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<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHP</td>
<td>Office of Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQS</td>
<td>Professional Qualification Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>California Public Resources Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRC</td>
<td>State Historical Resources Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

Dudek was retained by Stonemark Construction Management (Stonemark) to prepare an Historic Structures/Site Report (HSSR) Phase I and Phase II for Graholm located at 801 Alston Road (previously 2190 Alston Road), Santa Barbara, California (Project site). As a result of the submission and approval of the HSSR Phase I and the subsequent Resolution of Intent from the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) dated May 5, 2019, Graholm is currently recommended eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1 and C/3, and as a City Landmark under City Criteria A, C, D, F, and G. The Graholm property is associated with the growth and development of the current Eucalyptus Hill neighborhood, its association with master architect Ronald Sauter, and its representation of the Spanish Colonial Revival style of architecture. In consideration of these findings, Graholm is considered an historical resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The HSSR Phase I can be viewed in its entirety in Appendix A.

As a result of the recommendation of eligibility, the City of Santa Barbara requested a HSSR Phase II be completed for the proposed construction of a new garage on the property (Project). As a result of the City’s request for an HSSR Phase II on June 5, 2020, the following detailed impacts assessment of all proposed Project activities was conducted in consideration of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation (the Standards).

1.1 Project Location

The proposed project site is located at 801 Alston Road, Santa Barbara, California (APN 015-174-019) and consists of 6.92 acres (Figure 1). The property is located in a hilly residential area generally bound by Camino Viejo Road to the north, Alston Road to the south, Woodley Road to the east, and Alston Road/Camino Viejo Road to the west.

1.2 Project Description

The project proposes to construct a new detached garage along the north side of the existing motor court. The motor court would be modified to accommodate the new garage, including replacement of stone pavers, re-grading of the motor court and adjacent parking area, replacement of oval green space, and removal of small sections of original stone walls north of the main residence. Specifications and project details can be found in the project plans included as Appendix B.

1.3 Project Personnel

This report was prepared by Dudek Historic Built Environment Lead Sarah Corder, MFA with contributions from Dudek Architectural Historian Kate Kaiser, MSHP. All project personnel meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (PQS) for architectural history (36 CFR Part 61) (see Appendix C, Preparer’s Qualifications).
FIGURE 1

Project Location
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1.4 Regulatory Setting

**National Register of Historic Places**

The NRHP is the official list of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects deemed worthy of preservation in the United States. Overseen by the National Park Service under the U.S. Department of the Interior, the NRHP was authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended. Its listings encompass all National Historic Landmarks and historic areas administered by the National Park Service.

NRHP guidelines for the evaluation of historic significance were developed to be flexible and to recognize the accomplishments of all who have made significant contributions to the nation's history and heritage. Its criteria are designed to guide state and local governments, federal agencies, and others in evaluating potential entries in the NRHP. For a property to be listed in or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, the property must be demonstrated to possess integrity and to meet at least one of the following criteria:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. Historic properties either retain integrity (this is, convey their significance) or they do not. To retain historic integrity, a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the seven aspects of integrity (location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association). The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance (NRHP 2002).

**California Register of Historical Resources**

In California, the term “historical resource” includes, but is not limited to, “any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or
cultural annals of California” (California Public Resources Code (PRC), Section 5020.1(j)). In 1992, the California legislature established the CRHR “to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change” (PRC Section 5024.1(a)). The criteria for listing resources on the CRHR were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the NRHP, enumerated below. According to PRC Section 5024.1(c)(1–4), a resource is considered historically significant if it (i) retains “substantial integrity,” and (ii) meets at least one of the following criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In order to understand the historic importance of a resource, sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource. A resource less than 50 years old may be considered for listing in the CRHR if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance (see 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) 4852(d)(2)).

The CRHR protects cultural resources by requiring evaluations of the significance of prehistoric and historic resources. The criteria for the CRHR are nearly identical to those for the NRHP, and properties listed or formally designated as eligible for listing in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR, as are the state landmarks and points of interest. The CRHR also includes properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.

City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code – Chapter 30.157 Historic Resources

30.157.025 Significance Criteria.

In considering a proposal to designate or recommend designation of any structure, site or feature as a Landmark, Structure of Merit or for inclusion on the Historic Resources Inventory, any structure, site or feature must be at least 50 years of age, meet one or more of the criteria outlined below, and retain historic integrity. The designating authority must find the structure, site or feature retains enough historic integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association that it conveys its historic significance in accordance with the most recent National Register of Historic Places Bulletin How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. The designating authority must find that the structure, site or feature meets one or more of the following Criteria:
1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution in our past;

2. It is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, architectural style or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic or historic value, or represents a significant and distinguishable collection whose individual components may lack distinction;

4. It yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history; or

5. Its unique location or singular physical characteristic represents an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood.
2 IMPACTS ANALYSIS

2.1 The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards

Where a project has been determined to conform with the Standards, the project’s impact on historical resources would be considered mitigated to below a level of significance and, thus, not significant (14 CCR 15126.4(b)(1)). In most cases, a project that demonstrates conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards is categorically exempt from CEQA (14 CCR 15331), as described in the CEQA Guidelines:

Where maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation or reconstruction of the historical resource will be conducted in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Weeks and Grimmer 1995), the project’s impact on the historical resource shall generally be considered mitigated below a level of significance and thus is not significant (14 CCR 15126.4(b)(1)).

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards are a series of concepts focused on maintaining, repairing, and replacing historic materials, as well as designing new additions or making alterations. They function as common-sense historic preservation principles that promote historic preservation best practices. There are four distinct approaches that may be applied to the treatment of historical resources:

- **Preservation** focuses on the maintenance and repair of existing historic materials and retention of a property’s form as it has evolved over time.
- **Rehabilitation** acknowledges the need to alter or add to a historic property to meet continuing or changing uses while retaining the property’s historic character.
- **Restoration** depicts a property at a particular period of time in its history, while removing evidence of other periods.
- **Reconstruction** recreates vanished or non-surviving portions of a property for interpretive purposes.

The choice of treatment depends on a variety of factors, including the property’s historical significance, physical condition, proposed use, and intended interpretation. The CEQA Guidelines provide general design and technical recommendations to assist in applying the Standards to a specific property. Together, the Standards and Guidelines provide a framework that guides important decisions concerning proposed changes to a historic property.
The Standards for Rehabilitation

The Standards for Rehabilitation (below), taken together with the Guidelines, provide the framework in which proposed modifications should be reviewed.

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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.

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.

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

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 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. 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.
2.2 Proposed Project Components

Dudek was provided with architectural plans and renderings of the proposed new detached garage and other proposed modifications to the Graholt property, dated May 2022 (Appendix B). Based on these plans provided by Shubin Donaldson Architects, the following project components were analyzed for conformance with the Standards for Rehabilitation, and in consideration of potential impacts to historical resources under CEQA:

The project proposes to construct a new detached garage along the north side of the existing motor court. The motor court would be modified to accommodate the new garage, including replacement of stone pavers, re-grading of the motor court and adjacent parking area, replacement of oval green space, and removal of small sections of original stone walls north of the main residence. Specifications and project details can be found in the project plans included as Appendix B.

- **Construct a new detached garage along the north side of the existing motor court:** A review of the plans and schematics provided by the architect (Appendix B) indicate that the proposed design of the detached garage is in conformance with the Standards for Rehabilitation (see analysis provided in Table 1). Further, the proposed location of the new garage at the northern edge of the motor court would not disrupt or distract from existing views of the main house and the immediate setting, and would be in-line with the north elevation of the main house (See Figure 2).

Construction of the 2,466 net SF (2,945 gross SQ SF) consisting of a 1,108 net sq. ft. three-vehicle garage over a 1,358 sq. net ft. workshop detached garage would require removal of the existing low stone wall and hedge that currently outlines the motor court, however the low stone wall will remain visible along the south and east sides of the motor court and keep most of this original feature intact.

Construction of the new garage will avoid the original staircase and path leading to the lower level of the property. Historically, this path provided access to the pool below (no longer extant) and is an original path of circulation. Some modification will occur to the top-most step of the stairs in order to connect the original staircase to the motor court, however, the landings and stairs connected to the motor court do not appear to be original. All other features including remaining steps, landings, retaining walls, and boulder features will remain. Therefore, construction of a new detached garage along the northern portion of the property would result in a less-than-significant impact to historical resources.
• Modify existing motor court to accommodate new garage, including replacement of the existing stone pavers/concrete replacement pavers, re-grading of the motor court and adjacent parking area, and replacement of oval green space: the project proposes to expand the existing motor court in size to accommodate the new detached garage, replace the current pavers of the motor court, replace the oval green space, and re-grade the area to improve drainage and prevent water from draining toward the main house. After grading occurs, the new pavers will be added to the motor court, and a new central green space will be installed.

Archival research for the motor court indicates that it has been part of the property since the original construction period and was constructed within the period of significance. Historic photographs indicate that the motor court was always in its current location and was designed as an oval driveway around an oval green space. Historic photos show that the abstract pattern of stonework placement resembling cracked ice was part of the original design. However, materials analysis by historic preservation experts revealed that a significant percentage of the original stone was replaced throughout the history of the property. While the pattern was largely maintained, the replacements were not always in keeping with the original materials, as they were largely replaced with aggregate concrete versus stone. There is also evidence of stone that was patched with concrete, which further impacts the integrity of the materials of the motor court. Recently poured asphalt is also present on the western-most side of the motor court.

Archival research also indicated that the smaller oval center has always been a component of the motor court, but has been altered throughout the history of the property. Despite its alterations, the central oval green space is key to the experience of the entry to Graholm. The existing fountain within the
oval green space is not original to the property and falls outside the period of significance (Figures 3 and 4).

Given that the motor court (an oval driveway around an oval greenspace) is a character-defining feature of the property from the period of significance, Dudek has worked with the architect to mitigate impacts to this contributing element of the subject property. Prior to any new work taking place, the motor court 1) must be carefully documented using photography and architectural drawings; and 2) the design of the replacement motor court must be in keeping with the original design, thus maintaining an oval driveway that surrounds an oval green space.

The existing stone/concrete pavers will be replaced with an appropriate new material type in accordance with the guidance set forth in the City’s Historic Resource Design Guidelines (2015) and Spanish Colonial Revival Design Guidelines. The current plans for the proposed garage dated May 2022 (Appendix B) depict a historically appropriate material type in keeping with the Spanish Colonial Revival style, but still distinguishable from the original historic materials.

Part of the proposed changes to the motor court include expanding it in size (the new motor court will extend several feet further north to accommodate the new garage). The expansion of the motor court several feet is acceptable as long as the character-defining oval shape is maintained. Current design plans propose a predominately oval-shaped driveway that squares off when it meets the pavement of the entry road (to the southwest) and near the south elevation of the proposed garage. The new motor court will have an oval center that maintains the historical path of circulation for vehicles. The proposed motor court maintains the character-defining oval shape from the property’s period of significance and will utilize a compatible replacement material for the existing stone/concrete pavers. With incorporation of these design measures, impacts to the motor court can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.
Figure 3. Overview of motor court (IMG_0042)

Figure 4. Overview of motor court (IMG_0040)
• **Remove of a section of the northern pathway:** The proposed project includes the removal of the western fork of the northern pathway leading to the lower section of the property (Figures 5 and 6). As previously discussed, archival research indicates that the western fork of the northern path was a later addition to the property and was constructed outside the period of significance. The central fork is original to the property and falls within the period of significance. Historically, the central fork provided access to the pool below (no longer extant) and is an original path of circulation. The central fork will remain in place. Removal of the western fork, would allow for sufficient space for the new garage to be constructed. Therefore, the removal of this section of the northern pathway would result in a less-than-significant impact to historical resources.

![Figure 5. Circulation paths on the north elevation, below the motor court, the arrow is pointing to the western fork of the northern pathway proposed for removal (IMG_0723)](image)
Modify existing landscaping elements (removal of some mature trees and replacement of landscaping): The subject property has numerous mature trees and plantings throughout, as well as modern plantings and trees. The project proposes removal of some mature trees and vegetation. An original planting plan for Graholm was not identified as a result of archival research and is not part of the original plan set. Therefore, much of what we know about the original landscaping on the property is based on historic photographs and aerials of the property. Broadly speaking, it appears that most of the mature oaks on the property are original to the property and it is recommended that these trees remain in place. Smaller/younger trees that are not original to the property can be removed without impacting the historical significance of the property. Historic aerials and photographs of the property could not confirm when the trees were planted, but based on discussions with a Dudek arborist, it is highly unlikely that these trees are 100 years old and date to the property’s period of significance. Smaller, non-native trees throughout the property can be removed without issue.
2.3 Project Review for Conformance with the Standards

The Graholm property has been found eligible for designation in the NRHP, CRHR, and appears eligible for designation as a City Landmark. Therefore, the proposed project requires design review for conformance with the Standards for Rehabilitation and City requirements in order to minimize impacts to historical resources under CEQA and local code. The conformance review was prepared by qualified architectural historians who meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for Architectural History and Historic Preservation (36 CFR Part 61). Dudek understands that Stonemark Construction Management is proposing modification of various elements of the Graholm property and construction of a new garage, which are discussed in detail in Section 2.2. Table 1 presents the findings of a review of proposed project components (Section 2.2) for conformance with the Standards for Rehabilitation.

Table 1. Project Design Review for Conformance with the Standards for Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Project in Conformance?</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The property will be used as a single-family residence, which was its original historic function during the property’s period of significance, prior to its function as the Brooks Institute. Minimal changes are required to original materials, character-defining features, spaces, and spatial relationships.</td>
<td>Any required replacement of original materials will be made in-kind, with the exception of the motor court as discussed above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>While the proposed plans call for the removal of sections of retaining stone walls, the stone is a dominant material type and character-defining feature present throughout the property (e.g., as wall cladding, outlining paths, retaining walls, etc.) Because there are sufficient examples of the stone throughout the rest of the property, the removal of the small section of retaining wall to support the construction of the garage will not impact the property’s historic character.</td>
<td>Any original materials requiring removal (even if temporary) should be thoroughly documented with scale drawings and with photography prior to their removal and should be salvaged for reuse to the extent possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Project in Conformance?</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposed new garage design and materials are in keeping with the Spanish Colonial Revival style and character of the property, but it does not mimic the historic look and feel of the main house. The chosen materials will clearly appear modern, but reflective of thoughtful design choices inspired by the historic elements of the property. No conjectural features or elements will be added to the property.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The property has changed throughout time, but a clear period of significance was identified for the property from 1919-1924. The Brooks Institute period is not considered significant in the history of the property. Therefore, changes to the property that have occurred outside the period of significance do not contribute to the significance of the property.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All proposed changes are adjacent to the main house will be sympathetic to the original materials and craftsmanship. Great care will be taken to ensure that historic materials and features of the main house and site will be protected during the course of construction of the new detached garage. Protection measures will be in place to prevent deterioration and destruction of historic materials, features, and craftsmanship during the course of construction activities on the property.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Project Design Review for Conformance with the Standards for Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Project in Conformance?</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Great care will be taken to avoid further deterioration of the historic fabric of the property. The exception will be the motor court pavers, which will be replaced during the course of rehabilitation with a historically appropriate material.</td>
<td>Any historic features will be repaired whenever possible with the exception of the motor court, which will be replaced as discussed above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No chemical or physical treatments are proposed for the building.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Halt work and contact a qualified archaeologist per recommendations below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 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.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New construction of a garage is proposed for this project. The new garage will require the removal of a small section of an original stone wall and stone pavers from the original motor court to provide a new traffic and access pattern for the home. The placement of the garage is such that it will not detract from the original view of the main entry of the house. All materials and designs for the garage are sympathetic and in keeping with historic color schemes used on the property. The garage is also designed in a scale that is in keeping with the scale and massing of the property and will not impact the integrity of the property as a whole.</td>
<td>All designs and materials will be reviewed and approved by a qualified architectural historian and will be in keeping with the guidelines set forth by the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Project Design Review for Conformance with the Standards for Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Project in Conformance?</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposed construction of the garage will be done in a manner that can be reversed in the future without any destruction to the main house. While the removal of an original retaining wall and removal of the motor court pavers is proposed, these changes will serve to divert water away from the main house and will not significantly impact the main house.</td>
<td>All designs for new construction and additions will be reviewed and approved by a qualified architectural historian and will be in keeping with the guidelines set forth by the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Evaluation of Potential Project Effects

A detailed analysis of proposed project components indicates that all proposed new construction and modification to the Graholm property is in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Therefore, the proposed project's level of impact on historical resources will be less than significant (Class III).
3 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Findings

A detailed Impacts Analysis (Section 2) of proposed project activities indicates that all proposed new construction and modification to the Graholm property is in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Therefore, the proposed project’s level of impact on historical resources will be less than significant (Class III).

3.2 Recommendations

The Graholm property is considered an historical resource under CEQA. Therefore, any proposed modifications to the property should be carried out in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation in order to avoid material impairment of the resource. As demonstrated in Sections 2.2 and 2.3, all project components appear to be in conformance with the Standards for Rehabilitation, with incorporation of the recommendations provided in Table 1. A summary of these recommendations is provided below:

- Historic architectural features from the period of significance will be repaired whenever possible. Replacement of any original materials will be made in-kind. New material types will not be introduced on the main house, with the exception of the motor court.

- Any original materials requiring removal (even if temporary) shall be thoroughly documented with drawings and photographs prior to removal.

- In accordance with best management practices for historic preservation, it is recommended that final design plans for the subject property be reviewed prior to project implementation to ensure that proposed new construction is executed as described in the design plans (Appendix B).

- A reasonable protection plan shall be developed for the stone features during construction. This includes the stone walls throughout the property.

- In the event that archaeological resources (sites, features, or artifacts) are exposed during construction activities for the proposed project, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards, can evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether or not additional study is warranted. Depending upon the significance of the find, the archaeologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, additional work such as preparation of an archaeological treatment plan, testing, or data recovery may be warranted.
3.3 Residual Impacts

Following implementation of the above-described recommendations, the project’s level of impact on historical resources will be less than significant.
4 BIBLIOGRAPHY


APPENDIX A

Historic Structures/Sites Report Phase I for Graholm: 2190 Alston Road, Santa Barbara, California
PHASE I HISTORIC STRUCTURES/SITES REPORT
Graholm: 2190 Alston Road, Santa Barbara, California

PREPARED FOR:
STONEMARK CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

Contact:
Ali Salour, Senior Project Manager
2815 Townsgate Road, Suite 133
Westlake Village, CA 91361

PREPARED BY:
Sarah Corder, MFA, Kate Kaiser, MSHP, and Samantha Murray, MA
With contributions by Bryce Beemer, PhD

DUDEK
621 Chapala Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101

AUGUST 2019
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Project Description</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Project Location</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Environmental Setting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Project Personnel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Regulatory Setting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 HISTORIC CONTEXT</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Pre-History and Ethnography of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Historical Overview of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Estate Development in Santa Barbara and Montecito</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 History of Graholm</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Spanish Colonial Revival Style in Southern California (1895–1930)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BACKGROUND RESEARCH</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Documents Provided by the City of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Archival Research</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 FIELD SURVEY</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Description of Surveyed Resources</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 SIGNIFICANCE EVALUATION</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Summary of Findings</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Recommendations</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES

Appendix A Preparer’s Qualifications
Appendix B DPR 523 Forms
Appendix C Project Plans and Schematics

FIGURES

Figure 1. Vicinity Map ................................................................. 4
Figure 2. Mira Vista estate and garden, the first estate in Montecito (Redmon 2017a) ....................... 13
Figure 3. Graholm’s stone foundation under construction (Gledhill Library) .................................... 16
Figure 4. Graholm mostly completed in 1920, is located on Pepper Hill in Montecito (Gledhill Library) .... 17
Figure 5. Alston Road main entry gate to Graholm. Note the incorporation of local, natural stonework (Gledhill Library) ................................................................. 17
Figure 6. Graholm main house under construction circa 1920 (Graholm 2018) .................................... 18
Figure 7. Graholm main house under construction circa 1920 (Graholm 2018) .................................... 18
Figure 8. Interior of Graholm decorated with antiques collected by the Gray’s in Europe (Gledhill Library) .... 19
Figure 9. Map showing property divisions per the terms of Martha Gray’s estate (Graholm 2018) ........... 21
Figure 10. Promotional Card for Graholm Tours (Graholm 2018) ........................................................... 22
Figure 11. Students at the Brooks Institute pass through Graholm’s entry gate to attend classes, c 1950s.  
Note the estate’s wrought iron gate and stone archway (Lanz-Mateo 1999) ....................................... 23
Figure 12. Brooks Institute students train in advertising photography on the circular driveway of the Graholm campus (Lanz-Mateo 1999) ............................................................ 24
Figure 13. Close-scale aerial from 1948, shortly before the property is subdivided (Fairchild 1948) ........ 33
Figure 14. Overview of main (north) and west elevations, view looking southeast. View of the stone-paved circular driveway, water feature, and plantings (IMG_0758) ......................... 36
Figure 15. Overview of main (north) elevation, first section (IMG_0727) ............................................ 38
Figure 16. Overview of main (north) elevation, left portion of second section (DSC_0040) ................. 38
Figure 17. Overview of west elevation, left side (IMG_0746) ............................................................... 39
Figure 18. Overview of west elevation, middle section, letting out onto patio (IMG_0837) .................... 40
Figure 19. Overview of west elevation, middle section, letting out onto patio (IMG_0857) .................... 40
Figure 20. Overview of west elevation, right-most section (IMG_0866) .............................................. 41
Figure 21. Overview of south elevation, third section (IMG_0878) ...................................................... 42
Figure 22. Overview of south elevation, fourth section (IMG_0886) .................................................... 42
Figure 23. Overview of south elevation, fifth section (IMG_0900) ...................................................... 43
Figure 24. Overview of east elevation (IMG_0637) .............................................................................. 44
Figure 25. Gate feature, looking northeast. (IMG_0971) .................................................................... 45
Figure 26. Fireplace feature on west patio. (IMG_0846) ................................................................. 47
Figure 27. Prominent spreading mature oak and granite boulder at the northwest corner of the main house, driveway road, and circular driveway (IMG_0827) ................................................ 48
Figure 28. Retaining wall on south elevation, and west fork of driveway road (IMG_0958) ................. 49
Figure 29. Retaining wall on east lawn, with east elevation in background (IMG_0637).............................50
Figure 30. Circulation paths on the north elevation, below the circular driveway (IMG_0723)..................51
Figure 31. Project Site Map..................................................................................................................54

TABLES

Table 1. Historical/Archival Information Provided by the City of Santa Barbara.................................30
Table 2. Contributing and Non-Contributing Resources Associated with Graholm...............................52
INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym/Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCIC</td>
<td>Central Coast Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>California Code of Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>California Historical Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRHR</td>
<td>California Register of Historical Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSR</td>
<td>Historic Sites/Structures Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQS</td>
<td>Professional Qualification Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>California Public Resources Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRC</td>
<td>State Historical Resources Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Dudek was retained by Stonemark Construction Management (Stonemark) to prepare an Historic Structures/Site Report (HSSR) for Graholm located at 2190 Alston Road, Santa Barbara, California (project site). The City provided Dudek with one previously prepared study within the vicinity of the project site, which has been synthesized as part of the current study. In addition, Dudek conducted supplemental archival research on Graholm and conducted an intensive-level pedestrian survey of the property for historic built environment resources.

This technical report presents an historic significance evaluation of Graholm in consideration of National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and City of Santa Barbara designation criteria and integrity requirements. In addition to previous studies provided by the City, archival research was conducted at the Santa Barbara Central Library, Gledhill Library Santa Barbara Historical Museum, County of Santa Barbara Architectural Archives, City of Santa Barbara Assessors Office and the City of Santa Barbara Community Development Department for relevant city directory information, historic photographs, biographical information, building history, building records, notices of completion, county lot and block books, and deed information. Additionally, building permit history was reviewed using the City of Santa Barbara Planning Department Parcel Information Lookup online system.

As a result of the current study, Graholm is recommended eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1 and C/3, and as a City Landmark under City Criteria A, C, D, F, and G. The Graholm property is associated with the growth and development of the current Eucalyptus Hill neighborhood, its association with master architect Ronald Sauter, and its representation of the Spanish Colonial Revival style of architecture. In consideration of these findings, Graholm is considered an historical resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
1 INTRODUCTION

Dudek was retained by Stonemark Construction Management (Stonemark) to prepare an Historic Structures/Site Report (HSSR) for the Graholm property located 2190 Alston Road (previously 801 Alston Road), Santa Barbara, California (project site). This HSSR presents an historic significance evaluation of Graholm in consideration of National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and City of Santa Barbara designation criteria and integrity requirements. The City provided Dudek with previously prepared studies within the vicinity of the project site, which have been synthesized as part of this study.

1.1 Project Description

The project proposes to construct a new detached garage structure along the north side of the existing motor court. The motor court would be modified to accommodate the new garage, including replacement of stone pavers, re-grading of the motor court and adjacent parking area, and replacement of oval green space and fountain. Plans for demolition include the existing unpermitted garage, unpermitted shed, unpermitted pool pump house, and removal of a non-original pathway. Small sections of original stone walls would require removal in the paved parking area north of the main residence. Maintenance activities occurring at the main house include: new paint, landscaping, electrical upgrades, infill of a vent, repair of roof tiles and rafter tails, ventilation of the existing crawl space, and hazardous material abatement as needed.

1.2 Project Location

The proposed project site is located at 2190 Alston Road, Santa Barbara, California (APN 015-174-019) and consists of 6.92 acres (Figure 1). The property is located in a hilly residential area generally bound by Camino Viejo Road to the north, Alston Road to the south, Woodley Road to the east, and Alston Road/Camino Viejo Road to the west.

1.3 Environmental Setting

The subject property is located in the low foothills above a coastal plain south of the Santa Ynez Mountains, at the eastern terminus of the Santa Barbara city limits, between the Sycamore Canyon and Montecito Creek drainages. The subject property is located just over one mile from the coast on Pepper Hill, which rises to a height of 420 feet above sea level, in the Eucalyptus Hill neighborhood, northwest of the City of Montecito, and east of the Riviera neighborhood of Santa Barbara. The property is just northeast of the Pepper Hill summit, with an easterly aspect. The main house is at the highest point on the 6.92-acre plot, and the rest of the property slopes east and south away from the house. Slightly uphill of the main house is the 904 Camino Viejo house and water tower, now a separate property. The hill closest to the property, roughly 0.5 miles north from the subject property, rises still higher to over 550 feet above sea level (170 meters). This upward cant
continues to the foot of the steep slopes of the Santa Ynez Mountains, which lay between 2.5 and 3 miles inland from the coast. The Santa Ynez Mountains rise quickly to 3,000 feet and more above sea level. The climate is Mediterranean making it a good location for ranchland and citrus farmland in the Mexican and early-American phases of Santa Barbara history. The area surrounding the subject property has been developed with low-density suburban residential development and the surrounding vegetation reflects this: trees are mostly decorative and horticultural, or shading trees, with eucalyptus throughout. Like other upscale, suburban homes in the immediate vicinity, the landscaping at the subject property includes a mix of horticultural and shade trees, but also includes native oaks, and exotic evergreens.

1.4 Project Personnel

This report was prepared by Dudek architectural historians Sarah Corder, MFA, Kate Kaiser, MSHP, and Bryce Beemer, PhD. Materials analysis of the stone driveway was conducted by Dudek Historic Preservation Specialist Kara Dotter, MSHP. Dudek Historic Built Environment Lead Samantha Murray, MA served as the Architectural History Principal Investigator for the project. All project personnel meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards (PQS) for architectural history (36 CFR Part 61) (see Appendix A, Preparer’s Qualifications).
FIGURE 1
Project Location
Graham Estate Development Project

SOURCE: USGS 7.5-Minute Series Santa Barbara Quadrangle
1.5 Regulatory Setting

National Register of Historic Places

The NRHP is the official list of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects deemed worthy of preservation in the United States. Overseen by the National Park Service under the U.S. Department of the Interior, the NRHP was authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended. Its listings encompass all National Historic Landmarks and historic areas administered by the National Park Service.

NRHP guidelines for the evaluation of historic significance were developed to be flexible and to recognize the accomplishments of all who have made significant contributions to the nation’s history and heritage. Its criteria are designed to guide state and local governments, federal agencies, and others in evaluating potential entries in the NRHP. For a property to be listed in or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, the property must be demonstrated to possess integrity and to meet at least one of the following criteria:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. Historic properties either retain integrity (this is, convey their significance) or they do not. To retain historic integrity, a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the seven aspects of integrity (location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association). The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance (NRHP 2002).

California Register of Historical Resources

In California, the term “historical resource” includes, but is not limited to, “any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or
cultural annals of California” (California Public Resources Code (PRC), Section 5020.1(j)). In 1992, the California legislature established the CRHR “to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change” (PRC Section 5024.1(a)). The criteria for listing resources on the CRHR were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the NRHP, enumerated below. According to PRC Section 5024.1(c)(1–4), a resource is considered historically significant if it (i) retains “substantial integrity,” and (ii) meets at least one of the following criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In order to understand the historic importance of a resource, sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource. A resource less than 50 years old may be considered for listing in the CRHR if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance (see 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) 4852(d)(2)).

The CRHR protects cultural resources by requiring evaluations of the significance of prehistoric and historic resources. The criteria for the CRHR are nearly identical to those for the NRHP, and properties listed or formally designated as eligible for listing in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR, as are the state landmarks and points of interest. The CRHR also includes properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.

City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code – Chapter 22.22 Historic Structures

22.22.040 Criteria for Designation of Landmarks and Structures of Merit.

In considering a proposal to recommend to the City Council any structure, natural feature, site, or area for designation as a Landmark or, in designating a City Structure of Merit, the Commission shall utilize any or all of the following criteria and considerations:

A. Its character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;
B. Its location as a site of a significant historic event;
C. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City, the State or the Nation;

D. Its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City, the State or the Nation;

E. Its exemplification of the best remaining architectural type in a neighborhood;

F. Its identification as the creation, design or work of a person or persons whose effort has significantly influenced the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;

G. Its embodiment of elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship;

H. Its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that landmark;

I. Its unique location or singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood;

J. Its potential of yielding significant information of archaeological interest;

K. Its integrity as a natural environment that strongly contributes to the well-being of the people of the City, the State or the Nation. (Ord. 5333, 2004; Ord. 4848, 1994; Ord. 3900 §1, 1977.)

City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code – Chapter 22.12 Archaeological and Paleontological Resources

22.12.020 Standards.

1. KNOWN SITES. Permits to perform grading determined through the Environmental Review process or indicated through records kept by the State of California, or the University of California, to be within an area of known or probable archaeological or paleontological significance may be conditioned in such a manner as to:

a) Ensure the preservation or avoidance of the site, if feasible; or

b) Minimize adverse impacts on the site; or

c) Allow reasonable time for qualified professionals to perform archaeological or paleontological investigations at the site; or

d) Preserve for posterity, in such other manner as may be necessary or appropriate in the public interest, the

c) positive aspects of the archaeological or paleontological site involved.

2. UNKNOWN SITES. Where a grading permit has been issued with respect to an area not known at the time of issuance to include archaeological or paleontological resources, and where it is subsequently learned, either by representatives of the City or by any persons doing development pursuant to a grading permit, that significant archaeological or paleontological resources may be encompassed within the area to be graded or being graded, all grading which has substantial potential to damage archaeological or paleontological resources
shall cease and the grading permit deemed suspended to that extent. The finding of a site which may contain significant archaeological or paleontological resources shall be reported to the Chief of Building and Zoning, or the Public Works Director if a public project, and the Community Development Director within 72 hours from the time such archaeological or paleontological resources are found. The Chief of Building and Zoning, or the Public Works Director if a public project, upon receiving such a report, shall cause a preliminary investigation of the site to be made by qualified experts at the permittee's expense within five (5) working days after the time such a report is received. If the preliminary investigation should confirm that the site does or may contain significant archaeological or paleontological resources, the grading permit shall be suspended for a period not to exceed 45 days after the date the finding of the resources was first reported to or learned by the City. During the period of suspension, and as promptly as reasonably possible, the Chief of Building and Zoning, or the Public Works Director if a public project, shall develop conditions to be included in the grading permit pursuant to the provisions of Subsection 22.12.020.1 When such conditions are developed and included in the grading permit, said permit shall be deemed reissued subject to such conditions, and the suspension shall be deemed terminated. In extraordinary circumstances, the suspension may be extended beyond 45 days if the Chief of Building and Zoning, or the Public Works Director if a public project, makes application to the City Council for such an extension and the Council shall approve extension of the suspension.

3. APPEALS. Any condition or conditions imposed pursuant to the provisions of Subsection 22.12.020.1 may be appealed to the Planning Commission and thence to the Council in the manner prescribed by Section 1.30.050 of this Code. (Ord. 5136, 1999; Ord. 4174, 1982.)
2 HISTORIC CONTEXT

2.1 Pre-History and Ethnography of Santa Barbara

The local prehistoric chronology is divided into four major periods – Paleoindian, Early Period, Middle Period, and Late Period. It is generally accepted that humans entered the New World during the latter part of the Wisconsin glaciation between 40,000 and 20,000 years before present (B.P.). The earliest unquestioned evidence of human occupation in southern Santa Barbara County is dated to between 10,000 to 8,000 B.P. (Erlandson and Colten 1991). Paleoindian groups during this time focused on hunting Pleistocene megafauna, including mammoth and bison. Plants and smaller animals were undoubtedly part of the Paleoindian diet as well, and when the availability of large game was reduced by climatic shifts near the end of the Pleistocene, the subsistence strategy changed to a greater reliance on these resources. Post-Pleistocene changes in climate and environment are reflected in the local archaeological record by approximately 8,000 B.P., the beginning of the Early Period, as defined by Chester King (1990). The Early Period of the Santa Barbara Channel mainland was originally defined by Rogers (1929), who called it the “Oak Grove” Period. The diagnostic feature of this period is the mano and metate milling stones, which were used to grind hard seeds such as sage for consumption. Toward the end of the Early Period, sea mammal hunting appears to have supplemented subsistence strategies (Glassow et al. 1990).

The Middle Period (3,350 to 800 B.P.) is characterized by larger and more permanent settlements, related to a generally wetter environment. Materials from Middle Period sites reflect a greater reliance on marine resources and include marine shells, fish remains, and fishhooks. A major shift in vegetable food exploitation occurred, as the mano and metate milling stones were replaced by stone mortars and pestles. This indicates a transition from seed gathering to oak tree acorn gathering and processing, a result of cooler temperatures and more expansive oak woodland habitats. Toward the end of this period, the plank canoe was developed, making ocean fishing and trade with the Channel Islands safer and more efficient (Arnold 1987). Terrestrial resources continued to be exploited as evidenced by the presence of contracting-stemmed and corner-notched projectile points from Middle Period sites (Bamforth 1984).

The Late Period (800 to 150 B.P. or approximately A.D. 1150 to 1800) was a time of increased social and economic complexity. The increased number of permanent and semi-permanent villages clustered along the Santa Barbara Channel and on the Channel Islands, and the diversity of environmental site settings in which sites have been identified, indicates a substantial increase in prehistoric population (King 1990, Johnson and McLendon 1999, Gamble 2008). Intensification of terrestrial as well as marine resources occurred. Acorns continued to be processed, and land mammals were hunted with the bow and arrow, rather than exclusively by spear. Trade networks, probably controlled by village chiefs, expanded and played an important part in local Chumash culture, reinforcing status differences and encouraging craft specialization. Shell beads, found throughout the Early and Middle Periods, increased in number and variety, related to status and social value (King 1990, Gamble 2008, Johnson 1988). The protohistoric culture of the Chumash was terminated by the
arrival of a Spanish expedition led by Gaspar de Portolá in 1769. Chumash culture changed dramatically with the establishment of the Missions of Santa Barbara, Santa Ynez, and La Purísima (Johnson 1988).

2.2 Historical Overview of Santa Barbara

The historic occupation of the project vicinity can be divided into three settlement periods: the Mission Period (A.D. 1769–1830), the Rancho Period (ca. A.D. 1830–1865), and the American Period (ca. A.D. 1865–1915). Construction of Mission Santa Barbara in 1786 altered both the physical and cultural landscape of the region. The mission was the center of Spanish influence in the region and affected native patterns of settlement, culture, trade, industry, and agriculture. Following the secularization of the missions by the Mexican Government in 1821, California became part of the Republic of Mexico.

Secularization of lands and a focus on cattle raising marked the Rancho Period, where large land grants of mission lands were ceded to wealthy, prominent Spanish families. Native Americans continued to work as laborers on ranchos during this period. With California statehood in 1850 and the advent of the American Period, farming and more intensive land uses steadily replaced cattle stock raising. Cattle ranching was substantially curtailed by a prolonged drought in the 1860s.

Shortly following the establishment of California as a state, the American Gold Rush became a huge factor in the development of many towns in California, including Santa Barbara. It is during the American Period that Santa Barbara transformed from a small town to a sizable city. Advances in transportation and infrastructure within the rapidly developing city provided additional opportunities for commerce and increased settlement. Two of the most significant advances in transportation and infrastructure were the construction of Stearns Wharf in 1872 and the construction of the railroad in the early twentieth century. These innovations connected Santa Barbara not only to the rest of California, but also to the rest of the world through its thriving shipping industry (CSB 2000; DSB 2018).

The early 1900s were a period of substantial growth and development within the City. By 1910, the population reached 11,659. A variety of traditional industries grew such as retail, banking, and service-related businesses. In addition, there was a significant development in the tourism industry and the silent film industry. State Street flourished with new businesses and specialty shops, further supporting the resort atmosphere of the city and the local clientele (CSB 2000; DSB 2018).

In addition to commercial development, important steps were taken during the first two decades of the twentieth century to support the increased population, including construction of the Gibraltar Dam (started in 1913 and completed in 1920), construction of the Central Library and Post Office in 1917, construction of the Sheffield Reservoir water storage facility in 1918, and the expansion of the police force to include an automobile in 1915 and a shooting range in 1920. By 1920, the population grew again to 19,441 (CSB 2000).
Another significant event that would prove significantly influential to Santa Barbara’s architectural history was the Panama-California Exposition of 1915 in San Diego. Following the exposition, Santa Barbara took steps to create buildings designed in the showcased Spanish Colonial style. The Central Library (1917), Santa Barbara County National Bank (1919-1921), the Old Physician’s Building/Santa Barbara Clinic (1920), City Hall (1923), and the Lobero Theater (1924) represent early projects completed in this style of architecture in the city. In addition to the interest in architecture, there was clear interest in other community-related art and culture development in the early teens and twenties. Groups such as the Santa Barbara Community Arts Association formed in 1920 and took on city beautification projects (CSB 2000, 2009).

Although Santa Barbara was clearly on a positive trajectory towards becoming a flourishing modern city, a significant setback occurred on June 29, 1925, when a large earthquake occurred. The following quote from the Santa Barbara Historical Museum summarized the destruction caused by the earthquake:

> The twin towers of Mission Santa Barbara collapsed, and eighty-five percent of the commercial buildings downtown were destroyed or badly damaged. A failed dam in the foothills released forty-five million gallons of water, and a gas company engineer became a hero when he shut off the city’s gas supply and prevented fires like those that destroyed San Francisco twenty years earlier (Santa Barbara Historical Museum 2018).

The city made significant steps towards rebuilding, including the establishment of an Architectural Review Board to control new construction and renovation planning for the structures damaged or lost during the earthquake in 1925. Following the earthquake, the City of Santa Barbara continued to rebuild, grow and develop throughout the first half of the twentieth century. By mid-century, the city boundaries were expanded to the north and commercial and retail development began to shift from the downtown core to the northern part of the city (DSB 2018; Santa Barbara Historical Museum 2018).

### 2.3 Estate Development in Santa Barbara and Montecito

As Santa Barbara was transitioning from town to city in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Montecito was transitioning from farmland to a suburban neighborhood composed of wealthy estates. Isaac George Waterman was the first to purchase land in Montecito for an estate, which he established in 1892. The Waterman family had built a fortune from Caribbean coffee plantations, coal, and railroads, and like many other wealthy families from the Eastern United States, George Waterman’s grandmother sent him to Santa Barbara at age 14 to mend his ill health. Southern California returned his vigor and Waterman chose to remain in Santa Barbara as an adult. After Waterman was married in 1892, he acquired 42 acres of land in Montecito, which became known as the Mira Vista Estate (Figure 2). Waterman was a consummate host, and Mira Vista soon became a magnet for wealthy transplants and tourists who were flooding into the Santa Barbara area, popularizing Montecito as a desirable location for building and developing large estates. (Redmon 2017a).
Development of Montecito continued as wealthy Midwestern and East Coast transplants continued to establish elaborate homes and estates in the Santa Barbara and Montecito area through the economic boom years of the 1920s. However, this growth and development pattern was temporarily halted by the 1925 earthquake, which leveled many area homes and buildings. As was the case with much of Santa Barbara, the Spanish Colonial Revival style became the go-to style for post-earthquake reconstructions and new construction projects in the Montecito area including the large estates, which followed the precedent being set within the City of Santa Barbara with their use of the Spanish Colonial Revival Style for reconstruction efforts (CSB 2000; Redmon 2017c; DSB 2018).

The silent film industry also flourished for several decades in Santa Barbara before transitioning to Los Angeles. Many Hollywood stars saw the estates and stately homes developing in this area as an ideal location for vacation and retirement properties. This marked the beginning of Montecito’s connection to leading figures in the entertainment industry. In 1928, silent film star Charlie Chaplin and a group of investors built the Mediterranean and Spanish Colonial inspired Montecito Inn, advertising it as a getaway spot for Hollywood luminaries (Redmon 2017c; Los Angeles Times 2006; Population.us 2018; Associated Press 2018a).

One specific neighborhood that reflects this period of estate development is the neighborhood currently referred to as Eucalyptus Hill. The current neighborhood is comprised of lands associated with both Santa
Barbara and Montecito. Five titans of industry and philanthropy, sometimes referred to as the “Hilltop Barons”, sparked lavish estate development in the Eucalyptus Hill and Pepper Hill area during the 1910s and 1920s. These five wealthy men who were first to develop the area include (Beresford 2012/2013; Tyler 2013; Graffy 2015; Myrick 1991; Santa Barbara Independent 2011):

- George Owen Knapp, President of and one of the founders of Union Carbide and owner of Arcady (1912);
- Frederick Forrest Peabody, President of Arrow Shirts and owner of Solana (1915);
- William H. Cowles, a newspaper and publishing magnate and owner of Eucalyptus Hill (1915);
- C.K.G. Billings, Chairman of the Board and one of the founders of Union Carbide, and owner of Asombrosso (1919);
- David Gray, a Vice-President from Ford Motor Company, and owner of Graholm (1920).

The “Hilltop Barons” were not only responsible for the lavish estates, they were also generous philanthropists that helped to shape the growth and development of both Santa Barbara and Montecito in the first half of the twentieth century. While many of their donations and professional assistance was in response to the reconstruction efforts following the 1925 earthquake, other charitable organizations benefited greatly from their financial support. These organizations include, but are not limited to the following: Montecito Garden Tours, East Beach, Cottage Hospital, Sansum Clinic, Montecito Trails, Scenic Highway, Santa Barbara School for the Arts, Santa Barbara Art Museum, Santa Barbara High School, Cabrillo Pavilion, and the Santa Barbara Medical Foundation (Graffy 2015; Myrick 1991).

### 2.4 History of Graholm

#### History of Land Ownership

Originally, the land comprising Graholm was part of the larger Pueblo de Santa Barbara lands from the Spanish Colonial period. After Mexican independence was granted in 1824, the Mexican government sold off mission lands to pay its debts, and made several land grants to former soldiers and favorites of the governor. When California became a state in 1850, lands were given to the City of Santa Barbara, including “outside Pueblo Lands”. The City of Santa Barbara, in turn, granted lands to applicants in 40-acre measures. (Cole 2003; Wackenreuder 1853)

The first person to apply for a grant that encompassed the subject property was Benigno Gutierrez, a Chilean national and local Santa Barbara druggist since 1854. Gutierrez was awarded Outside Pueblo Lots 84, 85, 86, 92, and 93. Afterwards, the lots were sold to Miguel Smith in 1871, who in turn sold them to Dr. James Ashley in 1872. Ashley’s purchase encompassed 357 acres and Gutierrez’s lands, including Outside Pueblo Lots 74, 75, and 76, in addition to Gutierrez’s lots. Ashley’s lands encompassed the future estate lands from the Gray, Knapp and Billings families. After Ashley’s death in 1876, his widow, Mary inherited the lands. Before her
death in 1904, Mary Ashley’s nephew Frank M. Gallaher managed her property and subdivided her lands, allowing himself a plot on her northeast land, which appears on an 1891 map (Reicker 1891). In 1906, Ashley’s lands were subdivided into multiple parcels, and the subject property was part of the “Alley Tract,” 49.495 acres awarded to William Alley, another prominent Midwesterner who relocated to Montecito, and held an estate of his own at Morgan Hill. Alley and his wife died in 1919, and their properties were sold, including the Alley Tract. Later that year, David Gray bought 30 acres of the Alley Tract (Cole 2003; Flournoy 1906, N.D.; Myrick 1987; Reicker 1891; Storke 1891).

**David Gray (Owner from 1919-1928)**

David Gray (1870-1928) was one of four children born to John and Anna Gray. John Gray (1841-1906) was a candy and fireworks manufacturer in Michigan who parlayed his business interests to become the president of the German American Bank of Detroit. In 1903, John Gray purchased a 10% interest in Ford Motor Company, five years before production of the Model-T launched the company to global prominence. After John Gray passed away, his son, David Gray, served on Ford’s board of directors. In 1916, David Gray resigned from Ford. In 1919, he sold his family’s stock in the company for $26.5 million dollars (originally purchased in 1903 for just $10,000 dollars) (Cole 2003; Beresford 2012/2013; Myrick 1991).

David Gray and his family spent much of their time living in Detroit and maintaining a vacation house in Nantucket. While residing in Michigan, David Gray traveled to the Santa Barbara area on multiple occasions to visit local Ford dealer E.W. Alexander. It was during these visits that his fondness for the Santa Barbara area grew and he decided to purchase property in Santa Barbara in the 1910s. Following his arrival in Santa Barbara, David Gray became known as a generous philanthropist and benefactor of the arts. He was particularly concerned that Santa Barbara’s beaches remained unspoiled, and wanted to prevent Coney Island-style developments from springing up. To this end, in 1924, Gray joined the East Boulevard Improvement Association, which was organized to purchase ocean front land and hold it until the city could buy it. When the Association’s work was finished, Gray donated an additional $100,000 for the construction of the Cabrillo Pavilion as part of a plan to support public recreation at East Beach. He also headed a committee to buy up parcels of land from Stearns Wharf to the Bird Refuge and held them until a public bond was passed allowing the land to pass to the local government. He supported community beautification drives. He supported music education and donated money and land to the Santa Barbara School of the Arts. He subsidized annual concerts by the L.A. Philharmonic Orchestra in Santa Barbara. The Pavilion hosted music, plays, and conventions for many decades and was managed in its first years by Sauter (The Morning Press 1928; Tompkins 1992; Myrick 1991).

**Original Construction (1919-1924)**

Following the sale of his family’s stock in 1919, David Gray purchased the 29-acre parcel that would become Graholm. Gray’s intention with the purchase was to build an estate under the design expertise of Roland F. Sauter beginning in 1919. Sauter’s design for the property included a Spanish Colonial Revival style home
built at the crest of Pepper Hill, using local stone, using the existing landscape, and having a commanding view of the surrounding Montecito landscape. Sauter achieved his design goals at a cost of $75,000. Throughout the design of Graholm, Sauter utilized stonework as a rustic design motif that repeated throughout the property. His stonework designs can be seen not only on the main house, but also throughout the curving walls lining the driveway, as well as other retaining wall elements throughout the landscape. Another interesting element of Sauter’s design for the stonework and the rustic design aesthetic was achieved through his direction to the stone workers to leave the outward facing stonework uncarved. Further adding to the rustic nature of the property, Sauter designed the foundation to work within the natural landscape and laid the foundation in such a matter that the main house appeared to naturally rise out of the hillside (Figures 3 through 7)(Beresford 2013a, 2013b; Cole 2003; Myrick 1991).
Figure 4. Graholm mostly completed in 1920, is located on Pepper Hill in Montecito (Gledhill Library)

Figure 5. Alston Road main entry gate to Graholm. Note the incorporation of local, natural stonework (Gledhill Library)
Figure 6. Graholm main house under construction circa 1920 (Graholm 2018)

Figure 7. Graholm main house under construction circa 1920 (Graholm 2018)
Upon completion of initial construction of the main house, the estate was named Graholm. Originally, the house had multiple master bedrooms, five bathrooms, four servants bedrooms, two servants bathrooms, living room, billiards room, several gallery spaces, library, wine room, machinery room, laundry, as well as, a shooting hall. Once completed, the Grays filled their new residence with a variety of antiques and art purchased while on a shopping excursion in Europe (Figure 8) (Beresford 2012/2013; Graholm 2018).

While the bulk of the main house was completed by 1920, the intricate and elaborate ironwork seen throughout the property was not completed until 1924. Examples of the elaborate ironwork can be seen in estate’s grand entry gate, iron grilles, sconces, and windows (Beresford 2013a).

In addition to the lavish rooms, fine furnishings, artwork, stonework and ironwork of the completed Graholm, Gray also intended the building to have a practical purpose that is described in Walter A. Tompkins’ *Santa Barbara History Makers* as follows:

> At the time his mansion, “Graholm” was building, war was raging in Europe. Gray was appalled by the damage Zeppelins were doing to England in night bombing raids, the beginnings of aerial warfare. David Gray created Santa Barbara’s first “bomb shelter” by making the roof and ceilings of Graholm three feet thick of solid concrete reinforced with steel, in case Santa Barbara was ever subjected to air attack (Tompkins 1992).
Multiple ancillary structures were also built on the property throughout the 1920s, the most impressive being the water tower designed by Sauter for the property. When completed, the tower was 47 feet high and could hold up to 20,000 gallons of water. The total cost for construction of the water tower was $15,000. While the water tower still stands today, it is no longer part of Graholm, but part of the adjacent property that developed following the first subdivision of the original parcel in 1930 (Cole 2003; Beresford 2013).

**Graholm Subdivision (1930-1952)**

David Gray passed away unexpectedly of pneumonia in 1928 and control of Graholm passed to his wife, Martha. Shortly thereafter, in 1930 the first subdivision of the Gray property occurred. In 1930, David Gray Jr., the son of David and Martha Gray, built his home adjacent to Graholm on an 11-acre parcel gifted to him by his mother. This reduced Graholm in size to approximately 19.5 acres. David Gray Jr. interestingly chose to attach his home to the 47-foot Spanish Colonial Revival water tower built by his father in 1924. The home, built of adobe in the Monterey Colonial style, and attached water tower are now considered a historic resource by Santa Barbara’s Historic Landmarks Commission for its association with Roland Sauter, its association with David Gray, and its 1930s interpretation of an early nineteenth century adobe style building. Upon the passing of his mother, David Gray Jr. inherited Graholm in 1948 (Cole 2003).

Following the death of his mother, David Gray Jr. put Graholm up for sale. At the time of the sale the house was listed as having 26 master bedrooms, 4 servant bedrooms, 5 master bathrooms, and 2 servant bathrooms. Graholm and its 19.45 acres were purchased on January 5, 1948 by Herschel McGraw. In addition to the purchase of the property, McGraw also separately purchased the following items associated with Graholm: “all of the household furniture and furnishings, art objects, garden tools and equipment and other tangible personal property (Graholm 2018). The following Figure 9 is a map showing the division of parcels as they stood at the time of sale in 1948 as part of Martha Gray’s estate holdings.
Another change brought to the property was when the McGraws opened the property for public tours on November 1, 1948. According to a local newspaper article, the McGraws were encouraged to share their estate and its art with the public as a cultural point of interest for tourists, as well as, residents of the area. Figure 10 shows the promotional card that was used for the tours of the home (Graham 2018):
During the McCraw period of ownership a variety of property reconfigurations took place at Graholm. Shortly after the sale of the property to the McCraw family, subdivisions to the property were made along Alston Road to create multiple parcels, with the last division of parcels approved on October 23, 1952 (CSB 1952; Shively 1999).
The Brooks Institute (1952-1999)

Graholm went through a significant transformation in 1952 when it was purchased for $61,000 by Ernest H. Brooks Sr. as the new site for the Brooks Institute, a school for professional photography. By the time of Brook’s 1952 purchase, the estate had been subdivided twice and the resulting property encompassed just under eight acres, a significant decrease from Graholm’s original 39 acres. Brooks, a professional photographer and entrepreneur, opened his first photography school in 1945 at 903 State Street, just after the war. Attendance exploded as many recipients of the G.I. Bill looked to photography as an interesting post-War career and the second school location at 629 ½ State Street proved too small. Graholm became both the new campus for the Institute as well as home to the Brooks’ family. The school was widely respected as a training center for photographers. The ornate hand-wrought gates to Graholm were used widely in advertisements and promotions (Figure 11). The school’s new location on a former estate was also used as a setting for photography training and professional photo shoots (Figure 12) (Graholm 2018; Lanz-Mateo 1999; Redmon 2012).

Figure 11. Students at the Brooks Institute pass through Graholm’s entry gate to attend classes, c 1950s. Note the estate’s wrought iron gate and stone archway (Lanz-Mateo 1999).
In 1971, the Institute’s ownership passed to Ernest Brooks II, the son of Ernest Brooks. He sought to expand the 8-acre Graholm by buying the 9-acre former home of David Gray Jr. and other properties on Camino Viejo that had originally been part of Graholm before it had been subdivided. However, following the purchase of these properties, the Brooks Institute was unable to acquire the necessary permits for the school’s expansion and these properties were put back on the market. The Institute eventually expanded to two additional properties dubbed the Riviera Campus and the Jefferson Campus, however, Graholm property remained the heart of the school (Lanz-Mateo 1999; Cole 2003; Redmon 2012).

In 1994, the financial health of the Brooks Institute was in decline. The recession had severely cut enrollment, once at a high of 750 students, it dropped to 475 in 1994. The institute was $5 million in debt, and its president, Ernest Brooks II, announced his desire to retire. The school was not in danger of bankruptcy according to news accounts, but needed to restructure. The school was restructured as a non-profit educational organization to cut overhead costs. One of the most important changes was to sell Graholm, which served as the central campus. Maintaining the old building, it was reported, was too expensive. However, the school could not right itself financially. In 1999, the Brooks family sold the Institute to a for-profit higher education corporation. Graholm was still being used by the Institute in this year. It appears from newspaper accounts that the Estate was finally sold after 1999. With this sale, the estate returned to being a residential property (Santa Barbara News Press 1994; Santa Barbara News Press 1999).

During the ownership period by the Brooks Institute (1952-1999) permits were filed under both 2190 Alston Road (current address) and 801 Alston Road (previous address). Review of the permits indicates minor changes were made to the site’s exteriors and interiors. In October of 1959, a permit for new construction of
a non-residential building for large-scale photography was filed and approved for the site (Permit #19126). In September of 1996, reroofing took place in order to remove the existing tile roof, install new underlayment while retaining as much original tile as possible (Permit # BLD96-01432). In December of 1999, a permit was filed to remodel the reception area, approximately 110 square feet with no structural changes made (Permit #BLD1999-02628). In June of 2000 a permit was filed to remove a wall that was separating two classrooms to create a larger one (Permit #BLD2000-01185).

**The Modern Development Period 1999-Present**

Following ownership of the property by the Brooks Institute, the property was returned to its original function as a private residence, this time under the ownership of Anne and Allen Sides. During their ownership (c.1999-2018) period, the large parking lots that covered much of the east lawn and area north of the main house were removed. According to aerial photography, it appears that this change happened between 2012 and 2014. Aerial photography also indicates that in 2014, the east lawn had been reconstructed and two stonework terraces were installed in place of the parking lots. The only other renovations that appear to have taken place during the Sides’ ownership were interior renovations, specifically kitchen renovations completed prior to the house being listed on the market in 2015. In 2018, Graholm was sold to the current owners Bruce Heavin and Lynda Weinman (LAT 2015; Mineards 2018; NETR 2018; ParcelQuest 2018).

**Architect: Roland Frederick Sauter (1886-1951)**

Roland Frederick Sauter (1886-1951) was one of Santa Barbara’s most heralded architects working in Spanish influenced designs. Sauter was born in Maryland to a farming family. He studied art, design, and drafting at the Maryland Institute, graduating in 1910. In 1912, Sauter relocated to Santa Barbara and found work as a construction foreman at “El Cerrito,” the Santa Barbara hilltop estate of one of the founders of the Cadillac Motor Company, Clarence A. Black. Sauter oversaw construction of the Spanish Colonial Revival complex and the elaborate stonework central to the estate’s design: the building’s sandstone foundation, the stone staircase that rose from the courtyard to the roof, massive retaining walls, and the roadway leading to the home. This early work strongly influenced Sauter who made local stone and stone handwork a hallmark of his future designs (Santa Barbara News Press 1951; Beresford 2013a).

Roland Sauter opened his own architecture firm in 1914 and continued to work for Black on multiple projects including: a retaining wall and parking area for the Santa Barbara Mission; road construction and grading; parking lots; a tram station at Los Olivos and Laguna; and a lodge for the Black family near San Marcos Pass. The 1915 Panama-California Exposition in San Diego cemented the popularity of Spanish Colonial Revival architecture, not just in California, but, also, in New Mexico, Arizona, Texas, Florida, and Hawai‘i. This likely benefited Sauter who had already experimented with the style due to his work with the Black family. By 1916, Sauter’s architecture firm was attracting major commissions including the downtown location of the First Presbyterian Church completed in 1918. Following his work on the Church, Sauter was commissioned to
create Graholm for David Gray, which allowed him to showcase his skills including his preference for incorporating rustic elements into design projects (Beresford 2013a; Shively 1999).

By 1922, Sauter’s firm promoted E. Keith Lockard to partner and became Sauter & Lockard. By the 1920s, Santa Barbara community leaders were interested in promoting Spanish Colonial Revival-style architecture and took bids to replace the Victorian-era City Hall. In 1922, Sauter and Lockard’s Spanish Colonial Revival design won the city’s approval. In the same year, the firm also won a bid to build the local high school in the same style. Both the City Hall and the high school were completed in 1924 (Beresford 2013a, 2013b).

When the 1925 earthquake struck the Santa Barbara area, Sauter & Lockard were brought in to help with the reconstruction projects throughout the City. City leaders elected to rebuild the city in the popular Spanish Colonial Revival style. Sauter & Lockard participated in many of these rebuilding projects, designing new Spanish-style edifices for earthquake-damaged buildings. Sauter & Lockard worked on redesigning the Fithian Building, the Hotel Neal, and the Barbara Hotel. In 1925, when David Gray wanted to fund the construction of the Cabrillo Pavilion, he turned again to Sauter who designed a Spanish Colonial Revival-style building with Moorish screen work. The Pavilion was completed in 1927 and Sauter was asked to manage the complex. Sauter partially operated his architectural business from an office located in the Pavilion for the next five years (Redmon 2017d; Santa Barbara Independent 2017, 2018a).

The Great Depression was a truly difficult time for Sauter. His partnership with Lockard dissolved in 1926, but more importantly, Clarence A. Black and David Gray had each passed away in the years before the stock market collapse in 1929. The City of Santa Barbara changed practices and demanded that any person advertising themselves as an architect had to have the state certification to practice architecture. Sauter moved offices twice, and by 1932, Sauter closed his architectural practice. In 1937, he changed his job title from architect to draftsman. Then in 1951, Sauter passed away (Beresford 2013b).

Roland Frederick Sauter’s notable designs in Santa Barbara include the following:

- First Presbyterian Church, Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara (1918)
- Graholm Estate, Santa Barbara (1920)
- Casa Loma Estate, Santa Barbara (1924)
- Santa Barbara City Hall, 735 Anacapa St., Santa Barbara. Sauter & Lockard (1924)
- Fithian Building exterior remodel, State Street, Santa Barbara. Sauter & Lockard (1925)
- Barbara Hotel exterior remodel, State Street, Santa Barbara. Sauter & Lockard (1925)
- Cabrillo Pavilion, 1118 East Cabrillo Blvd., Santa Barbara. Sauter & Lockard (1927)
2.5 Spanish Colonial Revival Style in Southern California (1895–1930)

The Spanish Colonial Revival style has a rich history and popularity in California with a basis in Spanish architectural forms that were heavily influenced by the richness of the history of Spain. The Spanish Colonial Revival in Southern California can be divided into two phases, though the line between the two are somewhat blurred. The first phase was Mission Revival (1880s–1910), which relied on a short list of key features to define the style: simple arcades; gabled ends with parapets, scallops, and often a quatrefoil window; tile roofs, bell towers; and most importantly, broad expanses of rough cement stucco. Southern California contains the largest collection of extant Mission Revival buildings, including the world renowned Mission Inn (1890–1901) in Riverside, one of the largest and most significant examples of the style (Gebhard 1967).

The second phase of Spanish Colonial Revival is generally referred to as Mediterranean Revival (1910–1930s). During this phase, the style drew heavily from Spain and Mexico, but also from Italy and Islamic North Africa (Gebhard 1967). Many see this second phase as producing the most spectacular examples of Spanish Colonial Revival architecture. Deeply rooted in Spanish and Islamic traditions, Hispano-Moorish architecture became a uniquely Southern California tradition following the 1915 Panama-California Exposition in San Diego. Drawing not only from the rich heritage of Southern California and building on the traditions of the incredibly popular Mission Revival movement, architects Bertram G. Goodhue and Carleton Winslow, Sr. chose to elaborate and ornament the style to new levels with his interpretation of the Spanish Colonial principles and precedents from both Spain and Mexico. The elaborate ornament used by Goodhue and the Spanish Colonial Revival architects he influenced was specifically referred to as Churrigueresque (Bevil 1995). Goodhue’s use of the Spanish Colonial Revival style with Churrigueresque ornament at the 1915 exposition was an inspiration to architects and designers throughout California.

Character-Defining Features of the Style

The following summarizes the primary character-defining features for Spanish Colonial Revival architecture in Santa Barbara (CSB 2015:3-4):

**Massing:** The massing of the Spanish Colonial Revival house takes on a wide variety of forms. In all forms, the roof pitch is low (usually 4:12 or less) and an asymmetrical plan is the norm. Five massing types include the side-gabled type, which is rectangular in form and sometimes includes lower side-wing portions; cross-gabled roof, which typically has one front-facing gable and one side facing gable; the hipped-and-gabled roofs; the hipped roof, which tend to be simple rectangular box-shaped houses; and the flat-roof, which is a relative of the Pueblo Revival house.

**Cornice and Eave Details:** Simple if any ornamental detail at the cornices and eaves with the emphasis on the terra cotta tile that create a decorative edge from the roof to the wall.
**Porches and Balconies:** Front entries are often recessed in a deep wall opening. The emphasis is on balconies with balustrades made of wood, plaster, or iron rather than elaborate porches of the Victorian styles.

**Doors:** The wood entry door expresses solidity with an arched decorative plaster or stone surround that sets it apart from the other façade openings. Doors are made of wood planks or panels and recess in the wall plane with a stucco return and no trim. Colorful decorative tiles are used as baseboards, door surrounds, or other features of interest.

**Windows:** Deeply recessed, wood windows are generally fixed or paired casement windows with lights divided by horizontal mullions. Windows recess at the wall plane with a stucco return with no trim. Awnings are often found at window openings. Santa Barbara has many Spanish Colonial Revival buildings with a variety of intricate to simple wood or iron grilles (rejas) over the windows, especially on the ground floor.

**Vents and Chimneys:** Venting in places such as gable peaks is often accomplished through decorative plaster grills. Stucco chimneys are tower-like elements with decorative openings that are both practical and ornamental.

**Wall Materials:** The Spanish Colonial Revival style features smooth, whitewashed, planar, stucco walls, with the emphasis on broad, uninterrupted wall surfaces punctuated by a careful use of openings that are asymmetrically arranged. The thick walls help the plaster building to feel believable as it imitates buildings originally made of load-bearing masonry.
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3 BACKGROUND RESEARCH

3.1 Documents Provided by the City of Santa Barbara

On August 20, 2018, the City of Santa Barbara Urban Historian, Nicole Hernandez provided the following background information (Table 1) about the project site, which was used in the preparation of the historic context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source/Document Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Historic Structures/Sites Report, 904 Camino Viejo, Santa Barbara, California, APN: 015-060-048</td>
<td>Report prepared on adjacent property that was once part of Grahelm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>DPR Form for 904 Camino Viejo Road</td>
<td>DPR prepared by Urban Historian Nicole Hernandez for adjacent property that was once part of Grahelm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>DPR Form for 801 Alston Road (now 2190 Alston Road)</td>
<td>801 Alston Road (now known as 2190 Alston Road) was previously recorded on a DPR form with no date of recordation and no evaluation information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Archival Research

**County of Santa Barbara Assessor's Office**

On September 12, 2018, Dudek visited the County Assessor’s office and requested any information pertaining to the subject property. However, no information was available from the Assessor’s office.

**City of Santa Barbara Community Development Department**

On September 13, 2018, Dudek visited the City Urban Historian, Nicole Hernandez’s office and requested any plans, drawings, or records pertaining to the subject property. Information was available from the Community Development Department concerning copies of the original Roland Sauter as-built drawings (1919), the service wing addition (1927), the porch enclosure (1960), and various grounds alterations and interior remodeling. The information also detailed alterations to the surrounding properties which were once associated with the original parcel. Dudek was instructed to use the Community Development Department website to obtain any additional documents including permits pertaining to the subject property.

Permits for 2190 Alston Road were obtained by Dudek from 1959 until 2017 and for 801 Alston Road from 1971 until as recently as 2018. All permits with relevant information and clear alteration locations were incorporated into the historic context, however, many of the permits reviewed by Dudek were unclear and
could not be verified. All information obtained from the Community Development Department was used in the preparation of the historic context, building description, and alterations sections.

Gledhill Library Santa Barbara Historical Museum

Dudek visited the Gledhill Library Santa Barbara Historical Museum in person on September 12 and 13, 2018, and met with Michael Redmon, Director of Research. Mr. Redmon looked through the archives and provided various documents, as well as, general access for the subject property, David Gray, and Ernest Brooks Sr. The documents and photographs from the Gledhill Library were used in the preparation of the historic context.

Information Provided During Site Visit on September 14, 2018

During the field survey, multiple representatives of the current property owners including Sharon Kempner, provided Dudek with scanned documents and images pertaining to the Graholm and its history. Dudek was informed during the site visit, that many of the historical photographs and documents held by the current owners were donated by Dale Winter Perot, daughter of the second owners the Herschel McGraw and Patricia Dale Duffy. These items were used in the preparation of the historic context for the report.

Review of Historic Aerial Photographs


The 1927 aerial photograph is the first photograph available that shows the Graholm. The main house is visible in the same footprint it presents with today. The east lawn lacks its circling road, and a pool is visible just north of the house. The south lawn appears to have a statue or fountain in it with a round footprint. The round roof of the water tower (which is no longer part of the project site and is now 904 Camino Viejo) is visible among the dense vegetation northwest of the main house. There are several other large estates visible on the hilltops surrounding the subject property, and they are each relatively isolated, standing on dozens of acres and visually separate from the surrounding towns. The 1927 photograph also shows Montecito and parts of south Santa Barbara to be sparsely developed. Farming and orchards are still active in the arroyos and lowlands north of the estate (Fairchild 1927).

Though the subject property does not appear to change, the East Side suburbs of Santa Barbara begin to develop west of the subject property in the 1929 photograph. While the East Side street grid roads appear to
have been laid out, few houses appear fully constructed in the 1929 photograph (Fairchild 1929). The next available aerial from 1938 shows little change in the hilltop estates and there are new agricultural tracts appear north of these hilltop estate. However, suburban development in East Side and Coast Village appears much denser than 1929. Coast Village, south of the subject property, expands its boundaries to the bases of the nearby hills, and Waterfront Park is clearly visible and completed, south of the subject property at the coastal lagoon. Pacific Coast Highway (SR-1), a New Deal-funded highway project that traversed coastal California, is visible as a four-lane road with bridges and ramps south of the subject property and along the coastline (Fairchild 1937). The 1943 aerial continues to show suburban growth encroaching towards the hilltop estates. There is a steady increase in the suburban density in the East Side suburb. Montecito Country Club appears completed, and is clearly visible south of the subject property. Suburban development is increasing north of Hot Springs Road in Montecito, encroaching towards the subject property and the other estates (Fairchild 1943).

A close-scale 1948 aerial photograph shows the property immediately before the original large parcel was subdivided, leaving only the 6.92-acre parcel with the house, garden and grounds (Figure 13). Mature trees are clearly visible in the east lawn and growing against the main house. The circular drive and paths north of the driveway area clearly visible. A tennis court dominates the terrace downhill and north of the house, and on the terrace below (north) that is a large, rectangular pool. The water tower and adobe house at 904 Camino Viejo is clearly visible in relation to the main house and a fence does not yet separate the buildings. Southeast of the lawns and main house are garden beds, and then an open field beyond that to the east (Fairchild 1948).
The 1954 and 1956 aerials show significant transformation to the subject property. In 1952, Ernest H. Brooks Sr. bought the property and created the Brooks Institute, and as such, Brooks added several features to the property to let it operate as a school. The most visible of these changes is a large parking lot for faculty and students that has outgrown the area of the east lawn between mature oaks and the original road. South of the subject property was a newly established subdivision where there had been garden beds before: five new houses on a winding access road off of Alston Road. New homes have also been built on Summit Road and Remetto Road to the south and southeast of the subject property as neighboring estates and large properties were similarly subdivided (Hurd 1954, 1956). In the 1959 aerial photograph, even more homes appear, showing this pattern of suburban development of lands subdivided from larger estates continuing at a steady pace. Summit Road, Alston Road, and Camino Viejo all show new homes on small tracts, encroaching on all of the former hilltop estates. (Hurd 1959).

By 1965, the subject property is still dominated by new parking lots, which have extended into the former tennis court terrace on the north side of the main house. East of the subject property, two new large mansions are visible on the adjacent lots. South of the subject property, Coast Village appears to have become a dense suburb of small homes. Similarly, the Santa Barbara East Side suburb has expanded and grown denser, with schools, industrial development, and multi-family homes in the area. The area in-between has continued to fill in with large homes on big lots, and some of the hilltop estate mansions, visible from the earliest photographs, are demolished southwest of the subject property. New suburban roads such as Dulzura Drive,
Santecito Drive, Skyview Drive and several large house tracts appear under construction immediately north of the subject property along Camino Viejo Road. (International Mapping Corporation 1965). The 1969, 1973, and 1975 aerials reveals a continuing pattern of growth for large planned subdivisions (Hurd 1969, 1973, 1975). By 1994, aerial photographs show nearly all of the agricultural land to the north and south of the subject has been developed into residential use (NETR 2018). The large parking lots that covered much of the east lawn and area north of the main house remained until sometime between the 2012 and 2014 aerial photographs. In 2014, a reconstructed east lawn, with two stonework terraces are visible where the parking lot had been. (NETR 2018).
INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
4 FIELD SURVEY

Dudek Architectural Historian Kate Kaiser, MSHP, and Dudek Archaeologist Heather McDaniel McDevitt, MA, RPA conducted an intensive level survey of the subject property on September 14, 2018. During the survey, Ms. Kaiser and Ms. McDaniel McDevitt documented the entire property with detailed notes and photographs, specifically noting character-defining features, important spatial relationships, landscaping, and any observable alterations to the building. Photographs of the project site were taken with a 16-megapixel Canon Powershot ELPH180 camera. GPS information was recorded with a Trimble GeoXT unit. All field notes, photographs, and records related to the current study are on file at Dudek’s Pasadena, California office.

4.1 Description of Surveyed Resources

The 6.92-acre parcel at 2190 Alston Road is situated at the east side of the top of a low, flat hill, and is accessed by a gated, long driveway from Alston Road. The hill gently slopes downhill and away to the north, east, and south sides. The west side contains the former water tower house and is uphill of the subject property. The south elevation vista looks outward from the hilly Riviera neighborhood towards downtown Santa Barbara, the port, and the ocean. The north elevation vista looks inland towards a steep, vegetated canyon and the Santa Ynez Mountains. Vistas to the east and west are blocked by vegetation. The subject property is a one-story Spanish Colonial Revival-style residence, located in the Riviera neighborhood of Santa Barbara, California. The building is irregular in plan with open-air and enclosed arcaded walkways running parallel along most elevations (Figure 14). The wall cladding is a combination of trowel-finished stucco and uncoursed, uncut native rock. The roof is clad with red clay barrel tiles, and wood rafter tails are visible in the narrow overhanging open eaves. The main entrance is off a circular driveway on the north elevation, within the two wings of the L-shaped building.

Figure 14. Overview of main (north) and west elevations, view looking southeast. View of the stone-paved circular driveway, water feature, and plantings (IMG_0758)
The subject property is best described as a high-style Spanish Colonial Revival and the building retains several character defining features, including multiple low-pitched, cross-gabled roofs; arched entrance portico, door, and window openings; clay barrel tile roof cladding; asymmetrical elevations; stucco cladding that extends unbroken into gable ends; balconette windows; elaborate metal window grilles; arcaded walkways; decorative iron sconces and lighting fixtures; and dramatically carved wood doors.

In addition to the main house, there are several other landscape features and outbuildings around the subject property. These include a garage; store room; pump house; an elaborate fountain with statuary; rock-lined tree wells; terraced gardens; uncoursed random-rubble retaining walls built from uncut native rock; uncut native rock staircases with metal railings; a stone-paved circular driveway; a main gate; and several mature trees around the property, including oaks, eucalyptus, and magnolia trees.

**Main Building Exterior**

The bulk of the main (north) elevation is accessed from the circular driveway feature. The elevation is irregular and asymmetrical, presenting as two sections: a forward-projecting two-story side-gabled section and a broad, one-story section. The first section is clad with trowel-finished stucco, with the lower third clad in uncoursed, uncut native stone; fenestration consists of multi-lite wood single and double casement windows; a narrow pair of multi-lite French doors granting access onto a balconette supported by two decorative metal brackets, the whole enclosed by metal security bars; and a tripartite window consisting of a fixed picture window flanked by narrow five-lite casement windows. All windows except the picture window have metal grilles (Figure 15). The second section, visible from the circular driveway, contains the main entrance to the building. Uncoursed, uncut native stone planters abut this section, except along the western portion where there is a small, stone-paved walkway. The main entrance is set into an arched portico vestibule under a projecting front-gabled roof section, which has decorative iron gates and two large, iron, lantern-style sconces to either side of the entryway (Figure 16). Inside the vestibule, the floor is tiled with irregular stones. The main entry door is a large, wood, double door, elaborately carved with religious depictions. Over the door is a semicircular fan-lite, with an elaborate metal grille over the outside. The door is also flanked by ornate iron sconces, and below the left sconce is a stained glass window depicting the letter “G.” The remainder of the elevation features less elaborate ironwork sconces; multi-lite casement windows below multi-lite fanlights; one-over-one sash windows; double-leaf 12-lite French doors; single-lite casement windows; and one round window. While there are a variety of window types on this elevation as noted above, the windows appear to be original to the house and are either wood windows or steel windows and many feature elaborate metal grilles. Below the roofline on the gable ends and at two points along the side-gable are louvered attic vents.
The west elevation is irregular and asymmetrical, and presents as three sections: the largest section makes up the other “leg” of the L-shaped plan and faces towards the circular driveway, the second section projects forward and represents the other end of the L-shaped plan, and the third section is a small extension set back...
from the second section. The first section has a two-story gable-end portion clad in uncoursed, uncut, native rock veneer that sports five multi-lite windows and a single round window, each with a decorative metal grille, and a tall exterior chimney with battered sides, as well as a long side-gabled one-story portion clad with trowel-finished stucco and hosting a series of twelve evenly-spaced multi-lite, paired metal casement windows under multi-lite fixed fan lites (Figure 17). The second section is represented by a gable end and a side-gabled portion, each clad in trowel-finished stucco. The gable-end portion has a 10-lite paired casement window, a circular attic vent set in decorative stucco detailing, and an arched open entrance into an arcaded walkway (Figure 18). The side-gabled portion has two side-gables at different heights, with a 12-lite paired casement window, a pair of 18-lite French doors accessed by two stone-clad steps, and a single-lite fixed window; the doors are flanked with decorative iron wall sconces (Figure 19). The third section of the west elevation has a narrow side-gabled portion and a gable-end portion, each clad in trowel-finished stucco with the lower third clad in uncoursed, uncut, native rock veneer. Fenestration includes a pair of one-over-one wood-sash windows separated by a broad mullion and protected by a security panel of metal lattice work, and a large picture window flanked on either side by narrow single-lite casement windows protected by metal grilles (Figure 20). While there are a variety of window types on this elevation as noted above, the windows appear to be original to the house and are either wood windows or steel windows.

Figure 17. Overview of west elevation, left side (IMG_0746).
Figure 18. Overview of west elevation, middle section, letting out onto patio (IMG_0837).

Figure 19. Overview of west elevation, middle section, letting out onto patio (IMG_0857).
The south elevation is irregular and asymmetrical, and presents as five sections: a recessed side-gabled section, a partial front-gabled section, a two-story side-gabled section, a long side-gabled section, and a one-story front-gabled section. The recessed side-gabled section is fronted by an open multiple-arched walkway, clad in uncoursed, uncut native stone below the arch bases and trowel-finished stucco above. The second section is clad in trowel-finished stucco, and has a divided partial-lite door flanked to each side by a window protected by a security panel of metal lattice work. The two-story side-gabled section is clad at the ground level and partially up the right (east) corner with uncoursed, uncut native stone while the second story is clad in trowel-finished stucco; fenestration includes two arch-topped 12-lite casement windows below two rectangular windows, all of which are protected by metal grilles (Figure 21). The long side-gabled section is clad in trowel-finished stucco and contains a large metal-framed full-lite double door topped by a fan light, each protected by decorative metal grilles and accessed via a flight of nine shallow steps. Left of the door is a single multi-lite, paired metal casement window under a multi-lite fixed fan lite, and right of the door are four evenly-spaced multi-lite, paired metal casement windows under multi-lite fixed fan lites; a short arched window well protected by a grid of metal bars is situated below each of the four windows (Figure 22). The fifth section is accessed from an elevated patio, and is clad in trowel-finished stucco. To the left (west) is a large picture window, flanked to each side by a narrow casement window protected by metal grilles, shelters beneath a broad fabric awning supported by four twisted metal rods, to the right a full-lite double door and fan lite set in decorative metal ironwork and accessed by seven shallow steps, and above in the gable end is a round attic vent protected by an oriel fitted with a curved decorative metal grille (Figure 23).
Figure 21. Overview of south elevation, third section (IMG_0878).

Figure 22. Overview of south elevation, fourth section (IMG_0886).
The east elevation is irregular and asymmetrical, and presents as four sections: a recessed two-story front- and side-gabled section, a two-story side-gabled section, a long one-story side-gabled section, and a two-story front-gabled section (Figure 24). The front-gabled portion of the first section is clad in uncoursed, uncut native stone, has a centered exterior chimney with battered sides, and is devoid of fenestration, whereas the side-gabled portion is clad in trowel-finished stucco and has four evenly-spaced multi-lite, paired metal casement windows under multi-lite fixed fan lites at the second floor with two irregularly spaced, arched window wells protected by a grid of metal bars. The second section is clad at the ground level with uncoursed, uncut native stone while the second story is clad in trowel-finished stucco. Fenestration at the ground floor includes a heavy, arched, carved wood double door with hammered metal fixtures under an arched fabric awning, flanked by two multi-pane double casement windows protected by metal grilles, and a small lunette window with metal grille. At the second floor, there are six evenly-spaced multi-lite, paired steel casement windows under multi-lite fixed fan lites. The long side-gabled section is accessed from a full-length elevated patio reached by nine shallow stone-clad stairs at the middle point. Approximately three-fifths of the patio is enclosed in 1960 with a three-quarter lite double-door located near the top of the stairs and a series of several large single-lite windows, of which two pairs are sliding windows. Unlike the other windows on this elevation, these wood windows date from 1960 and are not original to the house. The remaining visible wall portion is clad in trowel-finished stucco and has irregular fenestration consisting of three single-lite double casement windows and a smaller single casement window, each protected by a metal grille. The two-story front-gabled section is clad at the ground level with uncoursed, uncut native stone at the second story is clad in trowel-finished stucco. Nine stone steps of variable depth lead to a heavy, arched, carved wood double door at ground level, while at the second story are two rectangular double casement windows protected by metal grilles and
in the gable end is a round attic vent guarded by a metal grille. With the exception of the wood windows in the 1960 enclosure, the east elevation is predominately comprised of a variety of window types that are wood windows or steel windows, which appear to be original to the house.

![Figure 24. Overview of east elevation (IMG_0637)](image)

**Exterior Alterations**

There are few exterior alterations to the subject property, although some are notable. One such alteration is the 1927 service wing addition north of the kitchen. The entry to the service wing addition is still visible on the west elevation of the building. The enclosed patio space on the east elevation is another notable addition, as the original architectural drawings indicate that the patio section was originally open. The patio alteration also disrupted egress to the south and north wings, which once would have had exterior access. Permits indicate that this alteration was completed in 1960 by architect Lawrence F. Hughes, in a large-scale reimagining of the subject property and grounds for the new Brooks Institute. Another observed alteration along the east elevation is the enclosure of a previously open, arcaded walkway at the first (southern) section (date of alteration unknown). Historical photographs indicate it was an open-air, arcaded walkway, and the metal grille doors at the end were originally open-air as well. For specific locations of the addition and the two enclosures discussed above, see the Site Plan on Page A01.10 in Appendix C.
Outbuildings and Structures

There are several outbuildings and structures on the property. These consisted of two storage sheds, a former garage, an entrance gate, a fountain feature, a patio with an integrated outdoor fireplace, and a non-operable pump house. Originally there were more outbuildings, but land containing servants’ quarters, a guest house, and a water tower was subdivided from the subject property in the 1950s.

The gate feature is the first built structure observed when approaching the property (Figure 25). It is visible from a Y-shaped, paved driveway that connects the access road to Alston Road. The gate is several feet thick, and has a decorative, Mission-esque ogee curve, then flares outward from the arch to the base and then curves up into a rounded arch. The gate structure is clad with stucco, and grown over with a vine plant. The gate features two iron gates, which are operated remotely. Hanging from the inside of the arch is an iron pendant lamp.

One of the storage outbuildings is downhill and southeast of the main building, located near the flowerbeds. It is of modern, prefabricated construction with plywood cladding with trim, a single vinyl window, and a plywood door. The building has a movable foundation and currently appears to rest atop concrete masonry units.

The other storage building is immediately north of the main building’s north wing. It is in poor condition, but is visually discernable as being executed in the same Spanish Colonial Revival style as the main house. It
features trowel-finished stucco walls and a red clay barrel tile roof. Many of the roof tiles are damaged and need to be replaced. The plan dimensions are roughly 15 ft. by 20 ft., with a shed-roofed open air storage area on the north side of the building. On the south side of the building there is a small wood-clad shed with a wood shed roof.

The garage building is immediately west of the second storage building. The garage has an irregular plan, as one of the elevations is angled away from the access road, and is of a utilitarian design. It features a flat roof, clad with rolled roofing materials, and plywood walls over a light wood frame. Batten boards cover the gaps between plywood panels.

The pump house building is located immediately downhill of the garage building, and is in poor condition. The structure is unadorned, smooth concrete, with a west-facing door opening and two decorative red ceramic vents; however, the doors have been removed from the front of the building. The remains of a generator engine for the pump is located in the house, situated on and bolted to a concrete pad. The brand on the base reads “Fairbank-Morse.” The small pump house is filled with leaf litter and the remains of a cast iron gate.

In the center of the circular driveway north of the main elevation of the main house is a water feature: a concrete fountain with a metal statue in the center. According to historical photographs, there has been a fountain at this location historically, but the fountain’s size, shape, material, and statuary in the current fountain is not original.

The fireplace is part of a patio on the west elevation of the property (Figure 26). The fireplace is in the southwest corner of the patio and is built out of the same local rocks that are present on the building’s exterior cladding on several elevations. The rocks that make up the fireplace appear to be cut to form a slightly curved opening for the fireplace itself, which is lined with fire-brick, but the rest of the stone appears to be uncoursed rock. Over the fireplace are two stone lintels, and above the second lintel the fireplace chimney is surrounded with a hedge. The fireplace is flanked by the retaining wall for the patio, which also functions as a planter for a tall hedge, effectively screening the patio from the driveway.
Landscape Elements

*Historical Tree and Vegetation Plantings*

Though many elements of the grounds have recent plantings, including a large lawn on the east elevation and various horticultural plantings around the elevations of the building, there are also several notable, mature trees throughout the property that are over 45 years in age. Tree species were identified by Ryan Allen, Urban Forester for Dudek (ISA Certified Arborist), and Ryan Gillmore, Urban Forestry Senior Specialist for Dudek (ISA Certified Arborist), through field photographs. Tree species around the property include Coastal Live Oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), Coast Redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), Strawberry Madrone (*Arbutus unedo*), Red Ironbark (*Eucalyptus sideroxylon*), Cook Pine (*Araucaria columnaris*), Southern Magnolia varietal (*Magnolia grandiflora*), King palms (*Archontophoenix cunninghamiana*), and Canary Island Pine (*Pinus canariensis*). Today, many of the horticultural plantings are new, and several new trees have been added to the subject property, especially near the east lawn. More drought-resistant plantings are planned for the site.

Oaks were the dominant tree at the property and were incorporated into several of the plantings that were immediately adjacent to the house (Figure 27). The trees have matured and spread, and generally appear healthy. Sharon Kempner and her staff informed Dudek that several mature oaks were removed from the property after they experienced rot at their bases, likely from the frequently watered lawns. At the east end of the property, east of the driveway, a row of mature oaks were numbered with silver tags and recorded.
There also appear to be mature plantings of *euphorbia*, a succulent, and *opuntia*, prickly pear cactus. Neither species could be positively identified. These plantings are growing in a dense, tall cluster, covering a 20 ft. by 10 ft. area northeast of the main buildings and east of the storage buildings. The plants, especially the *euphorbia*, reach over 6 feet in height.

Southeast of the east road fork, main building, and east lawn is a garden space with raised garden beds and vines growing on the steep hillside above. The garden is located on its own terrace, downhill of the rest of the property, and accessible by a series of steps. This garden is visible in historical photographs and has traditionally held raised beds. The modern storage shed is located in this raised bed garden terrace. Currently there are no extant plantings in this space, only the remains of garden beds.

**Retaining Walls**

Several retaining walls were present on the property and help form terraces, patios, and borders around the property. The larger, more elaborate retaining walls generally were constructed of brick or concrete, faced with stucco and uncoursed native stones, and form steep walls in the hilly sections of the subject property. One example of such a retaining wall is on the south side of the property, between the south lawn and patio, and above the west road fork (Figure 28). This retaining wall blends seamlessly into the main house’s cladding and appears to be part of the building’s overall structure than a separate, independent wall.

There are rock retaining walls functionally holding back soil from the west fork of the driveway, as well as retaining walls that hold in place the soil uphill and downhill of the road. There is also a retaining wall that separates the west fork of the driveway from the patio and fireplace feature, as well as retaining walls on the south elevation of the same patio that provide a flat terrace above the steep hillside below.
North of the main elevation, there is a long retaining wall that separates the circular driveway from steep hillside below it, visually and functionally separating the entry space from the leisure space. There is another retaining wall on the north side of the main building and driveway, retaining the soil and creating a terrace.

There is a very short rock retaining wall around the east lawn that forms a noticeable physical border around the lawn. Within the south lawn there are two retaining walls with stairs in the center of them. These retaining walls are located in shallow swales and help slow water runoff while providing visual interest to the east lawn (Figure 29).
There is also a retaining wall forming the path border and patio border near the east elevation below a basement entryway. The patio is accessed via a meandering path and through a lower level door on the east elevation.

**Circulation**

Circulation as a landscape architecture term refers to roads, stairs, planned paths, desired paths, trails, and parking areas throughout a property. They typically connect features to the main building, but may also be experiential, taking the person or vehicle through a visually attractive area rather than from a building to another building. Circulation around the subject property is extensive and appears mostly intentional.

Perhaps the most obvious of the circulation features is the driveway road. The driveway road begins at Alston Road in a “Y” shape to better facilitate safely exiting and entering the narrow, one-lane road. Here the driveway is paved with stone pavers. The driveway narrows in its approach to the gate feature, and then transitions to asphalt paving after the gate. The road travels northeast from the gate feature to a junction, just south of the south elevation lawn and patio. One road fork goes east, around the border of the large east lawn, then turns west towards the garage and storage building. A second, narrow fork at the southeast bend in the road continues off the subject property into the adjacent property to the east. The third fork goes west, then doubles back on itself to go east, before turning north to provide access to the circular driveway. At the circular driveway, the paving again transitions to irregular stone pavers which form an oval around a rock-lined planter and the fountain feature.
Other circulation features mostly consist of original and non-original paths, which can be distinguished in most cases by the use of modern materials like concrete versus the stone pavers seen in the original paths. One path leads from the kitchen, out onto the kitchen patio of the west elevation, then south and downhill towards the road; the path then turns east and connects to the south elevation lawn, which has stairs and is gated. On the east elevation there is a path from the southwest door onto a stonework patio and the end of a concrete path. The concrete path extends north and connects to the paved road and to the northeast door, via a stonework path. There is another path, with stairs at stonework retaining walls, through the east lawn (See Figure 29, above). Paths lead around the northeast door on the east elevation to the north side of the north elevation, then into a terraced garden area that connects a wide, downhill terrace to the main elevation and circular driveway. These pathways are constructed of stone and cement mortar, smooth concrete, or dirt. The most elaborate paths lead northward from the main elevation’s circular driveway to the wide terrace on the north side. These features also incorporate stairs with metal railings, a boulder with a commemorative plaque, and several light posts (Figure 30).

Figure 30. Circulation paths on the north elevation, below the circular driveway (IMG_0723)
5 SIGNIFICANCE EVALUATION

NRHP/CRHR Statement of Significance

In consideration of the Graholm’s history and requisite integrity, Dudek recommends the property eligible for designation in the NRHP and CRHR under Criteria A/1 and C/3 based on the following significance evaluation. State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 Forms (DPR Forms) are provided in Appendix B. Table 2 provides a breakdown of contributing and non-contributing elements of Graholm for the period of significance 1919-1924, and Figure 31 shows where these elements are located on the property.

Table 2. Contributing and Non-Contributing Resources Associated with Graholm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building/Element</th>
<th>Date Constructed</th>
<th>Eligibility Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main house</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Contributing (non-contributing elements of the main house include the added west patio and outdoor fireplace, and the east porch enclosure, which were altered outside the period of significance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance gate</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Contributing (all elements appear to be original)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool pump house</td>
<td>c.1920</td>
<td>Non-Contributing (although this feature likely dates to the original construction of the property, this could not be confirmed. Further, the structure does not retain requisite integrity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular driveway (motor court)</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Contributing (contributing elements include the original path of circulation and oval shape center; non-contributing elements include the fountain (added in 2011); the circular rock basin in the center of the oval (2011); and more recent landscaping. The cracked-ice stone pavers contains some original stone, but also contain numerous concrete aggregate replacements. For this reason, the already modified stone/aggregate pavers are considered non-contributing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths of circulation (with original materials)</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Contributing (contributing elements include the north lawn path and stairs; main driveway; and south lawn paths; non-contributing elements include paths added/modified outside the period of significance as part of the Brooks Institute context and all portions of the east lawn and hardscaping (replaced in the 1950s)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original retaining walls (with stonework)</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Contributing (contributing retaining wall elements include the south lawn and west patio retaining walls; north driveway retaining wall; north lawn retaining wall; and main elevation planters; non-contributing retaining wall elements include replacement walls; east lawn and east driveway retaining walls; and southeast garden retaining wall).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and plantings</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Contributing (contributing elements include mature trees grouped near the main house in planters. Archival research did not yield a planting plan. Other than these planter trees, it is not entirely clear which trees are original plantings related to the Graholm property and which are part of the natural setting. Therefore, only the mature trees oaks and other mature trees immediately adjacent to the main house in planters are considered contributors. Exceptions include the three mature magnolia trees on the south elevation which do not appear to be original to the property)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shed 1</td>
<td>c.1920</td>
<td>Non-Contributing (lacks integrity to the period of significance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shed 2</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>Non-Contributing (recently constructed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>c.1958</td>
<td>Non-Contributing (constructed outside the period of significance).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion A/1: Properties that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Archival research indicates that Graholm is strongly associated with the early development of lavish hilltop residential estates in Santa Barbara and Montecito, initiated by the original five “Hilltop barons” as part of the development of what is currently known as the current Eucalyptus Hill neighborhood during the late 1910s and 1920s. Original owner David Gray was one of these five industrial titans who transformed the undeveloped areas around Eucalyptus Hill and Pepper Hill into a collection of lavish estates, which included his home known as Graholm completed in 1920. Archival research also found that Graholm served as a home for the Brooks family and the Brooks Institute of Photography from 1952-1999. During their ownership, the property functioned as an educational institute dedicated to teaching photography. While Ernest Brooks Senior was a notable photographer and founder of the school, archival research failed to indicate any significant contributions to the broad patterns of development that would rise to the level required for significance under Criterion A/1. Therefore, the period of significance for Graholm under Criterion A/1 is limited to 1919-1924, beginning with David Gray’s acquisition of the property and ending with the completion of construction. Therefore, the property is recommended eligible for designation in the NRHP/CRHR under Criterion A/1.

Criterion B/2: Properties that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

Although owner David Gray made significant contributions to the City of Santa Barbara during his time at Graholm, there is no clear association between the property and the philanthropic efforts of Gray, nor is there a clear connection between the property and Gray’s role in the reconstruction of Santa Barbara following the 1925 earthquake. The only other owner of note found through archival research was, Ernest Brooks Senior. Brooks was a notable photographer and served as the founder of the Brooks Institute of Photography, but his contributions to the field of photography or other broad patterns of development do not rise to the level of significance required for eligibility under Criterion B/2. No other owners of Graholm were identified as persons significant to Santa Barbara’s past. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible for the NRHP/CRHR under Criterion B/2.

Criterion C/3: Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

Archival research, in-person survey, and studying architectural plans identified that the original Graholm designed was by locally important architect Roland F. Sauter in 1916, and completed under his direction in 1920. Sauter designed components of Clarence A Black’s El Cerrito Estate, and was the architect for Frank Hendry’s Casa Loma Estate, Santa Barbara City Hall, and Cabrillo Pavilion. Sauter regularly incorporated elements of rustic design into the Spanish Colonial Revival style that was newly popular in California after the Panama-California Exposition (1915). Like many of his other designs, Sauter used both traditional Spanish
Colonial Revival finishes, such as terra cotta tile and stucco, and elements of rustic design, such as unfinished wood timbers, and large walls of unfinished, un-coursed, local stone, making the building appear to “grow” naturally out of the surrounding hillside. While Sauter used some of these techniques at the El Cerrito estate, Graholm was his first opportunity to fully develop a design that incorporated mature Spanish Colonial Revival Style exhibited at the Panama-California Exposition and Rustic design elements that were popular at lodges and recreational homes for the wealthy.

Character-defining features of this design are still evident at Graholm including:

- Use of unfinished, un-coursed, local stone for wall bases and wall ends;
- Battered (sloping) walls
- Large exposed timbers emerging from the roofline
- Incorporation of naturalistic elements, like local boulders and natural terraces;
- and closely arranged planting beds around the house.

The subject property retains a strong association with architect Roland F. Sauter as one of the few remaining examples of his early works. Sauter was contracted to design Graholm at the beginning of his formal architect career. Though he was a foreman and designer for Clarence Black’s El Cerrito estate, he was not the named architect. Sauter’s contract with David Gray for the design of Graholm, likely aided him in getting commissions for later civic projects such as the design of Santa Barbara City Hall (1924) and Cabrillo Pavilion (1927).

The Graholm residence and grounds are good examples of Sauter’s use of the Spanish Colonial Revival Style architecture after the exposition of the style at the Panama-California Exposition, with decorative elements from the Rustic style, which is popular in the early twentieth century at lodges, parks, granges, and recreational houses. Subsequent alterations to the main house have not compromised the character defining features of either style or the hallmarks of Roland Sauter’s specific designs. The period of significance for Graholm under Criterion C/3 is 1919-1924, beginning with David Gray’s acquisition of the property and ending with the completion of construction. Therefore, the property is recommended eligible for the NRHP/CRHR under Criterion C/3.

**Criterion D/4: Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.**

There is no evidence that this property has the potential to yield information important to state or local history. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible for the NRHP/CRHR under Criterion D/4.
City of Santa Barbara Criteria

In considering a proposal to recommend to the City Council any structure, natural feature, site, or area for designation as a Landmark or, in designating a City Structure of Merit, the Commission shall utilize any or all of the following criteria and considerations:

Criterion A: Its character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation.

Archival research indicates that Graholm is strongly associated with the early development of lavish hilltop residential estates in Santa Barbara and Montecito, initiated by the original five “Hilltop barons” as part of the development of what is currently known as the current Eucalyptus Hill neighborhood during the late 1910s and 1920s. Original owner David Gray was one of these five industrial titans who transformed the undeveloped areas around Eucalyptus Hill and Pepper Hill into a collection of lavish estates, which included his home known as Graholm completed in 1920. Therefore, Graholm is recommended eligible under City of Santa Barbara Criterion A for its association with early estate development patterns in Santa Barbara and Montecito.

Criterion B: Its location as a site of a significant historic event.

Archival research failed to indicate that Graholm was the site of any specific historic events. Therefore, Graholm is recommended not eligible under City of Santa Barbara Criterion B.

Criterion C: Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City, the State or the Nation.

Graholm’s original owner David Gray made significant contributions to the City of Santa Barbara during his time at Graholm. Gray and his family spent much of their time living in Detroit and maintaining a vacation house in Nantucket. While residing in Michigan, David Gray traveled to the Santa Barbara area on multiple occasions to visit local Ford dealer E.W. Alexander. It was during these visits that his fondness for the Santa Barbara area grew and he decided to purchase property in Santa Barbara in the 1910s. Following his arrival in Santa Barbara, Gray became known as a generous philanthropist and benefactor of the arts. He was particularly concerned that Santa Barbara’s beaches remained unspoiled, and wanted to prevent Coney Island-style developments from springing up. To this end, he purchased all of the land along East Beach. He also headed a committee to buy up parcels of land from Stearns Wharf to the Bird Refuge and held them until a public bond was passed allowing the land to pass to the local government. He supported community beautification drives. He supported music education and donated money and land to the Santa Barbara School of the Arts. He subsidized annual concerts by the L.A. Philharmonic Orchestra in Santa Barbara. He donated $100,000 for the construction of the Cabrillo Pavilion as part of a plan to support public recreation in the
The Pavilion hosted music, plays, and conventions for many decades and was managed in its first years by Sauter (The Morning Press 1928; Tompkins 1992; Myrick 1991).

Archival research also indicates that Graholm is strongly associated with the early development of lavish hilltop residential estates in Santa Barbara and Montecito, initiated by the original five “Hilltop barons” as part of the development of what is currently known as the current Eucalyptus Hill neighborhood during the late 1910s and 1920s. David Gray was one of these five industrial titans who transformed the undeveloped areas around Eucalyptus Hill and Pepper Hill into a collection of lavish estates, which included his home known as Graholm completed in 1920.

While David Gray’s philanthropic and development endeavors do not rise to the level of significance required under NRHP and CRHR Criteria B/2, he did make significant contributions to the culture and development of the City of Santa Barbara. **Therefore, Graholm is recommended eligible under City of Santa Barbara Criterion C.**

**Criterion D: Its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City, the State or the Nation.**

The Graholm residence and grounds are good examples of the Spanish Colonial Revival Style architecture after the exposition of the style at the Panama-California Exposition, with decorative elements from the Rustic style, which is popular in the early twentieth century at lodges, parks, granges, and recreational houses. Elements of the Spanish Colonial Revival Style still present at Graholm include the following:

- Low pitched and gabled rooflines
- Terra cotta roof tiles
- Asymmetrical in plan
- Recessed entry ways
- Wooden entry doors
- Use of stucco on exterior walls
- Decorative stonework

Despite alterations to the property throughout its history, the property still retains a great deal of the character defining features associated with the Spanish Colonial Revival Style of architecture. **Therefore, Graholm is recommended eligible under City of Santa Barbara Criterion D for its exemplification of the Spanish Colonial Revival Style of architecture.**
**Criterion E: Its exemplification of the best remaining architectural type in a neighborhood.**

Given the prevalence of the Spanish Colonial Revival Style of architecture throughout Santa Barbara, no evidence was found that indicated that Graholm is the best remaining architectural type in the neighborhood or the city. Therefore, Graholm is recommended not eligible under City of Santa Barbara Criterion E.

**Criterion F: Its identification as the creation design, or work of a person or persons whose effort has significantly influenced the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation.**

Archival research, in-person survey, and studying architectural plans identified that the original Graholm designed was by locally important architect Roland F. Sauter in 1916, and completed under his direction in 1920. Sauter designed components of Clarence A Black’s El Cerrito Estate, and was the architect for Frank Hendry’s Casa Loma Estate, Santa Barbara City Hall, and Cabrillo Pavilion. Sauter regularly incorporated elements of rustic design into the Spanish Colonial Revival style that was newly popular in California after the Panama-California Exposition (1915). Like many of his other designs, Sauter used both traditional Spanish Colonial Revival finishes, such as terra cotta tile and stucco, and elements of rustic design, such as unfinished wood timbers, and large walls of unfinished, un-coursed, local stone, making the building appear to “grow” naturally out of the surrounding hillside. While Sauter used some of these techniques at the El Cerrito estate, Graholm was his first opportunity to fully develop a design that incorporated mature Spanish Colonial Revival Style exhibited at the Panama-California Exposition and Rustic design elements that were popular at lodges and recreational homes for the wealthy.

Character-defining features of Sauter’s design are still evident at Graholm including:

- Use of unfinished, un-coursed, local stone for wall bases and wall ends;
- Battered (sloping) walls
- Large exposed timbers emerging from the roofline
- Incorporation of naturalistic elements, like local boulders and natural terraces;
- and closely arranged planting beds around the house.

The subject property retains a strong association with architect Roland F. Sauter as one of the few remaining examples of his early works. Sauter was contracted to design Graholm at the beginning of his formal architect career. Though he was a foreman and designer for Clarence Black’s El Cerrito estate, he was not the named architect. Sauter’s contract with David Gray for the design of Graholm, likely aided him in getting commissions for later civic projects such as the design of Santa Barbara City Hall (1924) and Cabrillo Pavilion (1927). **Therefore, Graholm is recommended eligible under City of Santa Barbara Criterion F for its representation of architect Roland F. Sauter’s work.**
**Criterion G: Its embodiment of elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials,**

The evidence of workmanship is evident throughout the building through the inclusion of many handcrafted building and finish components created by master craftspeople. These include, most notably, the ornate ironwork, which took over 6 years to create for the property, and the artfully placed, un-coursed, local stonework incorporated into the building exterior which was a hallmark of Roland Sauter’s architectural style. The building also contains ornate ironwork lighting fixtures, and uniquely closing windows that were specially crafted for the property (determined from personal communication with Sharon Kemper), and the ornate and elaborately carved wooden doors on the main elevation are just a few examples of the workmanship evident at the property. Though some of the original materials have been removed, the property still conveys a high degree of workmanship and the involvement of several master craftspeople. Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of craftsmen’s skills in constructing the original building was diminished by the two-story additions in 1963 and the concomitant removal of original windows, openings, and detailing. Despite the additions and the diminished integrity workmanship in certain areas of the building, the bulk of the workmanship is still well represented. **Therefore, Graholm is recommended eligible under City of Santa Barbara Criterion G for its outstanding craftsmanship and attention to architectural materials and details.**

**Criterion H. Its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that landmark;**

Archival research failed to indicate any association with other landmarks. Therefore, Graholm is recommended not eligible under City of Santa Barbara Criterion H.

**Criterion I. Its unique location or singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood;**

Archival research failed to indicate anything that would suggest that Graholm is unique in its location or physical characteristics that would rise to the level of significance under Criterion I. Therefore, Graholm is recommended not eligible under City of Santa Barbara Criterion I.

**Criterion J. Its potential of yielding significant information of archaeological interest;**

There is no evidence that this property has the potential to yield archaeological information important to state or local history. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under Criterion J.
**Criterion K. Its integrity as a natural environment that strongly contributes to the well-being of the people of the City, the State or the Nation.**

There is no evidence that the natural environment associated with this property strongly contributes to the well-being of the people of the City, the State or the Nation. Therefore, the property is recommended not eligible under Criterion K.

Given the NRHP/CRHR criterion discussion and the City of Santa Barbara Landmark criterion discussion above, Graholm is recommended eligible as a City of Santa Barbara Landmark. Graholm is recommended eligible under City Criterion A for its association with early estate development patterns in Santa Barbara and Montecito. The property is also recommended eligible under Criterion C for its association with local philanthropist David Gray, whose financial contributions helped numerous charitable institutions within the City of Santa Barbara's history, most specifically his donations that led to the protection of beaches in the area and the construction of the Cabrillo Pavilion. With regards to Graholm’s architecture, it is recommended eligible under Criteria D, F, and G for its representation of the Spanish Colonial Revival style, the work of Roland Sauter, and the remaining examples of Sauter’s craftsmanship and materials. **Therefore, Graholm is recommended eligible as a City Landmark under City Criteria A, C, D, F, and G.**

**Integrity Discussion**

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, and the historical resource’s ability to convey that significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance. Historic properties either retain integrity or they do not. Within the concept of integrity, there are seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (NRHP 2002). To retain historic integrity, a property will generally possess several, if not most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance.

**Location:** The main house is sited on the original location of construction in its original orientation. While the original acreage of the estate has diminished over time, enough of the property remains today, therefore retaining its integrity of location.

**Design:** The main building is recognizable as a Roland Sauter-designed Spanish Colonial Revival mansion, with rustic design elements. As such, it retains many of the essential character defining features of the style including:

- stucco cladding;
- terra cotta roof tile
- elaborate ironwork including lighting fixtures, gates, grilles, and other decorative elements;
- elaborately carved wood doors;
- hand-crafted ceramic tilework;
- unfinished, un-coursed, local stone for wall bases and wall ends;
- battered walls
- exposed timbers emerging from the roofline
- incorporation of naturalistic elements, like local boulders, mature trees, watercourses, and natural terraces;
- and closely arranged planting beds around the house.

Although the building was subjected to several alterations over time, the integrity of design remains intact. These alterations do not detract from the overall appearance of the building as one cohesive Sauter-designed building. Therefore, the main building maintains integrity of design.

The Circular Driveway (motor court) retains the most basic elements of its design, the original path of circulation and the oval shape center. While replacement materials, including a replacement fountain, have been introduced into the motor court, these materials have diminished the integrity of design, not completely compromised the original path of circulation and the oval shape center designs.

Outbuildings have been damaged, allowed to deteriorate, been removed entirely, or have been incorporated into a separate property after subdivision and therefore these buildings do not retain integrity of design. The house and water tower at 904 Camino Viejo Road was evaluated separately in 2003 (Cole 2003).

**Setting:** Graholm was situated at the top of a large hill overlooking Santa Barbara, with ocean and mountain views, on a large, 29-acre estate. The subject property retains these views and prominence on its hill. The subject property also retains its relationship to a portion of the original grounds, a raised bed garden, walking paths, and original circulation and retaining walls, designed by Roland Sauter. The original estate had more outbuildings, including the house and water tower that are now part of the separate 904 Camino Viejo Road property, and the subdivision and separation of the properties interrupted the setting of the main building. A modern, wood board fence currently separates the two properties and visually intrudes into the setting of the subject property. The fence is visible from the entrance driveway, driveway circle, main elevation, and west elevation. Due to the proximity of this fence, and its visual intrusion into the historical setting, the property has diminished integrity of setting.

**Materials:** The 1927 service wing addition and the 1960 porch enclosure both constitute the addition of new materials to the building. However, the integrity of materials is still very high due to the use of sympathetic
materials providing a seamless transition between new and historic materials. The building maintains its character-defining, original exterior finishes: stucco cladding, unfinished, local, un-coursed stone-work, and red tile roofing. The building also retains nearly all of its original windows and metal ironwork. Despite the additions to the building and the introduction of new materials, a great deal of the original materials are intact in other parts of the building. Therefore, the building retains integrity of materials.

**Workmanship:** The evidence of workmanship is evident throughout the building through the inclusion of many handcrafted building and finish components created by master craftsmen. These include, most notably, the ornate ironwork, which took over 6 years to create for the property, and the artfully placed, un-coursed, local stonework incorporated into the building exterior which was a hallmark of Roland Sauter’s architectural style. The building also contains ornate ironwork lighting fixtures, and uniquely closing windows that were specially crafted for the property (determined from personal communication with Sharon Kemper), and the ornate and elaborately carved wooden doors on the main elevation are just a few examples of the workmanship evident at the property. Though some of the original materials have been removed, the property still conveys a high degree of workmanship and the involvement of several master craftsmen. Similar to the issue with materials, the physical evidence of craftsmen’s skills in constructing the original building was diminished by the two-story additions in 1963 and the concomitant removal of original windows, openings, and detailing. Despite the additions and the diminished integrity workmanship in certain areas of the building, the bulk of the workmanship is still well represented. Therefore, the main building retains its integrity of workmanship.

**Feeling:** Despite its brief life as a classroom building for the Brooks Institute of Photography, the building still successfully evokes the feeling of a grand Spanish Colonial Revival mansion form the 1910s or 1920s. Therefore, the property retains its integrity of feeling.

**Association:** Graholm was the home of David Gray and the work of architect Roland Sauter, and while there were multiple owners since David Gray and multiple alterations since Sauter's original design, Graholm retains requisite integrity of association with Gray and Sauter and their original vision for Graholm. Furthermore, Graholm retains the association with the Spanish Colonial Revival style of architecture. Therefore, the property retains its integrity of association.

In summary, Graholm retains integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. However, the property has diminished integrity of setting due to numerous parcel subdivision and visual separation from the water tower that was once part of the property that is not on another property and separated by a large fence. However, the property retains requisite integrity in all other aspects to warrant inclusion in the NRHP, CRHR, or City Landmark register.
6 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Summary of Findings

In consideration of the significance evaluation and integrity assessment for Graholm, the property is recommended eligible under NRHP/CRHR Criteria A/1 and C/3, and as a City Landmark under City Criteria A, C, D, F, and G. The property is significant for its association with the growth and development of the current Eucalyptus Hill neighborhood, its association with master architect Ronald Sauter, and its representation of the Spanish Colonial Revival style of architecture. Therefore, Graholm is considered an historical resource under CEQA.

6.2 Recommendations

Graholm is considered an historical resource under CEQA. Therefore, any proposed modifications to the property should be carried out in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, specifically the Standards for Rehabilitation, in order to avoid material impairment of the resource/adverse effects. This includes any impacts proposed to the exterior of the property, including character-defining features, and landscaping features. To facilitate this, Dudek recommends completion of a Phase II HSSR. The Phase II HSSR is used to assess potential project-related impacts to identified historical resources. In accordance with the City of Santa Barbara Master Environmental Assessment: Guidelines for Archaeological Resources and Historic Structures and Sites: “If the HSSR determines that historical structures/sites located at the proposed project site are significant historic resources, the HSSR should include an analysis of the proposed project’s potential effects on the resources.” In accordance with the recommendations provided by the City’s Historic Landmarks Commission on the May 15, 2019 hearing for the Graholm property, this analysis is most appropriately accomplished through preparation of a stand-alone Phase II HSSR.
INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
7 BIBLIOGRAPHY


CSB (City of Santa Barbara). 1952. Letter from the City of Santa Barbara to Mrs. H. McGraw regarding the approval of her parcel division.
https://www.santabarbaraca.gov/services/community/historic/historysb/timeline.asp


https://www.downtownsb.org/about/history

Perspectives in California Archaeology, Volume I. Edited by Jon M. Erlandson and Roger Colten.
Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara.

Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara.

Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara.

Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara.

Flournoy, F. F. 1906. “Map of Survey made by F. F. Flournoy of the Ashley Tract east of the City, Santa
Barbara Co., Cal.” F. F. Flournoy Maps, Department of Public Works, County of Santa Barbara.


Graholm 2018 refers to any items provided by the current owners of Graholm during the site visit on September 14, 2018.


Hurd. 1956. Aerial photograph. Flight Number HA-AN, frame 1-108. 1:9,600 scale. February 27, 1956. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara.


Reicker, P. 1891. “Map of the County of Santa Barbara, California.” Map. Library of Congress Geography and Map Division Washington, D.C. Accessed November 2, 2018. https://www.loc.gov/resource/g4363s.la000038/?r=0.795,0.541,0.06,0.035,0

Rogers, David Banks. 1929. Prehistoric Man of the Santa Barbara Coast. Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History.

Santa Barbara City Directory various years.


APPENDIX B

Project Plans and Schematics
PROPOSED SITE PLAN

GENERAL NOTES:

1. WATER CONSUMPTION.
   PROVIDE ULTRA FLUSH WATER CLOSETS FOR ALL NEW CONSTRUCTION.

2. EASEMENTS.
   AS PER THE REQUISITE PLANS AND THE CONTRACT.

3. SERVICE AREAS.
   OPEN SPACE揮

4. ENCLOSURE.
   PERMITTED EQUIPMENT YARD,
   PERMITTED TRASH ENCLOSURE,
   PERMITTED WATER TANK ENCLOSURE.

5. ASH Tree:
   (E) 8" OAK TO REMAIN
   (E) 4" OAK TO REMAIN

6. DRIVEWAY:
   (E) ASPHALT RESURFACED IMPERMEABLE UPPER MOTOR COURT
   (E) ASPHALT PAVING,
   PERMITTED ASPHALT PAVING,
   PERMITTED TRASH ENCLOSURE.

7. EUCALYPTUS GROVE:
   AS PER THE PLANS.

SCALE: 1/32" = 1'
EX-01, PLASTER FINISH TO MATCH (E) RESIDENCE
EX-05, BATTERED PLASTER FINISH TO MATCH EL PRESIDIO,
SEE IMAGES THIS SHEET

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

HISTORY DOOR & WINDOW DETAILS AT (E) RESIDENCE

PLASTER FINISH AT
EL PRESIDIO DE SANTA BARBARA

EXT FINISH SCHEDULE
TAG DESCRIPTION
EX-01 3 COAT HAND TROWELED PLASTER TO MATCH (E) RESIDENCE, COLOR: LA HABRA STUCCO BASE 100
EX-02 CUSTOM CLAY TILE ROOF TO MATCH SIZE & COLOR OF (E) RESIDENCE
EX-03 WOOD FRAMING TO MATCH (E) RESIDENCE
EX-04 WOOD DOOR TO MATCH (E) RESIDENCE
EX-05 UNCOURED FIELDSTONE TO MATCH (E) RESIDENCE
EX-06 3 COAT HAND TROWELED BATTERED PLASTER, COLOR: LA HABRA STUCCO BASE 100
EX-07 MOAT GRAY COLORED CONCRETE SANDED W/ PROSOCO SEALER
EX-08 4"X4" PENNSYLVANIA BLUE STONE IMPERMEABLE PAVERS
EX-09 4"X4" PENNSYLVANIA BLUE STONE PERMEABLE PAVERS
EX-10 DARK GRAY ASPHALT. SAMPLES TO BE APPROVED BY ARCHITECT IN THE FIELD.
EX-11 HANDCRAFTED IRON SCONCE TO MATCH (E) HISTORICAL SCONCES
EX-12 WOOD WINDOW/DOOR TO MATCH (E) RESIDENCE

ORIGINAL AWNINGS AT (E) RESIDENCE, PROPOSED LOWER LEVEL AWNINGS TO MATCH HISTORICAL DOOR & WINDOW DETAILS AT (E) RESIDENCE

PLASTER AT PROPOSED PLANTER TO MATCH, EX-06, SEE NORTH AND EAST ELEVATIONS
Sarah Corder, MFA

**HISTORIC BUILT ENVIRONMENT LEAD**

Sarah Corder (SARE-uh COR-der; she/her) is an architectural historian with 17 years’ experience throughout the United States in all elements of cultural resources management, including project management, intensive-level field investigations, architectural history studies, and historical significance evaluations in consideration of the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and local-level evaluation criteria. Ms. Corder has conducted hundreds of historical resource evaluations and developed detailed historic context statements for a multitude of property types and architectural styles, including private residential, commercial, industrial, educational, and agricultural properties. She has also provided expertise on numerous projects requiring conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Ms. Corder meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for both Architectural History and History. She has experience preparing environmental compliance documentation in support of projects that fall under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

**Project Experience**

**Santa Barbara Specific Experience**

**University of California, Santa Barbara, California.** Dudek was retained by the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) to complete a Phase I built environment Historical Resources Technical Report (HRTR) for the Building 7045, Devereux Gymnasium renovation project located on UCSB West Campus. The Mid-Century Modern building was constructed in 1971 to serve as a gymnasium for the Devereaux School. The purpose of this HRTR is to determine if the Project has the potential to affect historic properties pursuant to Section 106 or would impact any historical resources pursuant to CEQA. The Project is also subject to review under Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 5024 and 5024.5 for state-owned resources. Responsibilities included project management, archival research, client management, SHPO consultation, and quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) of all project deliverables. (2021-present)

**HSSR, Confidential Residential Project, Confidential Client, Santa Barbara, California.** Dudek was retained by a private construction company to prepare a Historic Structures/Site Report (HSSR) for a Spanish colonial revival estate built in the 1920s located in Santa Barbara, California. Dudek conducted archival research and an intensive-level pedestrian survey of the property for historic built environment resources. Dudek conducted archival research and an intensive-level survey of the property for historic built environment resources. As part of this study, Dudek prepared a Phase 1 HSSR for the property that included a historic context statement and significance evaluation and a Phase 2 HSSR that provided a detailed impacts analysis and Secretary of the Interior’s standards conformance review. Responsibilities included project management, primary authorship of

**Education**
- Savannah College of Art and Design
  - MFA, Historic Preservation, 2004
- Bridgewater College
  - BA, History, 2002

**Professional Affiliations**
- National Trust for Historic Preservation
- Los Angeles Conservancy
- California Preservation Foundation
- Society for Architectural Historians
the report, archival research, evaluation of the property, field work, presentation at Historic Landmarks Commission meetings, design guidance to the construction company and architecture firm, and preparation of an Secretary of the Interior’s standards conformance review of the design of the proposed garage. (2018–2020)

**HSSR, Confidential Development Project, Confidential Client, Santa Barbara, California.** Dudek was retained by a private construction company to prepare a HSSR for a Mid-Century Modern military facility built in the 1950s located in Santa Barbara, California. Dudek conducted archival research and an intensive-level survey of the property for historic built environment resources. As part of this study, Dudek prepared a Phase 1 HSSR for the property that included a historic context statement and significance evaluation and a Phase 2 HSSR that provided a detailed impacts analysis and Secretary of the Interior’s standards conformance review. Responsibilities included project management, primary authorship of the report, archival research, evaluation of the property, field work, SHPO consultation, and design guidance. (2019–present)

**Integrity Assessment and Comparative Analysis for Confidential Education Project, Confidential Client, Santa Barbara, California.** Dudek prepared a memorandum that provides a comparative analysis and detailed account of alterations made to a confidential educational property located in the City of Santa Barbara, California. This analysis was designed to facilitate future significance evaluations with regard to the property’s physical integrity and architectural merit. Responsibilities included project management, field survey, archival research, and preparation of the technical memorandum. (2019-2020)

**HSSR for the Arroyo Burro Open Space Park Project, City of Santa Barbara, California.** Dudek was retained by the City of Santa Barbara to prepare an updated HSSR for the Arroyo Burrow Open Space Park located within the City of Santa Barbara. The city provided Dudek with previously prepared studies of the project area, which were synthesized as part of the updated study. In addition, Dudek conducted supplemental archival research on the property and conducted an updated intensive-level survey of the property for both archaeological and historic built environment resources. Responsibilities included archival research and co-authorship of the report. (2018)

**Historical Resource Evaluation Report for the Figueroa Division Courthouse, Judicial Council of California, City of Santa Barbara, California.** Dudek was retained by the Judicial Council of California (JCC) to prepare an evaluation of the Figueroa Division Courthouse building, located at 118 East Figueroa Street in the City of Santa Barbara, California. The Figueroa Division Courthouse was found not eligible for designation under all applicable criteria. Responsibilities included archival research and co-authorship of the technical report and archival research. (2017)

**Other Relevant Experience**

**Coronado Citywide Historic Resources Inventory and Historic Context Statement, City of Coronado, California.** Dudek is currently in the process of preparing a historic context statement and historic resources inventory survey for all properties at least 50 years old within City of Coronado limits. Following current professional methodology standards and procedures developed by the California Office of Historic Preservation and the National Park Service, Dudek developed a detailed historic context statement for the City that identifies and discusses the important themes, patterns of development, property types, and architectural styles prevalent throughout the City. Dudek also conducted a reconnaissance-level survey of all properties within City limits that are at least 50 years old to identify individual properties and groupings of properties (i.e., historic districts) with potential for historical significance under City Criterion C (properties that possess distinctive characteristics of an architectural style; are valuable for the study of a type, period, or method of construction; and have not been substantially altered). This document also developed registration requirements for resource evaluation that are specific to Coronado, in consideration of both historical significance and integrity requirements. Served as the project manager, principal architectural historian, and co-author of the report. Also led and conducted reconnaissance and intensive-level surveys and provided QA/QC for all project deliverables. (2019–Present)
Kate Kaiser, MSHP

ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIAN

Kate Kaiser (KAYT KY-zer; she/her) is an architectural historian with 10 years’ experience as a cultural resource manager in California, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Hawai‘i. Ms. Kaiser meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for both architectural history and archaeology. Ms. Kaiser specializes in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance, National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 and Section 110 compliance, Historic Resource Evaluation Reports (HRER), historical resource inventories (HRI), environmental impact report (EIR) chapters, Historic American Building Survey (HABS) level documentation, archival research, adverse effects or impacts analysis, cultural landscapes, and geographic information systems (GIS).

Recent Dudek Project Experience

Historic Structures/Site Report Confidential Development Project, Confidential Client, Santa Barbara, California. Dudek was retained by a private construction company to prepare a Historic Structures/Site Report (HSSR) for a Mid-Century Modern military property built in the 1950s located in Santa Barbara, California. Dudek conducted archival research and an intensive-level survey of the property for historic built environment resources. As part of this study, Dudek prepared a Phase 1 HSSR for the property that included a historic context statement and significance evaluation and a Phase 2 HSSR that provided a detailed impacts analysis and Secretary of the Interior’s standards conformance review. Ms. Kaiser served as architectural historian and coauthor of the report as well as contributing analysis of CHRIS records search results, reviewing permits, archival research, historical context development, developing building descriptions, and drafting outreach letters to interested parties and . (2019–Present)

State Water Project, California Department of Water Resources, Various Locations, California. Dudek was retained by the California Department of Water Resources to prepare a historic context statement for historic-aged infrastructure related to the State Water Project and Built Environment Inventory and Evaluation Reports (BEIER) for various State Water Project maintenance projects. Over the course of this multiyear project, Dudek is providing technical assistance in creating individual and statewide historical context statements and significance evaluations for State-owned water infrastructure. Acting as architectural historian, Ms. Kaiser has coauthored BEIERS and findings of effects for multiple water infrastructure resources associated with the State Water Project. Ms. Kaiser has also provided technical expertise and peer review for historical built environment inventory and evaluation reports authored by subconsultants. (2020–Present)

Historic American Building Survey Written Documentation for Pomona City Stables, City of Pomona, Los Angeles County, California. Dudek was retained by the City of Pomona to complete Historic American Building Survey (HABS) level documentation of the Pomona City Stables, which was damaged and partially collapsed in 2017. Ms. Kaiser
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served as architectural historian and author of the HABS documentation for the Pomona City Stables Building, constructed in 1909. Ms. Kaiser also coordinated fieldwork and building recordation, outreach to archives, libraries, and historical societies, and HABS documentation product packaging for the City of Pomona. (2020–2021)

**On-Call Services, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Various Locations, California.** Dudek was retained by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works to prepare a historic built environment inventory, evaluation technical reports, and finding of effect statements for historic-aged infrastructure operated by the Department of Public Works as part of larger CEQA compliance efforts. Acting as architectural historian, Ms. Kaiser has coauthored HRERs and findings of effects for the following projects: Santa Anita Debris Dam Seismic Strengthening Project, Colima Road Improvement Project, and Mulholland Highway at Mile Marker 3.22. For all projects, Ms. Kaiser authored the built environment inventory and evaluation technical reports and conducted survey, outreach to interested parties, archival research, historic context development, and other tasks. (2021–Present)

**Integrity Assessment and Comparative Analysis for Confidential Education Building, Santa Barbara, California.** Dudek prepared a memorandum that provides a comparative analysis and detailed account of alterations made to the Santa Barbara Unified School District (SBUSD)-owned property located in the City of Santa Barbara, California. Ms. Kaiser provided technical analyses, background research sections, and written components of this memorandum. This analysis is designed to facilitate future significance evaluations with regard to the property’s physical integrity and architectural merit. (2020)

**Cultural Resources Study for the Chappell Property at 28600 Triple C Ranch Road, Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority, Murrieta, California.** Dudek was retained by Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority to prepare a cultural resources study for the Chappell Property. The project proposed to demolish all buildings and structures on the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority’s newly acquired land. Ms. Kaiser served as architectural historian and author of the Cultural Resources Technical Report. Preparation of the report involved extensive archival research, historic context development, building development descriptions, historical significance evaluations, and DPR forms for each building of the project. (2020)

**Cultural Resources Technical Report for the Alexan Arcadia Project, City of Arcadia, California.** Dudek was retained by the City of Arcadia Planning and Community Development Department to prepare a Cultural Resources Technical Report for the proposed Alexan Arcadia Project. The project proposed to demolish a 2-story office building, two 1-story commercial buildings, and surface parking. The proposed project site also contained an existing 8-story office building and 1-story bank drive-through, which would remain in place. Four properties more than 45 years old were identified within or immediately adjacent to the proposed project site and evaluated for historical and architectural significance. As coauthor, Ms. Kaiser prepared the historic built environment evaluation report sections, conducted archival research and outreach, developed the historical context for four buildings, and prepared the property evaluations. (2021)

**HRER for the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Council of California, Los Angeles, California.** Dudek was retained by the Judicial Council of California to prepare an evaluation of the Stanley Mosk Los Angeles County Courthouse building, located at 111 N. Hill Street. As a State-owned resource, the Judicial Council of California must comply with California Public Resources Code, Section 5024(b), and submit to the State Historic Preservation Officer an inventory of all structures more than 50 years old under the Judicial Council of California’s jurisdiction that are 1) listed in, or may be eligible for inclusion in, the NRHP or that are 2) registered, or may be eligible as a California Historical Landmark. Ms. Kaiser served as architectural historian and author of the HRER. Preparation of the report involved extensive archival research, interior and exterior survey fieldwork, historic context development, material descriptions, historical significance evaluations, and California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms for the Stanley Mosk Courthouse. (2019)