Initial Study, Section 15064.5. Determining the Significance of Impacts to Archeological and Historical Resources:

(3) Generally, a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer, shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historical resource.

# Secretary of the Interior Review:

Napa County generally references compliance with <u>The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings</u>, in the design review conditions and/or negative declaration for projects and discretionary permits. Compliance with these guidelines avoids any negative impacts on the existing building.

According to the introduction of these standards:

The Standards for Rehabilitation (codified in 36 CFR 67 for use in the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives program) address the most prevalent treatment. "Rehabilitation" is defined as "the process of returning a property to a state of utility, through repair or alteration, which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those

portions and features of the property which are significant to its historic, architectural, and cultural values."

### The introduction further states:

... As stated in the definition, the treatment "rehabilitation" assumes that at least some repair or alteration of the historic building will be needed in order to provide for an efficient contemporary use; however, these repairs and alterations must not damage or destroy materials, features or finishes that are important in defining the building's historic character.

# And the final introductory statement:

The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

#### Analysis:

Work described in the drawings for the barn structure conforms to *The Secretary* of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. Included with the comment is a citation of the Standard or guideline language involved, and specific recommendations by this reviewer in bold face type for compliance with the standards:

1. Standard 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.

Use of the replacement "barn" will be winery/agricultural use, consistent with historical use of the barn and site. The existing barn was used as an agricultural accessory structure for the historical grape growing and wine production on the site. Within the past 30-40 years the existing barn was inappropriately altered for use as a residence. Use will be returned to agricultural/winery use.

2. **Standard 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.

As a condition of the approved Use Permit for the site, the existing barn must be removed from its current encroachment into the existing creek setback. Since the condition of the altered barn is very poor, the barn will be replaced with a barn of similar style, size, massing and scale as close to the original location as practical. Existing heritage oaks will remain, and the replacement barn is carefully sited to avoid removal of existing trees.

3. **Standard 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.

No features from other buildings will be added. No conjectural features are proposed. New construction does not create a false sense of historical development.

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

The replacement barn has no negative impact on the existing historic house/wine cellar and guest cottages since siting of the replacement structure is as close as possible to the original location of the barn without encroaching into the creek setback or removing heritage trees.

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

Distinctive features and finishes will be not be removed.

6. Standard 6 Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where 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.

The existing altered wood board and batten barn is replaced with a new board and batten barn of similar style, material, massing, scale and detail. New work is differentiated from the historical site by straightforward contemporary detailing.

7. **Standard** 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.

No sand blasting or chemical treatments are proposed.

8. **Standard 8** Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures must be taken.

Napa County standard archeological mitigation measures should apply to all ground disturbing activities on the site.

9. **Standard 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, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

The proposed barn is differentiated from the historical resources by being constructed of new material, with a simple entry canopy and small ventilation cupola at the ridge of the roof. According to the Guidelines, "...additions should be designed and constructed so that the character-defining features of the historic building are not radically changed, obscured, damaged, or destroyed in the process of rehabilitation. New design should always be clearly differentiated so that the addition does not appear to be part of the historic resource." The Guidelines further recommend:

- Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.
- In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.

It is recommended that the new barn be detailed so that if plywood is used, no edges are exposed; and that signage, exterior finishes and lighting be reviewed for appropriateness prior to installation.

10. **Standard 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.

No alterations to the historic main building or cottages are proposed. If the barn is removed in the future, there is no alteration to the historic buildings or site.

page 6 Tilley 6/04/07

\* \* \* \* . .

#### Conclusions:

Following the recommendations in this report will help assure that work in the proposed project meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

#### Sources:

- 1. <u>36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties</u>, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 1986.
- 2. California CEQA Guidelines, amended 1 February 2001.
- 3. California CEQA Statute, amended 1 January 2002.
- 4. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, "Thresholds of Significance: Criteria for Defining Environmental Significance: CEQA Technical Advice Series," September 1994.
- 5. <u>Instructions for Recording Historical Resources</u>, California Office of Historic Preservation, March 1995.
- 6. National Register Bulletins 15 and 16A (National Park Service 1990b, 1991) NRHP Status Codes.
- 7. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, (1995), Weeks and Grimmer.

#### Report by:

Juliana Inman AIA California Architect, license #C14760

**Attachment:** Exhibit A – Drawings dated May 3, 2007 by Mary Sikes and Associates.