

## 4.3 HISTORICAL RESOURCES

This section summarizes the results of the historic resources studies conducted for the project, including information and documents peer reviewed during preparation of the EIR. The information in this section is largely based on the following technical reports and documents, and also relies on comments from the California SHPO received on March 18, 2015, in response to the NOP:

- *Pebble Beach Historic Context Statement* (Page & Turnbull, Inc. 2013)
- *Connell House National Register of Historic Places Registration Form* (Kirk and Lamprecht 2014)

Additional references are provided in Chapter 8 of the EIR.

### 4.3.1 Existing Conditions

The project is located in the unincorporated community of Pebble Beach in Monterey County. Pebble Beach occupies a unique location on the Monterey Peninsula, with a crescent-shaped coastline, low dunes, and coastal habitat giving way towards the northeast to the Del Monte Forest.

#### 4.3.1.1 Regional Setting

The historic period on the Monterey Peninsula began with the arrival of the first non-natives, the expedition of Sebastián Vizcaíno in 1602, which anchored in Monterey Bay. The next milestones were over a century later, when the Gaspar de Portolá expedition established a presidio at Monterey in the name of the Spanish king and Father Junípero Serra oversaw the founding of the Carmel mission, Mission San Carlos Borromeo, in 1770 and 1771. Monterey became the Spanish capital of Alta California in 1775.

In 1821, Mexico succeeded in its effort to become independent of Spain and assumed rule of Alta California. The missions were secularized a decade later, freeing vast tracts of mission lands that were sold or granted to early settlers. The Pebble Beach area was part of two such land grants, the Rancho El Pescadero, a 4,426-acre parcel granted to Fabian Baretto in 1836 and the Rancho Punta de los Pinos, a 2,667-acre parcel granted to José María Armenta in 1833. The lands were used primarily for sheep and cattle grazing.

California became a territory of the United States in 1848 under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ended the 2-year Mexican American War. Statehood was achieved in 1850, with the capital eventually being established in Sacramento. Over time, the original rancho grantees and their heirs lost ownership of their lands, so that, by the mid-1860s, the entire Pebble Beach/Pacific Grove area was part of the estimated 100,000 acres of the Monterey Peninsula that came to be controlled by one man, David Jacks, a real estate entrepreneur originally from Scotland. Under Jacks' stewardship, the community of Pacific Grove was founded, Monterey was connected to the railroad network, and a Japanese fishing village was set up in Stillwater Cove.

The Pacific Improvement Company (PIC) formed in 1878 as a subsidiary of the Southern Pacific Railroad, which had a vested interest in the development of Monterey Bay. Over the next few years, PIC acquired nearly all of Jacks' lands. The first resort hotel, the Hotel Del Monte, and a new railroad connection soon followed, as well as development of a scenic coastal drive, the predecessor of the 17-Mile Drive. Under the auspices of PIC, the first subdivision of Pebble

Beach was surveyed and recorded in 1907–1909. From the outset, real estate in the Pebble Beach area was marketed with the well-to-do in mind, with advertisements for “villa” lots and talk of the establishment of an associated golf course, a sport linked to the wealthy, leisure class. The Del Monte Lodge, forerunner of today’s The Lodge at Pebble Beach, was constructed in 1909 in a rustic style, the 17-Mile Drive was enhanced, and gates to the Del Monte Forest that collected a fee from non-hotel guests were instituted in 1913.

Lot sales were lackadaisical until Samuel Finley Brown Morse became manager of PIC in 1915. Under his leadership, Pebble Beach would assume the identity that characterizes it today as a gated enclave of limited, high-end residential development with the majority of the land devoted to open space, much of it in the form of golf courses and forest. Pebble Beach was resurveyed, with the result that streets were laid out and lots divided sympathetically to the topography, resulting in winding roadways, unevenly shaped and sized lots that were a minimum of 1.5 acres in size, and coastal vistas and open space that were preserved. The latter was partially achieved by the installation of the first of what would eventually be several golf courses in Pebble Beach on land adjacent to the coastline. The Pebble Beach Golf Links opened in 1918–1919. Following a fire, the Lodge was rebuilt in 1919. By that time, 17 homes had also been constructed in Pebble Beach.

Also in 1919, Morse purchased PIC’s interest in the area and founded the Del Monte Properties Company, with support from San Francisco banker Herbert Fleishhacker. Morse, who served as president of the Del Monte Properties Company, oversaw and contributed to the development of Pebble Beach and the Del Monte Forest until his death in 1969. The character and intact natural reserve areas throughout Pebble Beach and the Del Monte Forest are due to the control exerted over new development by Morse and the Del Monte Properties Company, which oversaw “both the location and character of new development” as well as the selection of areas to be preserved (Page & Turnbull 2013).

During the 1920s, additional golf courses were laid out with associated subdivisions, golf clubhouses were built, and recreational facilities in the form of the Equestrian Center and Beach Club were installed. Other than the pro shops, the only commercial facilities within the community were located at the Del Monte Lodge.

Development in Pebble Beach slowed but did not end during the Great Depression. World War II saw the leasing of the old Hotel Del Monte to the Navy. In the years following the war, Pebble Beach, like much of California, saw a marked upswing in the construction of single-family residences. A handful of new subdivisions were opened and for the first time, speculators also began building homes. The years between the end of the war and 1969 were the “greatest period of sustained growth in the history of the Pebble Beach / Del Monte Forest area” (Page & Turnbull 2013). Also during this period, the lodge area was redeveloped, a commercial annex was built, and more golf courses were installed.

In the 1920s, “the Del Monte Properties Company instituted architectural controls that mandated Mediterranean style architecture for all new buildings” (Page & Turnbull 2013). In this early period, “some of California’s most capable architects were designing houses for Pebble Beach residents,” including Pierpont and Walter Davis, George Washington Smith, Julia Morgan, Reginald Johnson, and Bernard Maybeck, as well as architects from outside California, including Florida’s Addison Mizner. The resulting collection of buildings created a “California Riviera,’ a largely harmonious collection of buildings drawing on Spanish Colonial and Mediterranean precedents” (Page & Turnbull 2013).

By the postwar period, changing tastes as well as relaxed architectural controls introduced the Mid-Century Modern idiom to Pebble Beach. The most common architectural expression of this era is seen in a number of homes in the Ranch Style, a postwar architectural vocabulary popular throughout the United States for (primarily) residential design. Although many variations exist, the Ranch Style generally features a low-slung, rambling plan and incorporation of rustic materials and design features, with an emphasis on the horizontal and plentiful indoor-outdoor integration. A handful of buildings stood out from the norm: “Some residences, however, were bold modernist designs by prominent architects” (Page & Turnbull 2013). Of particular note were the Buckner House, designed by local architect Jon Konigshofer (1948; conflicting information as to existence), the Sclater-Booth House (1952; demolished), and the Connell House, designed by Richard Neutra (1958; extant) (Page & Turnbull 2013).

### Richard J. Neutra

This section is primarily developed from the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form for the Arthur and Kathleen Connell House prepared by Anthony Kirk, Ph.D. and Barbara Lamprecht, M. Arch. (Kirk and Lamprecht 2014).

Richard Neutra was one of the most celebrated and influential architects of 20<sup>th</sup> century America. Born in 1892 in Vienna, Neutra completed his architectural education in that city in 1912. Early and important influences on his architectural philosophy were Frank Lloyd Wright, whose *Wasmuth Portfolios* illustrating a groundbreaking emphasis on horizontality and open floor plans had electrified the European architectural community, and fellow Austrian Adolph Loos, known for his advocacy of the elimination of historicism and superfluous ornament in architecture. Following service in World War I, Neutra worked in landscaping, setting the stage for a lifelong belief in the importance of the integration of building with site, which was later reinforced by a 1930 visit to Japan. He emigrated to the United States in 1923, settling first in Chicago where he worked on early skyscraper design for the prominent firm of Holabird and Roche and then at Taliesin, the workshop of Frank Lloyd Wright.

In 1925, Neutra moved to Los Angeles, to work on one of Wright’s commissions there. He joined his countryman, architect Rudolf Schindler, and the two briefly went into practice together. Neutra earned international acclaim for one of his first independent commissions in Los Angeles, the “Health House” for Phillip Lovell (1929). In the words of architectural historians Barbara Lamprecht and Anthony Kirk: “Set high in the Hollywood Hills, the house was a superb expression of the International Style and the first entirely steel-frame residence constructed in the United States” which showcased Neutra’s “command of proportion and his skillful synthesis of overlapping lines and planes of stucco, steel, and glass that extend into the surrounding landscape” (Kirk and Lamprecht 2014). The design earned Neutra a place in the seminal exhibition of the International Style of architecture mounted at New York’s Modern Museum of Art in 1932 and recognition as “the leading modern architect of the West Coast” (Kirk and Lamprecht 2014). This quote is originally from Alfred H. Barr, Foreword to *Modern Architecture* (Museum of Modern Art [MOMA] 1932) and quoted in Thomas S. Hines, *Richard Neutra and the Search for Modern Architecture* (Hines 1982).

Neutra’s architectural practice took off in the 1930s. Based in the Silver Lake district of Los Angeles, Neutra primarily designed single-family residences during this decade. Although most of his projects were in southern California, he worked on the occasional northern California commission. The first was the Koblick House in Atherton (1933; altered), which was followed by 13 more single-family homes and duplexes by 1940 in San Francisco, the Peninsula, and the East Bay, as well as the Davey House in Monterey (1939). In the post-World War II years,

Neutra's volume of work soared and encompassed a variety of building types in locations both national and international. He contributed to the Case Study House program, the highly admired and influential series of model homes sponsored by *Arts and Architecture* magazine that called on the major architectural talents of the post-war years. In 1942, Neutra was among a handful of pioneering modernist architects featured in a San Francisco Museum of Art exhibition presenting "Western Living: Five Houses under \$7,500" (Brown 2010). Five more Neutra-designed homes were built in northern California in the post-war years, including the Connell House in Pebble Beach. By the time of his death in 1970, Neutra's career had encompassed approximately 400 projects (built and unbuilt) in total (Brown 2010).

The winner of numerous awards and accolades during his lifetime, Neutra was accorded the American Institute of Architects (AIA) Gold Medal posthumously in 1977 for "most distinguished service to the profession of architecture" (Dreyfuss 1977). The *Los Angeles Times* marked the occasion by labeling Neutra, just 7 years following his death, as "one of the world's great architects" (Dreyfuss 1977). The AIA Gold Medal is only infrequently conferred. At the time of Neutra's posthumous award, only two Californian architects, William Wurster and Bernard Maybeck, had received the gold medal; other recipients by that time included Frank Lloyd Wright, Buckminster Fuller, Walter Gropius, Le Corbusier, and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe. In 1949, *Time* magazine featured Neutra on its cover and ranked him second only to Frank Lloyd Wright in American architecture. A prolific author himself, Neutra's architectural work has been the subject of numerous books and articles by others. In 1982, the MOMA held a retrospective on Neutra, describing Neutra's legacy in the following way:

*"For many, the private homes designed by Richard Neutra (1892-1970) and built in California between 1927 and 1959 represent the first truly regional, modern domestic architecture in the United States. This is particularly curious in that Neutra was, by birth, Austrian and emigrated to this country in 1923 at the age of thirty-one. Six years after his arrival he had become "another distinctly American voice, to be heard with respect in the growing international community of architects"... Neutra was to become one of the most important architects of the modern movement, instrumental in the development of an indigenous California tradition."*

Esteemed *Washington Post* architecture critic Wolf Von Eckardt noted (Smith 1970) that:

*"The most outstanding buildings of his career...are superbly elegant houses, most of them in California... They are gently placed in the landscape and, through lavish use of glass, extend the building into nature and bring nature inside the building. ...This closeness to nature, accomplished by his sophisticated and artful use of building technology, seems to be the essence of Neutra's philosophy."*

A few weeks following his death, in an obituary for Neutra, *The Architects' Journal* described the architect's international reputation, saying that "Neutra's buildings stand out among those that are internationally famous by the apparent ease with which they fit into their setting and by their natural elegance and feeling for material and shape, all typically Viennese virtues" (Segal 1970). The writer goes on to say that Neutra was "the acknowledged master of superlatively sensitive detail, and quality is so strongly imprinted on his work as to make it unmistakable. His name will continue to live in buildings which belong to the best of our time in a field contested by many" (Segal 1970).

### 4.3.1.2 Site-Specific Setting

#### History of The Connell House

In 1957, Neutra began working on a design for Arthur and Kathleen Connell, who had purchased a coveted, Pacific view lot in the exclusive community of Pebble Beach. The design process apparently involved numerous meetings with Neutra at his home and studio in Silver Lake and the completion of a 30-page response to a questionnaire by the Connells that enabled Neutra to gauge his clients' needs and hopes for their new residence. Arthur Connell later recalled that "the original concept seemed so absolutely right that it was never altered in any important aspect, although Richard himself had not as yet seen the site" (Hines 1982).

The house was constructed by Monterey-based builder Harold C. Geyer and completed in August 1958. Landscape was provided by Solomon and Hoy and reflected Neutra's and the clients' love of Japanese-inspired gardens, particularly evident in the courtyard. The house was published in *World and Dwelling*, a book of Neutra's houses, in 1962.

~~Although~~ The house was plagued from the outset by climate issues—a not infrequent occurrence in architect-designed homes, according to anecdotal evidence—and was described by Arthur Connell as follows:

*"the house turned out to be not ideally suited for the environment, although it certainly capitalized on the outstanding view. The main problem was that Cypress Point is exposed to northwest and southerly winds which exceed 30 knots with gusts to 50 and 60 on occasion, and these persist for long periods. I feel certain that the air flow through the house could be as much as 1 or 2 knots, despite all the windows and doors being closed, and the heat just never went off... the house leaked somewhere in every rain storm."*

Despite these issues, the Connells were pleased with the house and lived there until their children grew up and moved away and they began spending large periods of time in Fiji. In April 1973, William and Audrey Mennan purchased the house. After a short residence, the Mennans sold the house to Clifford and Patricia Mettler, who occupied the house in 1975. The Mettlers were responsible for the changes made to the house in 1978 and 1992-1993, as described further below.

#### The Connell House

The proposed project site is located on Signal Hill Road, adjacent to one of the best-known features of Pebble Beach—17-Mile Drive—a two-lane road that provides multiple scenic vistas and access from the Del Monte Forest to the coastline. Located approximately 100 feet above sea level, the site lies between the Cypress Point and Spyglass Hill Golf Courses and affords an unimpeded view of the coastline and the Pacific Ocean. The 2.22-acre property contains one building, the Connell House, an approximately 3,299-square-foot single-family residence, one and two stories in height, and roughly U-shaped in plan (later additions increased the size of the house to 4,125 square feet). The house sits high up on a sloping coastal dune, set back and descending below grade from Signal Hill Road. The site and its topography are generally characterized by sandy dunes, low shrubs, ice plants, and a number of mature trees, some of which were planted by the original owners. The Connell House is an intact and representative example of the Modernist architectural idiom known broadly as the "International Style," designed by internationally renowned Modernist architect Richard Neutra.

Strong horizontal lines juxtaposed against projecting and receding planes and volumes keynote the design of the house. The flat roof, with extended, cantilevered eaves and beams and a broad wooden fascia, establishes the horizontal emphasis. Bands of windows on both levels of the western, sea-facing elevation and a partial width second floor deck on the west elevation reinforce the theme. Rectangular in plan, the building incorporates a lower story that is set below street level to accommodate the sloped site and a U-shaped upper story that embraces a courtyard that opens east towards the street. The mahogany-veneered main entrance is located on the north elevation and the integrated, three-bay garage is located on the south elevation. Above a concrete foundation, the primary exterior material, other than aluminum-framed glass, is unornamented stucco. Accenting the stucco are narrow tongue-and-groove siding, which appears on the south elevation, and panels of Masonite, which wrap the exterior below the windows on the west and north and also face the courtyard.

### *West Elevation*

The most visible elevation is the west, which faces the ocean, 17-Mile Drive, and the Cypress Point Golf Course, and is visually accessible from those places (refer to Figures 4.3-1 and 4.3-2). This elevation showcases Neutra's masterful integration of the building into the site. In terms of the design composition, aesthetic effect is achieved through the asymmetrical but balanced arrangement of volumes, horizontal and vertical planes, and massing. This is seen, for example, in the use of a bold, geometric, stucco-clad volume on the south balanced to the north by a wall of windows and sliding glass doors, with thin steel frames adding to a feeling of lightness and transparency.

**Figure 4.3-1. West elevation, looking east from 17-Mile Drive.**



Photo taken November 2012. Source: Page & Turnbull, Inc., *Pebble Beach Historic Context Statement*, p. 127.

**Figure 4.3-2. West elevation, looking east from 17-Mile Drive.**



Photo taken January 5, 2012. Source: County of Monterey, Photos\_PLN010338\_010512.ppx (Slide 1).

A broad, cantilevered roof eave, its soffit unadorned and sheathed in smooth stucco, unifies the components of this elevation (refer to Figures 4.3-3 and 4.3-4). As on other elevations of the property, the roof eaves terminate in a broad wood fascia trimmed with metal. Under baseline conditions, the extant roof eaves, fascia, and stucco cladding beneath the eaves are in good condition. As viewed from the interior, the west elevation's ribbon windows allow for panoramic views of the coastal habitat below, in a sight line that extends in places from the home's central courtyard, through the interior of the house, and out to the Pacific Ocean. The west elevation is spanned primarily by continuous large-pane and sliding ribbon windows in a variety of configurations, as well as a band of non-original windows along the southern portion of the west elevation. On the second story, an open-air balcony framed by a low railing and sheltered beneath cantilevered roof eaves spans half of the west elevation and wraps around on the north. The second-story balcony is enclosed by thin, simple pipe supports.

**Figure 4.3-3. West elevation, looking north.**



Photo taken on July 28, 2010. Source: County of Monterey, Photos\_PPa\_PLN1—338\_Site Visit 07282010 (Slide 7).

**Figure 4.3-4. West and south elevations, looking northwest.**



Photo taken October 5, 2010. Source: 20101015\_Kirk DPR 523 Forms.pdf (Kirk, Anthony, PhD. State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Forms, Connell House, 10/15/10).



At the ground level, the second-story balcony acts as a canopy, which shelters an expansive patio area for the bedrooms facing it on the interior (refer to Figure 4.3-5). The landscaped patio exhibits a modular design composition and serves to integrate interior bedrooms with the outdoors. Hardscaping incorporates cobble-aggregate-sheathed tiles, alternating with squares open to the ground cover for plantings. Facing the patio, a series of large-pane windows and sliding glass doors, exhibiting an asymmetrical but balanced modular design, spans the length of the elevation and wraps around on the north. Beneath the south portion of the balcony on the first floor, a simple, unadorned wing-wall extends to provide privacy for the patio area. Smooth, unadorned stucco, with recessed circular lighting, characterizes the soffits beneath the balcony on the patio level.

Access is provided on the west elevation via an attenuated wood door located on the second floor balcony and an accompanying door on the first story. Exterior walls are sheathed with smooth stucco cladding; the stucco is in good condition. On the north, a simple wood beam extends beyond the wall plane.

**Figure 4.3-5. North and west elevations, looking southeast.**



Photo taken October 5, 2010. Source: 20101015\_Kirk DPR 523 Forms.pdf; Kirk, Anthony, PhD. State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Forms, Connell House, 10/15/10).

### *North Elevation*

As the location of the main entry, the north elevation is the second most publicly accessible elevation (refer to Figure 4.3-6). The entrance is accessed from Signal Hill Road via a concrete walkway leading down a short flight of steps. An elevated wood-plank porch, framed by a simple low railing, marks the entry. The entrance is framed by a band of thin rectangular transom windows that wraps onto the west elevation and is sheltered beneath a broad, cantilevered extension of the roof slab. The entry consists of a tall double-door sheathed in mahogany

vener. Extending from the entrance from the ground story is a broad, rectangular wing wall, which provides privacy and a strong geometric design element balancing the design composition on the north elevation. The wing wall is clad in smooth stucco and is in good condition. At the ground floor, the north elevation is characterized by a large-pane fixed window, set flush to the wall plane, and smooth, stucco-clad wall expanses mirroring the design throughout the house. The north elevation window on the ground story is in good condition.

**Figure 4.3-6. North elevation, looking southwest.**



Photo taken October 5, 2010. Source: 20101015\_Kirk DPR 523 Forms.pdf (Kirk, Anthony, PhD. State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Forms, Connell House, 10/15/10).

### *East Elevation*

Although it faces the street, the east elevation is largely obscured from view by a vertical plank privacy fence that encloses the upper (street) level courtyard (refer to Figure 4.3-7). The branches of a mature tree rise above the fence. A brick chimney is also visible on the roof near the northwest corner of the courtyard. The primary elements of the east elevation are this fence, trimmed with a single, unadorned wood beam, and the unornamented expanse of the stucco-clad east wall of the garage, which extends slightly above the roof line. The garage wall forms the northern border of the house's central courtyard. At the north end of the east elevation, an extension of the roof slab tops a gate leading from the north into the courtyard and shelters a large window that wraps the corner. Landscaping consists of a number of mature trees as well as other shrubs and ice plant.

**Figure 4.3-7. East elevation, looking west.**

Photo taken July 28, 2010. Source: County of Monterey, PPA1\_PLN100228\_Site Visit 07282010.pptx (Slide 12).

### *South Elevation*

From Signal Hill Road on the south side of the property, the driveway leads to the south elevation (refer to Figure 4.3-8). The driveway consists of large-aggregate cement trimmed by sandy dunes and landscaping. The principal features of the south elevation are a three-door garage and secondary entrance and small sunroom addition at the southwest corner of the building. The garage consists of three swing-up doors faced with attenuated wood tongue-and-groove planks. The garage doors and wood sheathing are in good repair. The garage doors are recessed beneath wide overhanging cantilevered roof eaves, trimmed with broad fascia boards.

At the west end of this elevation are a secondary entrance, facing east, and a small sunroom. Originally an open patio, the south-elevation entrance was enclosed in 1992 by Carmel architect Edward H. Hicks and converted to a 220-square-foot addition. Clad in the same smooth stucco sheathing the house, the addition displays steel-framed windows on the south elevation and a simple one-panel door facing east. The enclosure of the service yard had apparently been anticipated by Neutra, who had labeled the space a future maid's room on some early plans (Kirk and Lamprecht 2014).

**Figure 4.3-8. South elevation, looking northwest.**



Photo taken February 7, 2014. Source: County of Monterey, Photos\_PLN100338\_020714.pptx (Slide 6).

### *Courtyard*

Walls of glass, incorporating both fixed and jalousie (comprised of parallel glass slats) windows and sliding glass doors, face the courtyard on its west and north sides, integrating interior and exterior spaces (refer to Figure 4.3-9). Roof overhangs shade each exposure. A large, brick grill for cooking is integrated into the brick chimney, which is attached to the west courtyard wall. The north wall of the garage and the wood fence form the remaining two walls of the enclosure. Spanned by a terrace on the west elevated one step above ground level and paved in glazed tile, the courtyard is characterized by an ornamental garden accented by driftwood, boulders, stones, and shrubbery.

**Figure 4.3-9. Looking northwest at east and north sides.**

20101015\_Kirk DPR 523 Forms.pdf (Kirk, Anthony, PhD. State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Forms, Connell House, 10/15/10).

### *Interior Floor Plan*

The house is entered via a landing midway between the upper and lower levels. The upper story includes the living room, dining room, and kitchen (all of which open to or overlook both the courtyard and decks on the west and north), a den in the northeast corner, service spaces, and two darkrooms. The more private lower level consists of the master bedroom and bath on the northwest and two additional bedrooms that share a bath and sitting area. All of the bedrooms are characterized by window walls that both take advantage of the view and allow access to the western terrace.

### *Alterations and Integrity*

Alterations to the Connell House since it was completed in 1958 are limited. The most obvious change was the 1992–1993 enclosure of the yard on the southwest, a change that was in keeping with Neutra’s original vision. Designed by Carmel architect Edward M. Hicks, the new studio space added 220 square feet (approximately 8%) to the total floor area. In 1978, the kitchen was remodeled. Some of the original fenestration was replaced, mostly within the original openings, probably in association with the 1978 and 1992–1993 modifications. A large window has also been substituted for two Masonite panels on the north end of the west elevation.

The alterations have not compromised the overall integrity of the house. It retains integrity of location, having been designed for and built at its current site. The setting—characterized by sandy coastal dunes, overlooking the golf courses and coastline, and shielded from neighboring properties by topography and vegetation—is substantially the same. Many of the trees and

shrubs surrounding the house appear to date from the Connell's occupancy. The changes to the design and materials, as detailed above, have been minimal and have left character-defining features intact. Therefore, the Connell House's ability to convey Neutra's design intentions and aesthetic has not been impeded. The workmanship of the original house is still apparent in the materials and finishes. Integrity of feeling and association are the result of the retention of the other five aspects of integrity (location, design, setting, materials, and workmanship).

### Arthur Lowe Connell and Kathleen Connell

Arthur Lowe and Kathleen Connell commissioned the house on Signal Hill Road in 1957. The data presented in this section draws upon a 2014 study completed by San Buenaventura Research Associates, as well as additional research.

A native of Shamokin, Pennsylvania, Arthur Lowe Connell was born in 1913 to Edward W. and Margaret Lowe Connell. After attending the Connecticut-based preparatory academy Hotchkiss School, Arthur Connell attended Princeton University. Upon his graduation from Princeton in 1936, Connell married Kathleen Carpender in 1937. The couple settled in South Abington, Pennsylvania, and Arthur Connell worked at a bank. In 1944, Connell enlisted in the U.S. Navy, where he appears to have served as a photographer aboard U.S. Navy ships, including the USS Lake Champlain.

Following the war, the Connells moved to southern California, where they settled in San Marino, a community adjacent to the city of Pasadena and in close proximity, to the northeast, of the city of Los Angeles. In southern California, Connell continued to pursue his interest in photography. In 1948, he is said to have purchased the San Marino Camera Shop (his employer at the time). Connell had established another camera shop by the early 1950s in Pasadena, Connell's Camera Shop. According to available city directories, newspaper articles from the time, and Los Angeles County Voter Registration Roles, the Connells remained in San Marino until the late 1950s, when they commissioned their Signal Hill Road home from Richard Neutra.

While the details of Connell's work are not known, his primary professional pursuit and interest throughout his life appears to have been photography. As noted in San Buenaventura Research Associates (2014), Connell was "closely associated with a circle of important California photographers centered on Monterey Bay, including Ansel Adams, Morley Baer, Beaumont Newhall, Nancy Newhall, and Brett Weston, and through this association became a founding member of the nonprofit organization Friends of Photography in Carmel in 1967" (San\_Buenaventura Research Associates 2014:7).

Established "with the mission to promote education and exhibition in the photographic arts," Friends of Photography remained active in Carmel until the 1984 death of member Ansel Adams (San Buenaventura Research Associates 2014:7). Connell's life-long interest and work in photography is reflected in the purpose-built darkrooms, designed by Neutra adjacent to the garage, in the Signal Hill Road home.

### **4.3.2 Regulatory Setting**

This regulatory framework section identifies the federal, state, and local laws, statutes, guidelines, and regulations that govern the identification and treatment of historical resources as well as the analysis of potential impacts to historical resources.

### 4.3.2.1 Federal Regulations

#### Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) set forth national policy for recognizing and protecting historic properties. It established the NRHP, SHPOs and programs, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). Under Section 106 of the NHPA, federal agencies are required to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and provide the ACHP an opportunity to comment on those undertakings. Historic properties are defined in federal law as those properties that are listed in, or meet the criteria for listing in, the NRHP.

Cultural resources are considered during federal undertakings chiefly under §106 of the NHPA through one of its implementing regulations, 36 CFR 800 (Protection of Historic Properties), as well as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. Properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to Native Americans are considered under NHPA §101(d)(6)(A). Other relevant federal laws include the Archaeological Data Preservation Act of 1974, American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978, Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1989, among others.

#### The National Register of Historic Places

The NRHP, administered by the National Park Service (NPS), under the Department of the Interior, is the nation's official list of historically significant cultural resources. It is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect historic and archaeological resources. Properties listed in the NRHP include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture, and that retain integrity.

#### *National Register Criteria for Evaluation*

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is identified in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity 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 significant persons 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 history or prehistory.

In addition to meeting these criteria, a property must retain historic integrity, which is defined in National Register Bulletin 15 as the “ability of a property to convey its significance” (NPS 1990). In order to assess integrity, the NPS recognizes seven aspects or qualities that, considered together, define historic integrity. To retain integrity, a property must possess several, if not all, of these seven qualities, which are defined in the following manner in National Register Bulletin\_15:

1. *Location*: the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred;
2. *Design*: the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property;
3. *Setting*: the physical environment of a historic property;
4. *Materials*: the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
5. *Workmanship*: the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory;
6. *Feeling*: a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time; and,
7. *Association*: the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

“Integrity” is not synonymous with condition. A property may be in deteriorated condition but still retain sufficient integrity to convey the reasons for its significance.

Ordinarily cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historic figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, and properties that are primarily commemorative in nature, are not considered eligible for the NRHP, unless they satisfy certain conditions. In general, a resource must be 50 years of age to be considered for the NRHP, unless it satisfies a standard of exceptional importance.

#### **4.3.2.2 State Regulations**

##### Office of Historic Preservation

The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) is the governmental agency primarily responsible for the statewide administration of the historic preservation program in California. The mission of the OHP and the State Historical Resources Commission, in partnership with the people of California and governmental agencies, is to “preserve and enhance California’s irreplaceable historic heritage as a matter of public interest so that its vital legacy of cultural, educational, recreational, aesthetic, economic, social, and environmental benefits will be maintained and enriched for present and future generations.” The OHP’s responsibilities include:

- Identifying, evaluating, and registering historic properties;
- Ensuring compliance with federal and state regulatory obligations;
- Cooperating with traditional preservation partners while building new alliances with other community organizations and public agencies;
- Encouraging the adoption of economic incentives programs designed to benefit property owners; and,



- Encouraging economic revitalization by promoting a historic preservation ethic through preservation education and public awareness and, most significantly, by demonstrating leadership and stewardship for historic preservation in California.

The Northwest Information Center (NWIC) at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, is under contract to the OHP and helps implement the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS). It integrates information on new resources and known resources into the CHRIS, supplies information on resources and surveys to the government, and supplies lists of consultants qualified to do historic preservation fieldwork within the area. The California Archeological Site Inventory is the collection of Site Records that has been acquired and managed by the regional Information Centers and the OHP since 1975.

### California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA requires a lead agency to analyze whether historic and/or archaeological resources may be adversely impacted by a proposed project. Under CEQA, a “project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (PRC §21084.1). Under CEQA, a determination must first be made as to whether the proposed project has the potential to affect cultural resources. If cultural resources are present, then the proposed project must be analyzed for its potential to cause “substantial adverse change in the significance” of the resource.

According to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, for the purposes of CEQA, historic resources are:

- A resource listed in, or formally determined eligible for listing in, the CRHR (PRC §5024.1, 14 CCR, §4850 et seq);
- A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in §5020.1(k) of the PRC or identified as significance in a historic resources survey meeting the requirements of §5024.1(g) of the PRC;
- Any building, structure, object, site, or district that the lead agency determines eligible for national, state, or local landmark listing; generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be historically significant (and therefore a historic resource under CEQA) if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR (as defined in PRC §5024.1, 14 CCR, §4852).

Resources nominated to the CRHR must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to convey the reasons for their significance. Resources whose historic integrity (as defined in the previous section) does not meet NRHP criteria may still be eligible for listing in the CRHR.

According to CEQA, the fact that a resource is not listed in or determined eligible for listing in the CRHR or is not included in a local register or survey shall not preclude the lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource (PRC §5024.1). Pursuant to CEQA, a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment (State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(b)).

CEQA requires a lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on archaeological resources. If it can be demonstrated that a project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts to be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the

extent that they cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (§21083.2[a], [b], and [c]). Section 21083.2(g) describes a unique archaeological resource as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

The State CEQA Guidelines specify, “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired” (State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5). Material impairment occurs when a project alters in an adverse manner or demolishes “those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion or eligibility for inclusion” in the NRHP, CRHR, or local register.

#### *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*

CEQA provides that a project that has been determined to conform with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties can generally be considered to be a project that will not cause a significant adverse impact (State CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(b)(1)).

The goal of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards is to outline treatment approaches that allow for the retention of and/or sensitive changes to the distinctive materials and features that lend a historical resource its significance. When changes are carried out according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the historical resource retains its historic integrity and thereby continues to convey the reasons for its significance. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and associated Guidelines (36 CFR 67) are “neither technical nor prescriptive, but are intended to promote responsible preservation practices that help protect” cultural resources (Weeks and Grimmer 2001). The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines offer general recommendations for preserving, maintaining, repairing, and replacing historical materials and features, as well as designing new additions or making alterations. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards also provide guidance on new construction adjacent to historic districts and properties, in order to ensure that there are no adverse impacts to integrity as a result of a change in setting.

As part of the Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, the National Park Service defines four treatment approaches for historic properties. The basic definitions of the four treatment approaches are defined below.

- Preservation: 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: 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:** Restoration depicts a property at a particular period of time in its history, while removing evidence of other periods.
- **Reconstruction:** Reconstruction re-creates vanished or non-surviving portions of a property for interpretive purposes.

Choosing the appropriate treatment approach depends on a number of factors, such as the level of and reasons for a property's historic significance, physical condition, and proposed use. While a single approach is generally selected for projects involving historic properties, some projects benefit from the inclusion of two or more approaches, depending on the situation and condition of the property. For example, a property that retains most of its original features and materials, but is missing some character-defining materials and features, might require a rehabilitation treatment approach, with limited, focused reconstruction.

### California Register of Historical Resources

California PRC §5024.1 establishes the CRHR and charges the State Historical Resources Commission with overseeing its implementation. Created in 1992 and implemented in 1998, the CRHR is "an authoritative guide in California 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 §21083.2 and §21084.1). Certain properties, including those listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and California Historical Landmarks numbered 770 and higher, are automatically included in the CRHR. Other properties recognized under the California Points of Historical Interest program, identified as significant in historical resources surveys or designated by local landmarks programs, may be nominated for inclusion in the CRHR.

According to PRC §5024.1(c), a resource, either an individual property or a contributor to a historic district, may be listed in the CRHR if the State Historical Resources Commission determines that it meets one or more of the following criteria, which are modeled on NRHP criteria:

- Criterion 1: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
- Criterion 2: It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
- Criterion 3: It 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.
- Criterion 4: It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

Resources nominated to the CRHR must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to convey the reasons for their significance. Resources whose historic integrity does not meet NRHP criteria may still be eligible for listing in the CRHR.

### State Historic Building Code

The 2013 California State Historical Building Code (CHBC), which is defined in §§18950–18961 of Division 13, Part 2.7 of Health and Safety Code, is intended to save California’s architectural heritage by recognizing the unique construction issues inherent in maintaining and adaptively reusing historic buildings. The CHBC provides alternative building regulations for permitting repairs, alterations and additions necessary for the preservation, rehabilitation, relocation, related construction, change of use, or continued use of a “qualified historical building or structure.” CHBC §18955 defines a “qualified historical building or structure” as “any structure or property, collection of structures, and their associated sites deemed of importance to the history, architecture, or culture of an area by an appropriate local or state governmental jurisdiction. This shall include structures on existing or future national, state or local historical registers or official inventories, such as the National Register of Historic Places, State Historical Landmarks, State Points of Historical Interest, and city or county registers or inventories of historical or architecturally significant sites, places, historic districts, or landmarks. This shall also include places, locations, or sites identified on these historical registers or official inventories and deemed of importance to the history, architecture, or culture of an area by an appropriate local or state governmental jurisdiction.”

### California Statewide Historic Preservation Plan

As required by the NPS, each State Historic Preservation Office in the United States must prepare/update a State Preservation Plan each 5 years. As stated by the State Office of Historic Preservation, the State Preservation Plan is intended to:

- Identify current and emerging historic preservation issues throughout the state;
- Establish the vision, mission, and priorities for the Office of Historic Preservation;
- Identify preservation goals and objectives for integrating historic preservation into the broader planning and decision-making at local, regional, and state levels; and,
- Identify preservation partners and their contributions needed to accomplish the State Plan’s goals and objectives.

In the 2006–2010 California Statewide Historic Preservation Plan, preservation of modern resources of the recent past was identified as one of the top 10 goals for the state’s preservation program: “In California the demolition in recent years of buildings by master architects Edward Durrell Stone, Richard Neutra, and Rudolf Schindler, to name a few, has heightened the sense of urgency for the need to study and better understand the cultural resources of the Modern Age” (State Parks 2006).

### Certified Local Government Program

Monterey County is a Certified Local Government (CLG) in accordance with the provisions of the 1980 amendments to the NHPA. The California CLG program is administered by OHP. In accordance with federal requirements, each CLG must comply with the following requirements:

- Enforce state and local laws and regulations for the designation and protection of historic properties;
- Establish a historic preservation review commission by local ordinance;

- Maintain a system for the survey and inventory of historic properties;
- Provide for public participation in the local preservation program; and,
- Perform the responsibilities delegated to the local entity by the state.

### **4.3.2.3 Local Regulations and Policies**

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

Chapter 18 of the Monterey County Code of Ordinances describes the provisions and procedures related to historic preservation throughout the county. According to §18.25.070 of the Monterey County Code of Ordinances, an improvement, natural feature, or site may be designated a historical resource and any area within the County may be designated a historic district if such improvement, natural feature, site, or area meets the criteria for listing on the NRHP, the CRHR, or one or more of the following conditions are found to exist:

##### **A. Historical and Cultural Significance**

1. The resource or district proposed for designation is particularly representative of a distinct historical period, type, style, region, or way of life.
2. The resource or district proposed for designation is, or contains, a type of building or buildings which was once common but is now rare.
3. The resource or district proposed for designation was connected with someone renowned.
4. The resource or district proposed for designation is connected with a business or use which was once common but is now rare.
5. The resource or district proposed for designation represents the work of a master builder, engineer, designer, artist, or architect whose talent influenced a particular architectural style or way of life.
6. The resource or district proposed for designation is the site of an important historic event or is associated with events that have made a meaningful contribution to the nation, State, or community.
7. The resource or district proposed for designation has a high potential of yielding information of archaeological interest.

##### **B. Historic, Architectural, and Engineering Significance**

1. The resource or district proposed for designation exemplifies a particular architectural style or way of life important to the County.
2. The resource or district proposed for designation exemplifies the best remaining architectural type of a community.
3. The construction materials or engineering methods used in the resource or district proposed for designation embody elements of outstanding attention to architectural or engineering design, detail, material or craftsmanship.

### C. Community and Geographic Setting

1. The proposed resource materially benefits the historic character of the community.
2. The unique location or singular physical characteristic of the resource or district proposed for designation represents an established and familiar visual feature of the community, area, or county.
3. The district is a geographically definable area, urban or rural possessing a significant concentration or continuity of site, buildings, structures, or objects unified by past events, or aesthetically by plan or physical development.
4. The preservation of a resource or resources is essential to the integrity of the district.

### County of Monterey Mills Act Program

Adopted in May 2012, Chapter 18.28 of the Monterey County Code of Ordinances describes the provisions and procedures for the County's Mills Act program, which offers substantial property tax reductions for qualifying historic properties. In order to incentivize the rehabilitation and re-use of historically significant properties in the County, the Mills Act allows property owners to apply for and receive tax reductions for rehabilitation/maintenance/preservation projects that comply with the Secretary's Standards. Where rehabilitation/preservation of historically significant properties is prohibitive, the Mills Act property tax program helps offset costs of preservation, making the retention of historically significant properties economically feasible.

### Pebble Beach Historic Context Statement

Prepared in conjunction with the Monterey County Parks Department and adopted by the Monterey County Board of Supervisors in September 2013, the Pebble Beach Historic Context Statement establishes themes of significance, associated property types, eligibility requirements, and integrity thresholds for built environment properties and resources in Pebble Beach. The document was prepared in accordance with accepted professional standards, overseen by OHP, and partially funded by a grant under the State's CLG program. Seven primary themes were documented:

- Residential Development
- Commercial Development
- Landscape Development & Preservation
- Recreation, Leisure & Tourism
- Transportation & Infrastructure
- Resource Extraction
- Social and Economic Trends

These themes were related to six periods of development, from the Native American occupation of the Monterey Peninsula and ending in 1969.

#### **4.3.2.4 Applicable State, Regional, and Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Historical Resources**

Table 4.3-1 lists applicable state, regional, and local land use policies and regulations pertaining to historical resources that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and that are relevant to the proposed project. A general overview of these policy documents is presented above in Section 4.3.2, Regulatory Setting, and in Chapter 3, Environmental Setting. Also included in Table 4.3-1 is an analysis of project consistency with identified policies and regulations. Where the analysis concludes the proposed project would potentially conflict with the applicable policy or regulation, the reader is referred to Section 4.3.5, Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures, for additional discussion.

Table 4.3-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Historic Resources

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
<b><i>County of Monterey Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan</i></b>		
<b>Resource Management Element</b>		
<b><i>CULTURAL RESOURCES</i></b>		
<p><b>Policy 57.</b> The timely identification and evaluation of archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources, and coordination with applicable Native American representatives, is encouraged, so that these resources are given full consideration during the conceptual design phase of land use planning for project development.</p>	<p>This policy is intended to protect cultural resources and encourage coordination with Native American representatives to ensure proper consideration of these resources.</p>	<p><u>Potentially Consistent.</u> Archaeological surveys at the project site did not identify any archaeological resources. The surveys found no additional factors that would indicate elevated sensitivity at the project site. A Notice of Preparation of an EIR (NOP) was issued prior to July 2015; therefore, Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) does not apply to the project; however, in April 2018, the County notified and received a comment letter from the Ohlone/Costanoan-Esselen Nation, requesting a tribal monitor during new soil disturbance. Historical resources at the site have been identified and have played a central role in the planning process.</p>
<b><i>Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan</i></b>		
<b>Part 1 Title 20 Zoning Ordinance</b>		
<b><i>20.54 – HR DISTRICT</i></b>		
<p><b>20.54.040 Referral to the Historic Resources Review Board.</b></p> <p>A. Upon receipt of any application, except those involving archaeological resources, pursuant to Section 20.54.080, a copy of all application materials shall be transmitted to the Secretary of Historic Resources Review Board requesting the review and recommendation of the Historic Resources Review Board.</p> <p>B. The Appropriate Authority shall provide sufficient time, but not less than 30 days from the date of transmittal, to the Historic Resources</p>	<p>This section is intended to protect and preserve historical resources within the Del Monte Forest by requiring project review by the Historic Resources Review Board of a project's potential impacts on historical resources in the coastal development permit process.</p>	<p><u>Potentially Consistent.</u> The Historic Resources Review Board has been consulted on Code Enforcement cases related to this property, including development of a "mothball plan" to stabilize the structure. The HRRB will be asked for recommendation on this project prior to hearing.</p>



**Table 4.3-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Historic Resources**

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
<p>Review Board for the review of and recommendation on such applications.</p>		
<p><b>20.54.080 Regulations.</b></p> <p>A. Except as otherwise provided, no alteration may be allowed on any area in an "HR" district without the approval of a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 20.70 of this Title.</p> <p>B. Minor alterations and minor modifications to previously approved projects that do not harm the archaeological or historical resource may be approved without a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to Section 20.54.050B, if a Coastal Development Permit or amendment is not otherwise required pursuant to Chapters 20.70 or 20.76.</p> <p>C. Existing designated structures shall not be subject to the height and setback provisions of the district with which the "HR" district is combined.</p> <p>D. New construction on designated sites shall be subject to the height and setback provisions of the district with which the "HR" district is combined.</p> <p>E. Development proposed on parcels with an identified historic resource shall be designed and located so as to avoid significant adverse impacts on the historic resource.</p> <p>F. Feasible mitigation measures recommended by the Historic Resources Review Board or contained in any required historic or archaeological survey report prepared for the project shall be made conditions of approval.</p> <p>G. As a condition of approval of an application for demolition or alteration of an identified historic resource, rezoning to add an "HR" combining district or to modify an existing "HR" zoning district, shall be required to place only the designated site within the "HR" District.</p> <p>H. Notwithstanding the provisions of the California Government Code, Section 65091 (A)(3), no property shall be placed in the "HR" District without notice to the property owner in accordance with Section 20.84.040 (A)(1) of this Title.</p>	<p>This section is intended to protect and preserve historical resources within the Del Monte Forest by establishing provisions for project review of alterations to historical resources and new construction adjacent to historical resources or within historic districts.</p>	<p><u>Potentially Inconsistent</u>. The proposed project would result in the demolition of a historical resource and replacement with a new single-family residence. The project is not within the officially designated "HR" district, but would be required to obtain a coastal development permit, consistent with this section. The identified historic resource would be demolished and no historic easement adequate to protect the resource would be created, inconsistent with this section.</p>

**Table 4.3-1. Applicable Local Plans and Policies Relevant to Historic Resources**

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Intent of the Policy in Relation to Avoiding or Mitigating Significant Environmental Impacts	Preliminary Consistency Determination*
<p>I. As a condition of approval of an application for demolition or alteration of an identified historic resource, the historic resource shall be placed in an historic easement. The easement shall be adequate to protect the resource.</p>		
<p><b>20.64.300 – HISTORIC RESOURCES</b></p>		
<p><b>20.64.300 Regulations for Historic Resources.</b></p> <p>A. Purpose: To provide reasonable flexibility of zoning standards to encourage and accommodate the renovation and rehabilitation of historic resources and structures within historic districts.</p> <p>B. Following the provision of notice pursuant to Chapter 20.76 of this Code, the Director of Planning and Building Inspection may grant an exception to the zoning district regulations when such exception is necessary to permit the preservation or restoration of or improvements to a structure designated as historically significant pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 18.85 of this Code. Such exceptions may include, but not limited to, parking, yards, height, and coverage regulations. Such exceptions shall not include approval of uses not otherwise allowed by the zoning district regulations.</p>	<p>This section is intended to protect and retain historical resources through the use of flexible zoning standards for projects involving the retention and rehabilitation of historical resources and contributors within historic districts.</p>	<p><u>Potentially Inconsistent.</u> Proposed project does not include renovating and rehabilitating a historical resource or contributor within a historic district, but would demolish and remove a historical resource, inconsistent with this section’s intended purpose of renovating or rehabilitating historic resources.</p>
<p><b>County of Monterey General Plan (1982)</b></p>		
<p><b>Goals, Objectives, and Policies for Public Services and Facilities</b></p>		
<p><b>HISTORIC PRESERVATION</b></p>		
<p><b>Goal 52:</b> To designate, protect, preserve, enhance, and perpetuate those structures and areas of historical, architectural, and engineering significance which contribute to the historical heritage of Monterey County and to enhance Monterey County’s historical heritage and diverse cultural background by encouraging the systematic collection and preservation of historic records and artifacts and the promotion of related cultural events.</p>	<p>The intent of this goal is to protect structures and areas of historical, architectural, and engineering significance which contribute to the historical heritage of Monterey County.</p>	<p><u>Potentially Inconsistent.</u> The project would result in the permanent demolition of a historic resource. Although all available mitigation has been identified, identified mitigation would not be sufficient to protect, preserve, or enhance the historic structure.</p>

\* Although a preliminary determination regarding project consistency is made, it is the responsibility of the County Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors, the lead CEQA decision makers, to make the final determination regarding consistency issues.

### 4.3.3 Thresholds of Significance

CEQA directs lead agencies to protect and preserve resources with cultural, historic, scientific, or educational value. The significance of historical resources is based on thresholds identified in accordance with §15064.5 (Determining the Significance of Impacts to Archaeological and Historic Resources) and Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, which provide the following thresholds for determining impact significance with respect to historical resources. A significant impact to historical resources would occur if the project would:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

The State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 provides additional guidance regarding the determination of significance of impacts on historical resources. Section 15064.5 provides:

*Section 15064.5. Determining the Significance of Impacts to Archaeological and Historical Resources*

*(a) For purposes of this section, the term “historical resources” shall include the following:*

- (1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).*
- (2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.*
- (3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:*
  - (A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;*

- (B) *Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;*
        - (C) *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; or*
        - (D) *Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.*
      - (4) *The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.*
- (b) *A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.*
  - (1) *Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.*
  - (2) *The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:*
    - (A) *Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or*
    - (B) *Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or*

(C) *Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.*

- (3) *Generally, a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer, shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historical resource.*
- (4) *A lead agency shall identify potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant adverse changes in the significance of an historical resource. The lead agency shall ensure that any adopted measures to mitigate or avoid significant adverse changes are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.*
- (5) *When a project will affect state-owned historical resources, as described in Public Resources Code Section 5024, and the lead agency is a state agency, the lead agency shall consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5024.5. Consultation should be coordinated in a timely fashion with the preparation of environmental documents.*

#### **4.3.4 Impact Assessment Methodology**

The assessment of impacts to historic resources included site inspection and documentation, document review, supplemental research, utilization of the findings of SHPO, and application of the appropriate sections of the State CEQA Guidelines. Site visits to the property were performed on February 24 and April 20, 2015 (exterior and portions of the interior), and August 17, 2015 (from the public right-of-way). The project applicant, Massy Mehdipour, was present during the February 24 and April 20, 2015 visits. Document review encompassed the technical reports and documents cited above (page 4.3-1) as well as numerous studies and correspondence prepared for or submitted to the County and the project Applicant (itemized in Chapter 8 of the EIR, References). Supplemental research focused on the career of Richard Neutra and utilized Internet resources as well as recognized scholarly treatises, including:

- *Richard Neutra and the Search for Modern Architecture* (Hines 1982)
- *Neutra: The Complete Works* (Lamprecht et al. 2010)
- *Richard Neutra* (McCoy 1960)

Identification of historic resources was based on SHPO findings, which were obtained from the OHP Historic Property Directory and SHPO correspondence with the County (February 12 and July 11, 2014), as well as the County-adopted Pebble Beach Historic Context Statement. The application of CEQA to historical resources employed §15064.5 (Determining the

Significance of Impacts to Archeological and Historical Resources) and §15126.4(b) (Mitigation Measures Related Impacts on Historical Resources) of the State CEQA Guidelines.

#### 4.3.4.1 Baseline Conditions

June 13, 2014 is the date the Connell House was determined eligible for listing on the NRHP by the SHPO. Subsequent to that date and prior to release of the NOP, the structure was allowed to deteriorate, and surficial damage was incurred as further described below. After release of the NOP for this project, the existing residence was vandalized and allowed to further deteriorate. This analysis evaluates the level of impact that would result from implementation of the proposed project on historical resources at the time of issuance of the NOP (baseline conditions). It should be noted that, although the historic structure had been allowed to deteriorate since the June 13, 2014, eligibility determination (refer to Appendix C), the level of deterioration would not change the significance or eligibility of the historic resource; therefore, the baseline condition would not be substantially different from the residence's documented condition in June 2014.

Various conditions have changed at the site since the June 2014 eligibility determination (refer to Appendix C), including neglect, vandalism, damage, dereliction, and/or destruction of several components of the Connell House, resulting in various ongoing code enforcement actions that have been initiated by the County Code Enforcement Division. The historic residence is now in disrepair; however, a number of maintenance activities developed in accordance with the standards contained in Preservation Brief No. 31 of the National Park Service have been implemented in accordance with a Stipulated Agreement dated November 16, 2015.~~have been recommended by the Monterey County Historic Resources Review Board (Resolution No. 15CP01861). Specifically, the HRRB approved a measures of the "Mothball Plan" consistent with the standards contained in Preservation Brief No. 31 of the National Park Service. The measures of the "Mothball Plan" are intended to prevent additional structural deterioration, protect the building from sudden loss, weatherize and maintain the building to stop moisture penetration and control humidity levels inside the building. The measures in the "Mothball Plan" have been installed and are being monitored by the Monterey County Building Official. The environmental baseline captures the integrity of the residence as it existed at the time of NOP issuance irrespective of how the recent and ongoing dereliction and restoration recommendations are ultimately implemented and resolved.~~

The County recognizes that additional changes and degradation to the property have occurred since the site's NRHP eligibility listing and the filing of the NOP. However, to ensure the level of environmental impact is not understated as a result of intentional neglect of the historical resources, the established baseline at the time of the NOP will be used to support the analysis of historical resources in the EIR regardless of how ongoing code enforcement actions and restoration recommendations related to the Connell House are ultimately resolved. The residence's existing state of disrepair has been considered in assessing the feasibility of identified mitigation measures, as any mitigation measures would ultimately be implemented in the context of existing conditions.

Figures 4.3-10 through 4.3-13 show the baseline condition of the house. These photographs were taken by SWCA Environmental Consultants staff during field work conducted at the site on February 24, 2015. Additional photographs from February 24, 2015 and reflecting baseline conditions are included in Appendix D.

**Figure 4.3-10. West elevation, looking north.**



Photo taken February 24, 2015. Source: SWCA.

**Figure 4.3-11. South elevation, looking northwest.**



Photo taken February 24, 2015. Source: SWCA.

**Figure 4.3-12. North elevation, looking southwest.**



Photo taken February 24, 2015. Source: SWCA.

**Figure 4.3-13. Interior view facing northwest.**



Photo taken February 24, 2015. Source: SWCA.



#### 4.3.4.2 Mitigation Measures Related to Impacts on Historical Resources

The feasibility and effectiveness of identified mitigation measures was based on guidance set forth in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b), which provides:

*(b) Mitigation Measures Related to Impacts on Historical Resources.*

- (1) 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 (1995), Weeks and Grimmer, the project's impact on the historical resource shall generally be considered mitigated below a level of significance and thus is not significant.*
- (2) In some circumstances, documentation of an historical resource, by way of historic narrative, photographs or architectural drawings, as mitigation for the effects of demolition of the resource will not mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur.*
- (3) Public agencies should, whenever feasible, seek to avoid damaging effects on any historical resource of an archaeological nature. The following factors shall be considered and discussed in an EIR for a project involving such an archaeological site:*
  - (A) Preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to archaeological sites. Preservation in place maintains the relationship between artifacts and the archaeological context. Preservation may also avoid conflict with religious or cultural values of groups associated with the site.*
  - (B) Preservation in place may be accomplished by, but is not limited to, the following:*
    - 1. Planning construction to avoid archaeological sites;*
    - 2. Incorporation of sites within parks, greenspace, or other open space;*
    - 3. Covering the archaeological sites with a layer of chemically stable soil before building tennis courts, parking lots, or similar facilities on the site.*
    - 4. Deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement.*
  - (C) When data recovery through excavation is the only feasible mitigation, a data recovery plan, which makes provisions for adequately recovering the scientifically consequential information from and about the historical resource, shall be prepared and adopted prior to any excavation being undertaken. Such studies*

*shall be deposited with the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center. Archeological sites known to contain human remains shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 7050.5 Health and Safety Code. If an artifact must be removed during project excavation or testing, curation may be an appropriate mitigation.*

*(D) Data recovery shall not be required for an historical resource if the lead agency determines that testing or studies already completed have adequately recovered the scientifically consequential information from and about the archaeological or historical resource, provided that the determination is documented in the EIR and that the studies are deposited with the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center.*

### **4.3.5 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures**

There is one identified historical resource located on the project site (the Connell House) and one identified historical resource located in close proximity to the project site (17-Mile Drive). Potential direct and indirect impacts on these resources as a result of the project are discussed below.

#### **4.3.5.1 The Connell House**

The Connell House has been the subject of various historical evaluations over the last decade and historians have disagreed about the historical significance of the structure. However, the Connell House was determined eligible for listing in the NRHP on June 13, 2014, and is listed in the CRHR, pursuant to its formal determination of eligibility for the NRHP (CCR §4851(a)(12)) (Roland-Nawi 2014a). Therefore, the Connell House is considered a historical resource per State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5.

The property was determined to be significant for its architecture under Criterion C/1 as “an excellent example of the International Style within the Modern Movement in Pebble Beach, and representative of master architect Richard Neutra’s mid-century residential work” (Kirk and Lamprecht 2014). The Connell House also appears eligible for designation as a historic resource under the Monterey County Historic Preservation Ordinance, Significance Criterion 1.a.iii. According to the Pebble Beach Historic Context Statement adopted by the County Board of Supervisors, the house is “an extremely rare example of an International Style residence in Pebble Beach” (Page & Turnbull 2013), which exhibits nearly all the character-defining features of the International Style, including:

- horizontal emphasis with large sections of unornamented wall surface;
- cantilevered sections of house, roof, and balconies;
- ribbon windows or large expanses of window walls; and,
- stucco cladding.

Designed during Neutra’s most prolific decade, the Connell House clearly articulates Neutra’s mature residential architectural style. Features of Neutra’s style evident in the Connell House, which had earlier helped to define the International Style, and his approach to design include:

- An asymmetrical but balanced design composition and massing;

- Rational design based on modular approach to building elements and spaces;
- Juxtaposition of opaque and transparent planes;
- An emphasis on the horizontal, with strong, geometric volumes, cantilevered roof eaves; and balcony, and use of continuous bands of windows and fenestration;
- The careful integration of the building within the site’s features and topography;
- Orientation of the houses living spaces to the remarkable view;
- The incorporation of generous expanses of windows, and butted window joints at corners, to integrate exterior and interior;
- The provision of associated exterior spaces, accessible through the window walls, to further integrate exterior and interior;
- Expansive, unadorned wall surfaces, with smooth stucco cladding;
- Lack of historicizing ornament or decoration; and,
- Sensitivity to the client’s program and lifestyle.

The proposed project would demolish the Connell House, a historical resource listed in the CRHR, including all the physical characteristics that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in the CRHR. According to §15064.5(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the project would “materially impair” the significance of the Connell House, resulting in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, which is a significant environmental effect. CEQA requires that even where a significant and unavoidable adverse impact would occur, all feasible mitigation measures shall be required to lessen the severity of the significant impact. The following mitigation measures are designed to accomplish a lessening of severity of the significant impact identified above.

<b>HR Impact 1</b>	
The project would demolish the Connell House, a significant historical resource, resulting in a significant impact.	
<b>Mitigation Measures (mm) and Mitigation Monitoring Actions (mma)</b>	
HR/mm-1.1	<i>Prior to issuance of the demolition, grading, or construction permits and subsequent to repair and restoration of ongoing vandalism and degradation, the applicant shall submit to the County of Monterey Resource Management Agency – Planning Department for review and approval a recordation of the Connell House per the most recent guidelines of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS). Where baseline conditions are no longer in existence and have not been repaired, original features and materials shall be restored, with the use of documentary evidence, in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The documentation package shall include measured drawings; written and oral histories, including historic context and statement of significance; written architectural description; bibliographic materials; large-format, black-and-white photographs; and relevant related information. The original documentation shall be submitted to the HABS office in Washington, D.C., for deposit in the Library of Congress. Copies of the documentation package shall be offered to the Pebble Beach Company Lagorio Archives; Monterey Public Library (California Room); Monterey County Historical Society; Richard Neutra archives at the UCLA Charles E. Young Research Library, Syracuse University Library, and Columbia University</i>

<b>HR Impact 1</b>	
<i>Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library; and NWIC at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park.</i>	
<i>An individual or team meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (36 CFR Part 61) shall be retained to oversee the return of the property to baseline conditions in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and to prepare the HABS materials. In the event that restoration is not possible, recordation shall still be required in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to the greatest extent feasible.</i>	
<i>HR/mma-1.1.1</i>	<i>Prior to issuance of the demolition, grading, or construction permits, the applicant shall submit a recordation of the Connell House per the most recent guidelines of the HABS to the County of Monterey Resource Management Agency – Planning Department to demonstrate compliance with this measure.</i>
<i>HR/mm-1.2</i>	<i>Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, or construction permits, the applicant shall submit for review and approval to the County of Monterey Resource Management Agency – Planning Department, and a designated host organization (e.g., Monterey County Historical Society or Pebble Beach Company), electronic information in a web-based format for use in creating a web page documenting the Connell House. Prior to starting the gathering of this information, the applicant shall work with a qualified professional to create a scope of work for the educational materials to be developed, and the scope of work shall be provided to the Monterey County Historic Resources Review Board for review and approval. The web page shall document the house, its history, and features, at baseline conditions. The web page shall include, but not be limited to, a video tour of the Connell House to be completed prior to any demolition; photographs; architectural drawings; current and historic photographs; and background material such as oral histories with individuals with knowledge of the Connell House.</i>  <i>An individual or team meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (36 CFR Part 61) shall be retained to prepare the web page content. The web page shall be operational no later than 1 year following issuance of project permits.</i>
<i>HR/mma-1.2.1</i>	<i>Prior to issuance of demolition, grading, or construction permits, the Applicant shall submit educational information documenting the Connell House to the County of Monterey Resource Management Agency – Planning Department for incorporation into a web page documenting the Connell House.</i>
<b>Residual Impacts</b>	
Demolition of an historical resource is irreversible and historical resources are irreplaceable. Demolition of the Connell House would permanently remove from the community of Pebble Beach a rare and well-articulated example of the residential use of the American International Style and the community's only example of the work of master architect Richard Neutra. CEQA provides that, "in some circumstances, documentation of an historical resource...as mitigation for the effects of demolition of the resource will not mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur" (State CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(b)(2)). Implementation of mitigation measures HR/mm-1.1 and HR/mm-1.2 would reduce but not eliminate the adverse impacts of the proposed project. Therefore, residual impacts would be <i>significant and unavoidable</i> .	

### Infeasible Mitigation

In documentation submitted by the Applicant as part of the EIR administrative record, the Applicant asserts that in order to fully evaluate all mitigation scenarios and options applicable to the proposed project and demolition of the Connell House, the EIR must consider the "mitigation" option of replacing the Connell House with a residence designed by another architect of some measure of acclaim. The Applicant believes that replacement of the historic residence with another notable architect's work would compensate of the loss of the historic

structure. The following discussion explains why replacement of the Connell House by a residence designed by another notable architect (Ricardo Legorreta) does not constitute mitigation that can be considered in this EIR to reduce significant and unavoidable impacts to the Connell House.

The proposed project would replace the Connell House, designed by Richard Neutra in 1957–1958, by a new home designed by Legorreta + Legorreta in 2011. It has been stated by the project Applicant that the construction of a new single-family dwelling designed by renowned Mexican architect Ricardo Legorreta would compensate for the loss of the Neutra-designed home to the extent that effects on historic resources would be mitigated and reduced to a level of insignificance. The following discussion identifies the reasons the “Legorreta design mitigation” proposed by the Applicant is considered infeasible and cannot be implemented to minimize impacts to a less than significant level.

Historical resources under CEQA are defined by inclusion in the CRHR, a local register, or eligibility for the same. According to OHP, the significance of a potential historical resource cannot be evaluated until sufficient time has elapsed for a scholarly understanding of its historic context (e.g., as has been the case for the Connell House). The proposed project has not yet been constructed nor its design realized; therefore, its historic context and associated period of significance is not yet defined. It is impossible to analyze the potential historical significance of the Legorreta design in the absence of any defined historic context.

If, as hypothesized by the Applicant, the proposed project is significant for its design by Ricardo Legorreta, or the firm Legorreta + Legorreta (whose name is listed on the plans), or Bill Bernstein, AIA, of Bernstein Zubieta Architects (who now appears to have taken responsibility for handling architectural planning for the proposed residence and whose name is also listed on project plans), a finding of significance under Criterion C (a resource that “embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction”), would require the consideration of several issues on which there is currently inadequate information to analyze, as further described below.

It is unclear what significance this design has in the career of Ricardo Legorreta or the Legorreta + Legorreta firm (with assistance from Bernstein Zubieta), which is still in practice. The NPS, in *National Register Bulletin 15, How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, states that “A property is not eligible as the work of a master [architect], however, simply because it was designed by a prominent architect.” The Bulletin explains that “The property must express a particular phase in the development of the master’s career, an aspect of his or her work, or a particular idea or theme in his or her craft.”

It is unknown how the proposed (unbuilt) project may express the career of Ricardo Legorreta or the firm of Legorreta + Legorreta. Additionally, it is unknown how much of the design can actually be attributed to Ricardo Legorreta, who passed away December 30, 2011. The extent to which the built project, which may have undergone design revision(s) since 2011 and may also be revised as a result of the entitlement process or during construction, reflects Legorreta’s design and philosophy is also unknown.

Richard Neutra’s status as a master architect and his contributions to 20<sup>th</sup> century architecture are undisputed. Legorreta’s legacy is not defined and his ultimate place in architecture is yet to be determined. Ricardo Legorreta’s reputation and fame were established well before his son

Victor Legorreta joined the firm. The significance of the Legorreta + Legorreta firm is currently unknown.

From a regulatory standpoint under CEQA, the only provision specifically addressing mitigation of adverse impacts to historical (non-archaeological) resources to a less than significant level is the use of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The Applicant-proposed mitigation scenario outlined above does not meet this standard and was further rejected as infeasible because there is no known precedent under CEQA for mitigation of significant impacts resulting from demolition of a historical resource by the construction of another resource of undetermined historical value and a different, as yet undefined, historic context and period of significance. Therefore, the above Applicant-proposed mitigation scenario was thoroughly considered but deemed infeasible/inadequate in minimizing impacts.

#### **4.3.5.2 17-Mile Drive**

The proposed project is adjacent to, and would be seen from, 17-Mile Drive, an eligible historical resource. The following section addresses potential indirect impacts to the character-defining features and historic integrity and significance of 17-Mile Drive.

Pebble Beach Historic Context Statement identified 17-Mile Drive as a cultural landscape:

*“As a deliberately designed scenic drive, 17-Mile Drive clearly meets the definition of a historic designed landscape [a type of cultural landscape]. It is also one of the oldest and [most] readily-identifiable features of the Pebble Beach area. Preliminary research conducted for this report appears to indicate that some segments of the Drive—notably the scenic coastal section north of Cypress Point—retain historic integrity and may be good candidates for historic registration.” (Kirk and Lamprecht 2014)*

A historic designed landscape is defined as “a landscape that has significance as a design or a work of art; was consciously designed and laid out by a master gardener, landscape architect, architect, or horticulturalist to a design principle, or an owner or other amateur using a recognized style or tradition in response or reaction to a recognized style or tradition; has a significant historical association with a significant person, trend, event, etc. in landscape gardening or landscape architecture; or a significant relationship to the theory or practice of landscape architecture” (NPS N.d.:2). Many historic landscapes are also significant for their association with important historic events, trends, or people.

The NRHP recognizes several types of historic designed landscapes, including “parkways, drives, and trails” (NPS N.d.:2–3). Character-defining features of a historic designed landscape may include existing topography and grading; natural features and land uses; circulation system of roads, paths, trails, etc.; spatial relationships and orientations such as symmetry, asymmetry, and axial alignment; views and vistas into and out of the landscape; vegetation; landscape dividers such as walls, fences, and hedges; drainage and engineering structures; site furnishings and small scale elements such as benches, planters, and urns; bodies of water such as pools, fountains, lakes, streams, and cascades; lighting; signs delineating entrances, street names, and other features; buildings such as houses, barns, dormitories, or hospitals that may be contained within the landscape; structures such as bridges, roads, and dams; and sculpture and other works of art (NPS N.d.:3–4).

As described in the Pebble Beach Historic Context Statement (Page & Turnbull 2013), 17-Mile Drive was consciously and deliberately designed and laid out by PIC and its successor, the Del Monte Properties Company, with the assistance of noted landscape architects such as Mark Daniels, using naturalistic principles of landscape design. While a complete survey of 17-Mile Drive to determine if it would be an eligible historical resource in its entirety or only in portions has not yet been undertaken, the primary character-defining features of 17-Mile Drive can be identified:

- its meandering route, that takes into account topography and the coastline;
- vistas and overlooks accessed from the street;
- native and designed vegetation;
- notable and natural landmarks and features, such as the Lone Cypress and the rocky shoreline; and,
- associated open space, much of it in the form of golf courses.

The proposed project site is located above and set back from 17-Mile Drive. Although clearly visible from 17-Mile Drive, especially from Fanshell Beach and the Fanshell Overlook, the proposed project would be sufficiently removed from 17-Mile Drive to avoid any potential significant indirect adverse impacts on the character-defining features of the resource. Because of its location, the project would not physically affect any aspect of 17-Mile Drive. However, the proposed project would have a larger footprint and taller profile than the existing Connell House. The surrounding dunes and vegetation that provide the backdrop for the project site as seen from 17-Mile Drive would still be visible; however, the scale and massing of the new residence and its height above the existing Connell House would alter views from nearby vantage points on 17-Mile Drive.

Under CEQA, an adverse impact occurs when the significance of a historical resource is significantly impaired through demolition or alteration of the features that convey the resource's historic character and importance. The proposed project would affect limited views from a small segment of 17-Mile Drive, and would be largely consistent with adjacent large-scale single-family residential development along 17-Mile Drive. The vast majority of 17-Mile Drive's character-defining features would remain intact and the historical significance of 17-Mile Drive would not be indirectly impaired. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact on this historical resource and no mitigation is necessary.

#### **4.3.6 Cumulative Impacts**

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15130(a), the EIR “shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable, as defined in Section 15065(a)(3).” The analysis of cumulative impacts relates to whether impacts of the proposed project and future related projects, considered together, might substantially impact/diminish the number of similar historic resources, in terms of context or property type.

The Connell House is significant for its embodiment of the American International Style and for its association with master architect Richard Neutra. No other houses in Pebble Beach are significant for this combination of reasons. Neutra's practice, while international in scope, was primarily centered in southern California, where he maintained his office for the majority of his productive life. It is estimated, that of the approximately 289 built commissions of his career, less than 20 were located in northern California. These estimates are based on counts of

buildings itemized in the monograph by Thomas S. Hines, *Richard Neutra and the Search for Modern Architecture* (Hines 1982). Seventeen northern California houses and duplexes, located in San Francisco, Berkeley, Los Altos, Hillsborough, Atherton, El Cerrito, Orinda, Pebble Beach, and Monterey, were discussed or listed in “The Buildings.” It is unknown how many of these houses still exist or retain their architectural integrity. It is also unknown if any of the northern California Neutra buildings are being considered for demolition or alteration by currently proposed projects. Clearly, demolition or alteration such that their significance is impaired of any one of the surviving northern California Neutra homes would contribute to cumulative impacts on historical resources.

Within the broader context of Neutra’s overall career, there have been several notable demolitions, including the Joseph von Sternberg House (1935, Northridge, California), demolished in 1971, and more recently, the Maslon House (1963, Rancho Mirage, California), demolished in 2002. When the Gettysburg Cyclorama Building (1959–1962), a non-residential structure designed by Neutra in partnership with Robert Alexander, was slated for demolition, notice was taken in the national press (Owens 2012). Demolition of the Maslon House generated an international outcry, as did recent threats to Neutra’s Kronish House in Beverly Hills (recently rehabilitated). Given the significance and rarity of the resource (as one of very few remaining commissions of a master architect in Monterey County and northern California), as well as the recent losses of Neutra commissions throughout the United States, the loss of the Connell House would result in a *significant* contribution to a cumulative impact on historical resources within Neutra’s architectural oeuvre.

Although the 2013 Page & Turnbull Pebble Beach Historic Context Statement identifies six historic periods, including “Pebble Beach Post-War: 1946–1969” (a time period which clearly encompasses the 1958 construction of the Neutra-designed Connell House), the Historic Context Statement assigns a distinct and separate significance to the historic period “Samuel Morse and the Del Monte Properties Company (1919–1945).” This 25-year period is marked by the direct, personal leadership of Samuel F. B. Morse, as both founder and policymaker for the Del Monte Properties Company. In that respect, the Historic Context Statement is proscriptive about built environment resources constructed in the Pebble Beach area, both before and after the 1919–1945 bracket, which must be regarded as the intended period of significance for Pebble Beach as a Del Monte Properties entity. Outside of that bracket of time, significant resources may still be found eligible, but on different merits—perhaps as aboveground historical archaeological resources, as engineering structures linked to the development of the Monterey Peninsula as a whole, or as individual examples of the work of significant architects, landscape architects, or planners.

The Connell House, then, is an example of an architectural resource that lies outside the Pebble Beach period of significance, yet expresses another kind of significance (and another period of significance) for its connection to master architect Richard Neutra, for its place in his oeuvre, and for its place in the International Style movement in the West. This isolation of Neutra’s work from the Morse-era Pebble Beach context does not, therefore, represent a diminution of the Connell House, but, rather, clarifies its importance by placing it in its own appropriate historical context.

As a result, there is no potential for the project to result in a cumulative impact to Pebble Beach architectural resources constructed in the 1919–1945 period of significance.



<b>HR Impact 2</b>
Impacts to historical resources caused by destruction of the Connell House would be cumulatively considerable when considered in conjunction with other recent losses of Neutra commissions throughout the United States, resulting in a significant cumulative impact.
<b>Mitigation Measures</b>
<i>Implement HR/mm-1.1, HR/mma-1.1.1, HR/mm-1.2, and HR/mma-1.2.1.</i>
<b>Residual Impacts</b>
Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce the level of cumulative impact, but not to a level of insignificance. Residual cumulative impacts would be <i>significant and unavoidable</i> .

### 4.3.7 References

- Adamson, Paul. 2012. Legorreta + Legorreta: Themes and Variations in Modern Practice. Essay. April 21, 2012.
- . 2012. Letter to John S. Bridges, Fenton & Keller, from Paul Adamson, FAIA LEED AP. June 7, 2012.
- Aikens, Douglas. 2012. Demolition of Historic Structures; CEA Compliance and Tactics. *Real Property Journal*, Volume 30, No. 2:19–28.
- . 2015. Memorandum to County of Monterey, Luis Osorio. March 28, 2015.
- Brown, Mary. 2010. *San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design 1935–1970 Historic Context Statement*. Prepared for San Francisco City and County Planning Department. September 30, 2010.
- California Coastal Commission (CCC). 2010. Memorandum to County of Monterey from Katie Morange, California Coastal Commission. December 8, 2010.
- California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks). 2006. *California Statewide Historic Preservation Plan, 2006–2010 Update*. California Department of Parks and Recreation, California Office of Historic Preservation.
- . 2013. *Sustainable Preservation: California’s Statewide Historic Preservation Plan 2013–2017*. California Department of Parks and Recreation, California Office of Historic Preservation.
- Chattel Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, Inc. 2012. Letter to John S. Bridges, Fenton and Keller, from Robert Jay Chattel, Chattel Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, Inc. April 19, 2012.
- Circa Historic Property Development. 2011. Letter to John S. Bridges, Fenton & Keller, from Sheila McElroy, Circa Historic Property Development. April 7, 2011.
- . 2011. Letter to Massy Mehdipour from Sheila McElroy, Circa Historic Property Development. December 6, 2011.
- . 2012. Letter to John S. Bridges, Fenton & Keller, from Sheila McElroy, Circa Historic Property Development. Modernism Survey Methodology. July 11, 2012.
- . 2012. Letter to John S. Bridges, Fenton & Keller, from Sheila McElroy, Circa Historic Property Development. Review of letter from P. Adamson. July 11, 2012.
- . 2012. Letter to Massy Mehdipour from Sheila McElroy, Circa Historic Property Development. May 18, 2012.
- . 2013. Letter to Delinda Robinson, Monterey County Planning Department, from Sheila McElroy, Circa Historic Property Development. August 23, 2013.
- . 2013. Letter to Massy Mehdipour from Sheila McElroy, Circa Historic Property Development. September 10, 2013.

- . 2013. Letter to Massy Mehdipour from Sheila McElroy, Circa Historic Property Development. November 25, 2013.
- County of Monterey. 1982. *Monterey County General Plan*. Adopted on September 30, 1982.
- County of Monterey. 1982. *Monterey County General Plan*. Adopted on September 30, 1982. Available at: <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/government/departments-i-z/resource-management-agency-rma-/planning/resources-documents/1982-general-plan>. Accessed October 2015.
- . 2012a. *Del Monte Forest Area Land Use Plan*. June 22, 2012. Available at: [http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/docs/plans/Del\\_Monte\\_Forest\\_LUP\\_and\\_CIP\\_Amendment\\_Adopted\\_052212/DMF\\_LUP\\_Amended\\_052212\\_Complete\\_Version.pdf](http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/docs/plans/Del_Monte_Forest_LUP_and_CIP_Amendment_Adopted_052212/DMF_LUP_Amended_052212_Complete_Version.pdf). Accessed October 2015.
- . 2012b. *Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan, Part 1, Title 20: Zoning Ordinance for the County of Monterey*.
- . 2013. Memorandum to Delinda Robinson, Senior Planner, County of Monterey, from Meg Clovis, Cultural Affairs Manager. July 15, 2013.
- Covell Construction. 2012. *Structural Survey*. Prepared for Massy Mehdipour. March 5, 2012.
- Docomomo/NOCA. 2012. Letter to Delinda Robinson, Monterey County Planning Department, from Gretchen A. Hilyard, President, Docomomo/NOCA [Documentation and Conservation of Buildings, Sites and Neighborhoods of the MODern MOVement, Northern California Chapter]. August 31, 2012.
- Dreyfuss, John. 1977. Neutra: Greatness Rewarded. *Los Angeles Times*. Page F1. March 13, 1977.
- Fenton & Keller. 2011. Memorandum to John S. Bridges, Fenton & Keller, from Michael P. Burns, Fenton & Keller. February 10, 2011.
- Hines, Thomas S. 1982. *Richard Neutra and the Search for Modern Architecture*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2011. Email to Delinda Robinson, County of Monterey, from Thomas Hines. November 16, 2011.
- Kirk, Anthony. 2010. State of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Forms, *Connell House*. Anthony Kirk, PhD. October 15, 2010.
- . 2012. *Response and Rebuttal to Comments by Circa: Historic Property Development and Bill Bernstein AIA on an Evaluation of the Connell House, Pebble Beach, California, Recorded by Anthony Kirk, PhD. 15 October 2010*. Prepared for Anthony L. Lombardo, Anthony Lombardo & Associates. March 12, 2012.
- Kirk, Anthony, and Barbara Lamprecht. 2014. *Connell House National Register of Historic Places Registration Form*. Anthony Kirk, PhD., and Barbara Lamprecht, M. Arch. January 15, 2014.

- Lamprecht, Barbara, Julius Shulman, and Peter Gössel. 2010. *Neutra: The Complete Works*. Cologne, Germany: Taschen GmbH.
- Lamprecht, Barbara. 2012. Letter to Delinda Robinson, County of Monterey, from Barbara Lamprecht, M. Arch. February 1, 2012.
- Leitzinger, Elizabeth. 2012. Memorandum to John S. Bridges, Fenton & Keller, from Elizabeth Leitzinger. September 25, 2012.
- M3 Environmental Consulting, LLC. 2013. Letter to Massy Mehdipour from Chris G. Gatward, CMC, CAC, M3 Environmental Consulting, LLC. September 13, 2013.
- McCoy, Esther. 1960. *Richard Neutra*. New York: George Braziller, Inc.
- Monterey County Historic Resources Review Board. 2011. Historic Resource Review Board Meeting Minutes. August 4, 2011.
- Museum of Modern Art. 1932. *Modern Architecture: International Exhibition* [exhibition catalog].
- National Park Service (NPS). N.d. *National Register Bulletin 18: How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes*. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. J. Timothy Keller, ASLA, and Genevieve P. Keller Land and Community Associates Charlottesville, Virginia.
- . 1990. *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Prepared by staff of the National Register of Historic Places, finalized by Patrick W. Andrus, edited by Rebecca H. Shrimpton. 1990; Revised 1991, 1995, 1997; Revised for Internet 1995, 2001, 2002.
- Neutra, Dion. 2012. Email to Delinda Robinson, County of Monterey, from Dion Neutra. January 23, 2012.
- Neutra, Raymond Richard. 2012. Letter to Delinda Robertson, County of Monterey, from Raymond Richard Neutra. January 23, 2012.
- Owens, Mitchell. 2012. Richard Neutra's Gettysburg Cyclorama to Be Demolished. *Architectural Digest*. December 31, 2012.
- Page & Turnbull, Inc. 2013. *Pebble Beach Historic Context Statement*. Prepared for Monterey County Parks Department. August 29, 2013.
- Pebble Beach Company. 2015. *Welcome to Pebble Beach and the Del Monte Forest: 17-Mile Drive, Pebble Beach*. Public Brochure.
- Roland-Nawi, Carol, PhD. 2014a. Letter to Craig Spencer, Associate Planner, County of Monterey, from Carol Roland-Nawi, PhD, State Historic Preservation Officer. July 11, 2014.
- . 2014b. Letter to Gail T. Borkowski, Clerk of the Board, Monterey Board of Supervisors, from Carol Roland-Nawi, PhD, State Historic Preservation Officer. February 12, 2014.

- . 2015. Letter to Luis Osorio, Senior Planner, Monterey County Planning Department, from Carol Roland-Nawi, PhD, State Historic Preservation Officer. March 18, 2015.
- San Buenaventura Research Associates. 2014. Memorandum to Megan Jones, Rincon Consultants, Inc., from Mitch Stone, San Buenaventura Research Associates, Inc. February 25, 2014.
- Segal, Walter. 1970. Obituary: Richard Neutra. *The Architects' Journal* 151(18):1111. May 1970.
- Seldis, Henry J. 1970. Richard Neutra: 1892–1970. *Los Angeles Times*. Page C49. May 3, 1970.
- Signal Hill, LLC. 2012. New House Proposed for 1170 Signal Hill Road. Applicant Presentation. May 25, 2012.
- Smith, J.Y. 1970. Architect Richard Neutra Dies at 78. *The Washington Post*. Page B10. April 18, 1970.
- The Museum of Modern Art. 1982. *The Architecture of Richard Neutra*. No. 23. Summer 1982.
- Tim Kelley Consulting, LLC. 2013. Letter to John Bridges, Fenton & Keller, from Tim Kelley, Tim Kelley Consulting, LLC. March 7, 2013.
- Weeks, Kay D., and Anne E. Grimmer. 1995. *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, with Guidelines for Rehabilitating, Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*. National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC. Available at: <http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation/rehabilitation-guidelines.pdf>. Accessed April 2, 2015.
- . 2001. *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*. National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC. Available at: <http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation/rehabilitation-guidelines.pdf>. Accessed April 2, 2015.

*This page intentionally left blank.*