CITY OF SAUSALITO
PLANNING DIVISION
MEMORANDUM

Date: April 30, 2014
To: Historic Landmarks Board
From: Ben Noble, Contract Planner – PlaceWorks
Subject: Valhalla – 201 Bridgeway and 206 Second Street

Background

On April 9, 2014 the Historic Landmarks Board (HLB) received information on the proposed Valhalla residential condominium project at 201 Bridgeway and 206 Second Street (APNs 065-242-06 and 065-242-17). At this meeting the HLB determined that the Valhalla building at 201 Bridgeway has historic significance, and that the residence at 206 Second Street does not. The finding of historic significance for the Valhalla building requires the HLB to review and comment on the design of the proposed project.

Discussion

On April 30, 2014 the HLB will discuss the design of the proposed project to determine if the project complies with the US Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The Preservation Architecture evaluation report prepared by the applicant's consultant evaluates the project's compliance with the Standards for Rehabilitation and is attached for reference.

Recommendation

The HLB should take the following actions:

- Review the project design;
- Determine if the project design complies with the Standards for Rehabilitation.
  - If yes, direction should be provided to staff to prepare a memorandum with the HLB's findings of significance and determination;
  - If no, direction should be provided to staff to prepare a memorandum with the HLB's findings of significance and recommendations for project modifications to more fully comply with the Standards for Rehabilitation.

The HLB's memorandum will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for the Commission's consideration when it takes action on the Design Review Permit for the proposed project.

Exhibit

Project Evaluation Report prepared by Preservation Architecture, July 26, 2013

I:\CDD\PROJECTS - ADDRESS\B\Bridgeway 201\GPA-ZOA-PD-TM-DR-CC-EA 13-150\HLB Materials\SR 04-30-14.doc

blank

PRESERVATION
ARCHITECTURE

July 26, 2013

The Valhalla, 201 Bridgeway Blvd., Sausalito
Project Evaluation

Introduction

The purpose of this documentation is to evaluate proposed new work at 201 Bridgeway Blvd. with respect to its historic resource conditions and relevant standards.

Presently, the Valhalla property is not identified as an historic resource. However, a recent evaluation (Historic Architectural Evaluation, by this author, dated June 21, 2012) identifies the property as eligible for the Sausalito Register. Though it appears to have such potential, and for the sake of simplicity is herein called "historic," it is not at this juncture an identified historic resource. Nonetheless, respecting its potential and for planning and design and purposes, it is presumed to be "historic" and a proposed project is likewise presumed to be a rehabilitation with guidance and compliance measured by application of the U. S. Secretary of the Interior's ***Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards).***

The proposed project (based on 9 drawings sheets of plans and elevations by Michael Rex Associates, dated July 23, 2013):

- Adapts the property to residential use;
- Retains and rehabilitates the identified historic structure;
- Removes non-historic construction at the rear (north) side of the property;
- Makes several new additions to the historic structure;
- Selectively retains and alters non-historic structures directly associated with the historic;
- Makes alterations and new additions to non-historic areas of the property.

Evaluation Summary

As demonstrated in the following evaluation, the proposed project meets each ***Standard.*** Therefore, the project appears to meet the Secretary of the Interior's ***Standards for Rehabilitation.***

Description

Identified defining characteristics:

Very Significant

- 2-story rectangular building form
- 4-sided hipped roof (flat-topped)
- Continuous, ornamental wood fascia and roof eave
- South wall and upper east wall
- Wood windows and trim (at upper south and west walls)
- Wood corner boards

Significant

- South facing wall segment at original porch extension to east
- Upper west wall and portion of upper north wall

446 17th Street #302 Oakland 94612
510 418 0285 mhulbert@earthlink.net

EXHIBIT
(7 PAGES)

- Wood board siding (while wood siding is missing and/or concealed, given the simple quality of the original building and evidence of its original wood siding, that siding is character-defining)

Contributing
- South facing wall segment at original-early west side extension
- Projecting bay at portion of upper north wall
- Wood windows and trim (at upper north and west walls)

These points sum up a resource of minimal character and with minimal characteristics. The historic structure is essentially a primary building form with a narrow range of elements and materials. Yet, a meaningful resource is undeniably present in the form of a longstanding, wood-frame commercial building central to this waterfront cove and surrounding community. The historic structure is a simple thing, but it has also been a relatively important presence and commercial use.

Evaluation

With respect to the *Standards*, as the project envisions substantial alterations and new construction to adapt the property for reuse, the appropriate treatment and evaluation *Standard* is that of *Rehabilitation*, which is defined as follows:

"When repair and replacement of deteriorated features are necessary; when alterations or additions to the property are planned for a new or continued use; and when its depiction at a particular period of time is not appropriate, Rehabilitation may be considered as a treatment."

The following lists the ten *Standards for Rehabilitation* and analyzes the proposed project with respect to each.

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.*

   The extant property has stood vacant for half of a decade. While dining and drinking establishments (along with a period of lodging uses) occupied the building for 100 years, based on accumulated evidence, a dining and drinking establishment use is no longer feasible at this location.

   Consequently, a project is proposed that will adaptively reuse the vacant and former hospitality property for multi-residential occupancy. That work will include a range of alterations and additions associated with the historic structure:
   - Selected windows to be relocated (upper windows, north and south walls at historic structure);
   - Wood shingles to be removed and wood board siding to be restored and/or reconstructed;
   - Sets of new doors, windows and related openings (at lower south, upper east, upper and lower west, and at north walls) to be constructed at historic and non-historic structures;
   - New roof dormers and monitor (at historic structure);
   - New roof deck (west side, historic structure);
   - Trellised appendages (at historic [upper east and west sides] and non-historic [lower west side] structures);
   - Structural removal (at non-historic rear additions and outbuildings);
   - Two new residential structures (at non-historic property);
   - New garage structure (at non-historic property);

- Selective removal and alterations (exterior walls and roofs at non-historic structures to remain).

With no specific knowledge of what the original interiors were like, except an image of the second floor as an open hall, the existing interior spaces of the historic structure – an open saloon/bar room at the first floor, with a subdivided group of lodging-like rooms at the second floor – are not potentially historic in character.

Basic evidence of the appropriateness of the new use is that few changes are proposed at the historic structure. Removal of existing construction is proposed at non-historic areas and structures. Associated non-historic portions of the existing structure, specifically the dining and banquet room additions, will also be selectively retained, altered and reused.

As the new use will allow for the retention and rehabilitation of the historic structure, its exterior materials and spatial relationships, the proposed project complies with Rehabilitation *Standard 1.*

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.*

The identifiable, historic architectural character of the subject property is the essential, two-story building form under a flat-topped hipped-roof. From the south, the east and west wing walls extending from the main structure are also character defining. Additionally, its character derives both from its waterfront setting and its context within a then urbanizing mid-to-late-19th century enclave of southern Sausalito.

From an historic resource perspective, the measure of the proposed project is whether the essential building form within its essential setting is sustained.

The project will retain and selectively alter the elements of the historic structure and structural form, including the east and west wing walls; plus rehabilitate the building's identified exterior materials and features.

While elemental changes are made to its exterior envelop – the removal and relocation of windows (at upper south and north walls), and the addition of new doors, windows and associated trimwork – such changes generally reinforce the patterns and characteristics of original elements. The new openings are proposed at walls that are non-historic or were previously altered (lower south, upper east and north walls). The exceptions are the proposed sets of doors at the upper west wall, which is currently (and historically) a blank side wall with a single window. The proposal inserts a broad opening and appends a low, trellis-like structure at this wall. Together with the removal of the existing window at its left side, and along with the replacement addition below (with a roof deck and railing above), specific impacts at this upper west wall – which is the only portion of this elevation identified as significant – are the removal of a central section of the historic wall (along with an adjoining window) for a new opening. A more general impact is the appendage of a small, trellis-like enclosure outside the upper west wall.

Creating a new opening in an otherwise blank wall cannot be defined as a substantial effect. The form of the building will remain, as will sections of this very wall. Changes are allowed under the *Standards for Rehabilitation* in order to enable reuse. And relative to which the retention and preservation of a basic and featureless wall would be an onerous measure under any reuse scenario.

The proposed appendage is separate, additive and, like the wall opening, reversible. The other adds and alterations at the west wall are also separate from the historic structure and affect areas and construction identified as non-historic. Were the *Preservation Standards* applicable, then such proposed changes would be considered detrimental. Under *Rehabilitation,* and given the historic resource status and basic character of the historic structure, such alterations are acceptable.

Additional exterior alterations are proposed at the roof, with new dormers proposed at the north and south slopes, a monitor-like projection at the flat top, and the insertion of an open roof deck to the east face, where the essential simplicity of this structure is underscored by its simple, hipped roof. Thus, such alterations to the roof form are an obvious concern. The measure, again, being whether the essential building and roof forms are sustained.

Designs for the new roof dormers, central popped-up monitor, and open deck take a strategy of differentiation. They are relatively contemporary forms and materials – i.e., minimal and clean, using glass and metal – that are clearly additive. Yet, the dormer and the deck each subtract original roof. Still, the overall, hipped form remains legible. And while – again from an historic resources perspective – it may be preferable that the roof form be unaltered, the scale of the proposed project is not aggressive. Program area is evidently at a minimum. Proposed roof alterations are a consequence of expanding into the attic space of the existing structure. The project otherwise proposes additions that are appropriately subordinate to the historic structure. Were the attic space deemed unimprovable, then it can be anticipated that the proposed scale of such additions may need to grow. Thus, these exterior alterations at the roof modify yet retain the essential hipped form, while also ensuring more modest additions to the property.

Exterior alterations are largely concentrated at non-historic areas and structures to remain. And the selective removal of non-historic structures will have no detrimental impact on the historic structure.

Additionally, the restoration of original wood siding patterns is a highly positive treatment. And design gestures that take cues from the historic character of the property, in particular the veranda forms and corner flagpoles on the water (east) side, reinforce historic patterns without mimicry.

Altogether, the new work retains the character and primacy of the historic structure. Proposed changes are largely focused on non-historic areas and structures. Therefore, the proposed project meets *Standard 2.*

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.*

The project proposes new additions to the property (new residences and garage) that are separate from, compatible with and subordinate to the historic structure.

Exterior alterations (altered and new openings, replacement railings, and roof alterations) are concentrated at non-historic areas and structures, but are also proposed at the west elevation. The domestic design character of this new work is distinct from the vernacular style of the original building, and does not copy or mimic the original style or features.

Exterior alterations at the roof of the historic structure are clearly differentiated by being relatively contemporary (i.e., generally current rather than specifically traditional) in style, thus distin-

guishing what is new versus what is early. And as there are no conjectural features proposed, and no false sense of historical development will be caused by the new work, so the proposed project also meets *Standard 3.*

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

   The identified historic structure consists of the original, two-story building exterior. No changes or additions subsequent to the original are important architecturally or historically. As such, the proposed project meets *Standard 4.*

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

   Distinctive materials and techniques are in limited supply on this property. The most distinctive, original, exterior material is its ornamental wood frieze and roof eave. The next most distinctive material was its horizontal, wood board siding, though that material has been absent since the 1960s. Flat wood trim, and double-hung wood windows are also distinctive relative to this structure. Even the wood-frame building structure is, in the context of this modest building, arguably distinctive.

   Each of these extant materials along with their embedded techniques and craftsmanship are proposed to be retained with minimal exception. (Wood board siding is not extant, see below.)

   The removal of several identified, character-defining features (projecting bay at north; west facing upper wall and window) is proposed. These elements are identified as contributing, their assigned rehabilitation priority is the lowest, this extent of loss is balanced by the extent of retention and rehabilitation, and their loss will not alter the essential character of the building.

   As the project retains and preserves essential character and characteristic materials, features, etc., the proposed project meets *Standard 5.*

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.*

   Identified original materials and assemblies will be retained and repaired. Non-historic wood shingles that cover the exterior walls will be removed. If original wood siding in good condition is found beneath the shingles, it may be selectively retained and repaired. Otherwise, where required, new wood siding to match the original (based on historic photos and physical evidence) will be installed. With these measures, the overall project complies with *Standard 6.*

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.*

   Historic materials to remain shall be protected during the course of the project. Treatments to such materials will be limited to low-intensity repairs and repainting. Thus, the proposed project complies with *Standard 7.*

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

No archeological resources have been identified as associated with the subject property or proposed project. However, given the location, unidentified subsurface resources could be present where ground disturbing activities may be undertaken during construction. In order to protect cultural resources, the construction project shall employ protocols and procedures for encountering and mitigating archeological resources to ensure that the proposed work complies with *Standard 8.*

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.*

The proposed rehabilitation scheme retains the essential historic building form and its identified materials, features, and spatial relationships, with limited exceptions:

- Several identified elements are proposed to be removed (the north projecting bay and the upper west window), yet these elements are identified as contributing, thus are given the lowest preservation priority, and their loss will not change the structure's essential character.
- A segment of the upper west exterior wall will be removed to create a new opening into the trellised addition. As this wall is blank and featureless and sections of it will yet remain, the new opening is a simple and acceptable extent of alteration.
- Several other identified elements (upper windows at north and south) will be altered by being removed and relocated within the existing walls to which they are associated. So this extent of alteration effectively reuses the features, and the change will have no detrimental impact on the historic structure, while allowing for its more effective reuse.

Where related new construction is proposed alongside and to the north of the historic building, they are entirely separate structures, are generally traditional and domestic in their architectural character, and do not mimic or copy historic forms or details. Where added structures (wood trellised forms) are appended to the building to the upper east and west, their character is again domestic and traditional. Appropriately, all these appendages and additions are modest, subordinate and complementary to the historic structure. Additionally, the design of alterations at the roof are appropriately distinguished from the historic structure, making clear new and old.

Simultaneously, designs for the alterations to the existing, non-historic structures (specifically the former dining and banquet structure to the east, including their rooftops) take cues from the recorded historic character of the property, specifically the water-side verandas, deck railings and corner flag poles (which were elements on the original structure). This proposed design work does not begin to copy what was original, but is derived therefrom so that new and old are compatible yet differentiated.

As the proposed new work achieves a requisite balance between compatibility and differentiation, the project meets Rehabilitation *Standard 9.*

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.*

Were the proposed project to be removed in part or in its entirety, the essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be intact, and its setting and environment would not be impaired. Thus, the proposed project meets *Standard 10.*

Evaluation Summary

As demonstrated in the above evaluation, the proposed project meets each ***Standard.*** Therefore, the project meets the Secretary of the Interior's ***Standards for Rehabilitation.*** Moreover, the design strategy of compatibly expanding the property via simple and largely traditional forms and materials appears to be an appropriate decision relative to this setting, property and building. The limited and modest nature of the identified historic structure poses a difficult design challenge: how to adapt and enlarge a structure that does not have outstanding potential without diminishing it. As illustrated, that design challenge appears to have been met. The historic structure stands amidst alterations and additions that are equally modest and clearly subordinate.

Signed:

Mark Hulbert
Preservation Architect

blank