

# Exhibit D

This page intentionally left blank.

KENT L. SEAVEY  
310 LIGHTHOUSE AVENUE  
PACIFIC GROVE, CALIFORNIA 93950  
(831) 375-8739

January 17, 2024

Mr. Luyen Vu  
Eric Miller Architects inc.  
211 Hoffman Ave.  
Monterey, CA 93940

Dear Mr. Vu:

**Introduction:**

This Focused Phase II Historic Assessment has been prepared on behalf of Mr. Stephen Rivera, as part of an application for a Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), for his residential property, located at 4161 Sunridge Dr. (APN# 008-071-011-000 and 008-071-012-000), at Pebble Beach in Monterey County (see photos, plans & drawings provided).

**Historical Background & Description**

The subject property is a wood & glass framed Second Bay Region Modern Style, residence, irregular in plan, resting on a concrete foundation. The exterior wall-cladding is a combination of vertical, flush redwood board siding & full-height fixed & sliding plate-glass windows. The flat roof is slightly tilted toward the SW, to take in views of the Monterey County coastline. It is sited in a rural landscape setting. Constructed in 1948, the architect of record is noted San Francisco designer John E. Dinwiddie (see full description & significance in the 2014 DPR523 provided).

**Proposed Project Description**

The owners propose to add an 856 S.F. Accessory Dwelling Unit approx. 13ft. NE of the SE terminus of the main building envelope. The proposed project will not be visible from a public right-of-way (see photos, plans & drawings provided).

The proposed detached addition is to be consistent with the intent of National Parks Service 2010 Preservation Brief #14, which emphasizes, preservation of the character of the historic buildings. The above described treatment has been designed to do so. The subject property is identified as an example of post WWII Second Bay Region architectural design in Monterey (see modified documentation and, plans & drawings provided).

### **Evaluation for Significance**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), PRC Sec.21084.1 requires all properties fifty years of age or older to be reviewed for potential historic significance. Criteria for that significance is addressed in PRC Sec. 5024.1 (a). It asks, did any event important to the region, state or nation occur on the property. Did anyone important to the region, state or nation occupy the property during the productive period of their lives. Does the building represent an important architectural type, period or method of construction, or is it a good example of the work of a noted architect or master-builder. The criteria also asks if the property is likely to yield information significant to the understanding of the areas history.

Eligibility for historic listing of buildings, structures, objects, sites and districts, i.e., rests on the twin factors of historic significance and integrity to be considered for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, & the City of Monterey Historic Resource Inventory. Loss of integrity, if sufficiently great, will overwhelm the historic significance a resource may possess and render it ineligible for historic listing. Likewise, a resource can have complete integrity, but if it lacks significance, it must also be considered ineligible.

Integrity is measured by the application of seven aspects, defined by the National (NR) & California (CR) registers criteria for Evaluation. They include: Location, the place where the historic property was constructed, or an historic event occurred;

Design, the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a building; Setting, the physical environment of the historic property; Materials, the physical elements that were combined during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property; Workmanship, the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history; Feeling & Association are subjective elements that assess a resources ability to evoke a sense of time and place.

### **Monterey County Historic Preservation Ordinance**

The criteria employed by Monterey County for designation of historic resources are the same general standards by which the significance of a historic property is judged for inclusion in the National (NR) and/or California Register (CR), and are included in the Monterey County Historic Preservation Ordinance.

The subject property is not included in the California Office of Historic Preservation-maintained “Historic Data File for Monterey County” (updated August, 2022). It is not listed in the California Register, or the National Register of Historic Places, but has been listed in the attached DPR523 as NRHP Status Code as 5S2.

Regarding the necessary seven aspects of integrity, the historic residence retains its location and setting, and the majority of its original materials and workmanship. The residence is a good example of it’s type. In its present neighborhood context, which contains a variety of architectural periods and styles, the property continues to evoke a strong sense of time and place, and of feeling and association with its 1948 documented date of construction.

## **IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

### **Introduction**

The *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (standards)* provides the framework for evaluating the impacts of additions and alterations to historic buildings.

The *Standards* describe four treatment approaches: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction. The *Standards* require that the treatment approach be determined first, as a different set of *Standards* apply to each approach. For the subject property, the treatment approach is rehabilitation. The *Standards* describe *Rehabilitation* as, “historic building materials and character-defining features are protected and maintained as they are in the treatment for Preservation, however, an assumption is made prior to the work that existing historic fabric has become damaged or deteriorated over time and, as a result more repair and replacement will be required”.

Thus, latitude is given in the *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitation* to replace extensively deteriorated, damaged, or missing features using either traditional or substitute materials. Of the four treatments, only *Rehabilitation* includes an opportunity to make possible an efficient contemporary use through alterations and additions. (see *The Secretary of the interior’s Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1995).

## **Project Impacts**

The proposed detached ADU use should not be visually detectable from any public right-of-way. It will employ design characteristics of the Second Bay Region Style outlined in the 2013 Pebble Beach Historic Context Statement by Page & Turnbull, Inc of San Francisco, outlined on Page 120 of the Context Statement

As described in the said document:

The style has no standardize appearance, but frequently simple or vernacular with a horizontal orientation. The emphasis is on volume over ornamentation.

It has wood siding, including boards, board-and-batten & shingles.

Flat, shed or canted roof forms, overhang eaves with exposed rafters. The emphasis in on indoor-outdoor living. Spaces include the use of large window openings, and an open plan of flexible plan interior spaces.

The proposed detached ADU design addresses the general characteristics described, without copying, or trying to match the existing features of the original 1948 adjacent historic property.



## Proposed Project Description

The proposed detached ADU will make possible for a more efficient contemporary use of the property, while preserving those portions and features of the adjacent historic residence which are significant to its historic, architectural, and cultural use. All new work will be undertaken in conformance with the *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, under the Standard for Rehabilitation*.

The 1992 National Park Service *Illustrated Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, states that “The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.”

The proposed new wood-framed building envelope is essentially “U” shaped in plan, with an open partial roof deck above (see plans and drawings provided).

The exterior wall cladding is a Green Hard-board vertical siding, differentiated from the white painted redwood siding on the 1948 building envelope.

The tall, fixed and sliding windows on the proposed ADU have a copper painted ribbed aluminum fascia running around the building envelope breaking up the verticality of the fenestration, and high, narrow white metal windows on the side-elevation facing the historic residence for privacy.

The slightly flared SW facing roof eaves will be ribbed beneath.

Posts and railings throughout will be painted black

An exterior eave wall chimney will be finished in an assorted block Carmel stone.

While respectful of the character-defining features of the Second Bay Region Style, called out in the 2012 Pebble Beach Historic Context Statement, the proposed ADU will in no way attempt to “match” in kind the specific character-defining features of its immediate neighbor, architect John E. Dinwiddie’s Ferris Bagley House, at 4161 Sunridge Dr. in Pebble Beach.

## Conclusion

As proposed, the detached Accessory Dwelling Unit, (ADU) adjacent to the 1948 John E. Dinwiddie's Second Bay Region style residence, at 4161 Sunridge Dr., in Pebble Beach, has been designed to reflect the descriptor of the architectural form, identified in the 2012 Pebble Beach Historic Context Statement. It is also consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the treatment of Historic Properties, especially Rehabilitation Standards #9 & #10. In that:

(#9) "as related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will 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."

(#10) "In that new additions and adjacent or related construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in future, the essential form & integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired".

The proposed work on the subject property is consistent with the *Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation* and will not cause an adverse effect on the environment.

## Mitigation

The proposed project appears to be in conformance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* under the *Standard for Rehabilitation* (see documentation, photos and plans & drawings provided). No mitigation is required.

Respectfully Submitted,

