CULTURAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE AGENDA REPORT

SUBJECT: Pre-application review of conceptual plans for the multiple structures comprising the Froom Ranch Historic Complex, in association with the Froom Ranch Specific Plan.

ADDRESS: 12165 & 12393 Los Osos Valley Rd.

BY: Emily Creel, Contract Planner
Phone Number: (805) 543-7095 x6814
e-mail: ecreel@swca.com

VIA: Shawna Scott, Associate Planner
Phone Number: (805) 781-7176
e-mail: sscott@slocity.org

FILE NUMBER: SPEC-0143-2017
FROM: Brian Leveille, Senior Planner

1.0 RECOMMENDATION

Provide feedback on the applicant’s conceptual plan for the multiple structures comprising the Froom Ranch Historic Complex, including structure demolition, structure relocation, structure reconstruction, and adaptive reuse within a proposed neighborhood trailhead park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Representatives</th>
<th>John Madonna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pam Ricci and Victor Montgomery, RRM Design Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Zoning/General Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP-3 Madonna on LOVR, would require pre-zoning for Specific Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposes Medium-High Density Residential, High Density Residential, Commercial Retail, Conservation/Open Space, and Public Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 110 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be prepared to evaluate the Specific Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.0 SUMMARY/BACKGROUND

On April 5, 2016, the City Council authorized initiation of the Madonna on Los Osos Valley Road (LOVR) Specific Plan (currently referred to as the Froom Ranch Specific Plan). Following initiation by the City Council and prior to submittal of the Specific Plan, the applicant presented preliminary park concepts to the Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC) on August 3, 2016 and the Cultural Heritage Committee (CHC) on September 26, 2016. The previous CHC agenda report and meeting minutes are provided as Attachment 2.
The applicant-prepared Draft Froom Ranch Specific Plan proposes a mix of land uses, including a Life Plan Community, approximately 130 multi-family residential units, 30,000 square feet of retail-commercial uses, a 70,000-square foot hotel, open space (54% of the project site), and a neighborhood trailhead park (see Figure 1 Conceptual Land Use Plan).

Based on preliminary feedback received from the CHC during the September 26, 2016 pre-application review (refer to Section 4.1 of this report), the applicant has incorporated the neighborhood trailhead park into the 110-acre Specific Plan area and developed a preliminary plan for reconstruction and reuse of certain “key” historic structures within the park (refer to Attachment 5 Froom Ranch – Historical Buildings Conceptual Plans).

2.0 CHC PURVIEW

The CHC should provide feedback on the applicant’s conceptual plans for the historically significant structures identified on the site based on the Historic Preservation Ordinance (HPO), City policies, Historic Preservation Guidelines, and Secretary of Interior Standards. This is the second conceptual review of the project by the CHC. The intention of referring this item to the CHC at this early stage in the process is to allow staff and the applicant to receive and consider collective CHC feedback prior to finalizing the Specific Plan and moving forward with environmental review of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
3.0 PROJECT AND SITE INFORMATION

3.1 Site Information/Setting
The project site consists of two parcels totaling approximately 110 acres (APNs 067-241-030 and 067-241-031) within unincorporated San Luis Obispo County, and adjacent to City of San Luis Obispo city limits. The site is located immediately west of Los Osos Valley Road between U.S. Highway 101 and the Irish Hills Plaza. These parcels are identified for future annexation in the Land Use Element (LUE) as the Madonna on Los Osos Valley Road (LOVR) Specific Plan Area (SP-3).

The current land use and natural setting includes livestock grazing, stormwater basins, the Froom Ranch Historic Complex, John Madonna Construction office (within the historic complex), staging and materials storage, quarry area, unpaved agricultural roads, wetlands, grasslands, stands of mature trees, Froom Creek and associated tributaries, and vacant land. Surrounding uses include Irish Hills Plaza (including the Costco/Home Depot shopping center) to the north, Los Osos Valley Road and auto dealerships to the east, hotels along Calle Joaquin and Mountainbrook Church to the south, and the Irish Hills Natural Reserve and associated trails and open space to the west.

3.2 Specific Plan
Project entitlements will include a Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments/Pre-Zoning, Development Plan/Tentative Tract Map(s), Architectural Review, Annexation, and related entitlements that would allow for the proposed development of the property. Froom Ranch is envisioned as a primarily residential project with some commercial development in the northeast portion of the site closest to Los Osos Valley Road and the adjacent Irish Hills Plaza. A major component of the planned residential uses is a Life Plan Community known as Villaggio. Villaggio would provide a variety of different unit types for independent senior housing as well as access to higher levels of care such as Assisted Living, Memory Care, and Skilled Nursing, when needed. Additional residential uses in the northern portion of the site will be multiple-family. As required by the Land Use Element, a minimum of 50% of the project site must be designated as Open Space; the current plan designates approximately 54% of the site as Open Space. The Specific Plan also includes a neighborhood trailhead park to connect to the Irish Hills Natural Reserve, which would incorporate three onsite historic structures.
3.3 Froom Ranch Historic Complex

The Froom Ranch Historic Complex is located within the northern portion of the project site, immediately south/southeast of Home Depot (refer to Figure 2, Location of Froom Ranch Complex). To facilitate the CHC’s review and response to the applicant’s conceptual plan for the Froom Ranch Historic Complex, background information regarding the Froom Ranch Historic Complex and detailed descriptions of the structures comprising the complex is provided in the September 26, 2016 CHC Minutes and Agenda Report (Attachment 2) and updated Historic Resource Assessment prepared by the applicant’s consultant, First Carbon Solutions and Chattel, Inc., dated July 21, 2017 (Attachment 3). As discussed in the attached historic assessment, the following seven structures contribute to the historic significance of the complex: Main Residence, “Old” Barn, Bunkhouse, Dairy Barn, Creamery/House, Granary, and Shed. Non-contributing structures within the complex include a repurposed kiosk/outhouse, storage building, and faux water tower (telecommunications facility).

A comprehensive analysis of the project’s potential environmental impacts and consistency with the City’s General Plan and HPO, including potentially significant impacts to historic resources, will be provided in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that will be prepared for the project. This information will be provided to the CHC upon finalization of the Specific Plan and public release of the Draft EIR.

Froom Ranch Complex - Federal, State, and Local Criteria

According to the historic evaluation provided by the applicant, the complex appears eligible for consideration as a local historic resource, meets California Register criteria as a historic resource, and meets National Register criteria for a historic district1. The complex is an excellent example of early 20th century ranching and dairy industry development in San Luis Obispo County, is associated with the pioneering Froom family including Bill Froom and his local contributions, and the contributing structures represent predominant Craftsman and Vernacular styles of the early 20th century (First Carbon Solutions and Chattel, Inc. 2017).

The historic assessment evaluated the Froom Ranch complex’s eligibility for the City’s Master List or Contributing List of Historic Resources. The eligibility discussion below is based on the report provided by the applicant; please note that peer review of this report will occur during preparation of the EIR for the Specific Plan and associated entitlements. The HPO contains the below historic significance criteria2 (refer to Attachment 2, September 26, 2016 Cultural Heritage Committee Minutes and Agenda Package, General Plan Policies and Historic Preservation Ordinance). In order for a property to qualify for historic resource listing the property shall exhibit a high level of historic integrity, be at least fifty (50) years old (less than 50 if it can be demonstrated enough time has passed to understand its historical importance) and satisfy at least one of the following criteria3:

---

1 A district possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development. A district can comprise both features that lack individual distinction and individually distinctive features that serve as focal points. It may even be considered eligible if all of the components lack individual distinction, provided that the grouping achieves significance as a whole within its historic context. In either case, the majority of the components that add to the district’s historic character, even if they are individually undistinguished, must possess integrity, as must the district as a whole (National Park Service 1997).


3 HPO Section 14.01.070. Evaluation Criteria for Historic Resource Listing
1. **Architectural Criteria (Style, Design, and/or Architect)**
   The Froom Ranch complex includes intact and good examples of Craftsman architecture, including the Main Residence (1915) and Bunkhouse (1915). The complex contains a unique example of Vernacular architecture: Dairy Barn (1913) with the rare rounded front. Additional Vernacular-style structures include the Creamery/House (unknown date), Granary (1913) and Shed (1913). The buildings represent the local farming and dairy industry development and the predominant architectural styles of the early 20th century.

2. **Historic Criteria (Person, Event, and/or Context)**
   The Froom Ranch complex is considered to have historic significance for its connection with the Froom family and Bill Froom and the development of early 20th century ranching and the dairy industry. The complex exemplifies the Early 20th Century Agricultural Development theme.

3. **Integrity**
   The Froom Ranch complex has retained its overall integrity of design, location, feeling, association, materials, workmanship, and overall historic integrity. As such, the Froom Ranch complex exemplifies the early 20th century agricultural development of San Luis Obispo County.

Based on the historic assessment, the complex appears eligible for consideration as a local historic resource.

**National Criteria for Evaluation and California Criteria for Designation**
The historic assessment evaluated the Froom Ranch complex’s eligibility for the National and California Registers, and determined that the Froom Ranch complex appears eligible for these Registers as a historic district (refer to Attachment 2, September 26, 2016 Cultural Heritage Committee Minutes and Agenda Package, Federal and State Criteria Evaluation, and Attachment 3, Historic Resources Assessment).

### 4.0 DISCUSSION

The discussion below includes a summary of the applicant’s previous and current conceptual proposals and a list of applicable policies and regulations for the CHC to consider when reviewing the applicant’s conceptual plan for the Froom Ranch Historic District.

#### 4.1 September 26, 2016 Conceptual Review of the Froom Ranch Historic District
At the time of conceptual review in 2016, the applicant had identified an adjacent 7.4-acre parcel located behind (west of) Home Depot within the City limits as the potential site for a park, which was conceptually proposed as a receiver site for two relocated historic structures (the Main Residence and Bunkhouse) and other interpretive elements (refer to Attachment 2, September 26, 2016 Cultural Heritage Committee Minutes and Agenda Package). The remaining structures were previously all proposed for demolition, and incorporation of salvagable materials into new and reconstructed buildings. At the time of this first conceptual review, no structural analysis had been completed to determine the viability for rehabilitation of the structures. During CHC’s previous conceptual review, the Dairy Barn was identified as a vital component of historical value and options for replication and adaptive re-use of the Dairy Barn were discussed. Committee members considered the initially proposed relocation...
to be incongruous in proximity to Home Depot, and noted concerns that “any relocation will destroy the historic narrative”. The CHC made a motion “indicating CHC is in favor of the preservation of structures intact and in situ, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Secretary of Interior’s Standards, and toward maintaining the historic narrative and meaning of the complex” (refer to Attachment 2 September 26, 2016 Cultural Heritage Committee Minutes and Agenda Package).

4.2 Current Conceptual Proposal for Froom Ranch Historic Complex
The applicant completed a structural analysis of the historic complex in June 2017 (refer to Attachment 4, Structural Analysis of Historic Structures) and provided an updated Historic Resource Assessment prepared by First Carbon Solutions and Chattel, Inc. (Attachment 3). Based on preliminary feedback received during 2016 conceptual review, the results of the structural analysis, and ongoing historic buildings treatment approach and conformance review by the applicant’s consultant, the applicant has developed a revised concept for Froom Ranch Historic Complex. The current proposal includes development of the neighborhood trailhead park in the general vicinity of the existing historic district and incorporation of three significant historic structures within the park (refer to Attachment 5 and Figure 3 Historic Structures and Park Conceptual Site Plan, below).

![Figure 3. Historic Structures and Park Conceptual Site Plan](image-url)
As identified on the conceptual plan set provided by the applicant (refer to Attachment 5, Sheet 1 Project Description), and as described in the applicant’s updated Historic Resource Assessment (refer to Attachment 3), three of the seven existing historic structures (Main Residence, Creamery/House, and Roundnose Dairy Barn), were deemed to be primary contributors to the potential historic district based on their exhibition of unique architectural features and historic significance from their association with the Froom family and dairy industry of San Luis Obispo County. The Shed, Bunkhouse, Old Barn, and Granary, and non-significant additions, “are not considered to retain, or embody, enough of the distinctive features, type or method of construction to be considered significant” (First Carbon Solutions and Chattel, Inc. 2017). The applicant is requesting feedback from the CHC regarding this distinction; however, it should be noted that this information has not yet been peer reviewed through the EIR process. The applicant’s current concept includes the relocation, rehabilitation or reconstruction, and adaptive re-use of the Main Residence, Creamery/House, and Dairy Barn. The remaining historic structures (Old Barn, Bunkhouse, Granary, Shed) are proposed to be thoroughly documented consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (SOI Standards) prior to demolition (refer to Table 1. Froom Ranch Historic Complex and Attachment 5, Applicant’s Historic Building Conceptual Plans). Modern structures (outhouse and storage building) would be demolished, except for the faux water tower, which would remain in place.

Table 1. Froom Ranch Historic Complex Conceptual Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>YEAR BUILT</th>
<th>APPLICANT PROPOSED CONCEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Main Residence       | 1915       | Relocate and rehabilitate as building for City Parks and Recreation:  
|                      |            |   • Structurally reinforce roof and walls;  
|                      |            |   • Provide new foundation; and  
|                      |            |   • Install utilities to building.  
| “Old” Barn           | Moved to site in early 1900s | Remove and document per SOI standards.  
| Bunkhouse            | 1915       | Remove and document per SOI standards.  
| Dairy Barn           | 1913       | Relocate out of fault setback and reconstruct consistent with SOI standards for adaptive reuse in park.  
| Creamery/House       | Unknown    | Relocate and reconstruct western portion of building as City park restrooms; re-imagine eastern portion for use as a covered area for picnics and events.  
| Granary              | 1913       | Remove and document per SOI standards.  
| Shed                 | 1913       | Remove and document per SOI standards.  
| Outhouse             | 2000       | Remove.  
| Storage Building     | 2010       | Remove.  
| Faux Water Tower     | 2013       | Retain in place.  |
The applicant has stated that due to the presence of a trace of the Los Osos earthquake fault which runs beneath the Dairy Barn and steep existing slopes, the project requires relocation of the architecturally significant Dairy Barn, Creamery/House, and Main Residence at a new location approximately 200 feet to the east of their current location (see Figure 4 Comparative Conceptual Relocation of Dairy Barn, Creamery/House, and Main Residence).

The three buildings would each be relocated to maintain their same relative horizontal spacing, with the goal of maintaining the visual hierarchy of these three buildings. Grade changes would be created between the structures with the goal to approximate their existing vertical relationship. Vertical separation from the existing configuration would be reduced by approximately 50% but would be kept proportionate with existing elevations.

The Main Residence is proposed to be relocated and rehabilitated per SOI rehabilitation standards. The Dairy Barn is proposed to be reconstructed to SOI standards and adaptively reused. The building would not be fully sealed and would have open beams without internal drywall, similar to existing conditions. Some existing siding would be harvested and reused for rebuilt facades.

The Creamery/House is proposed to be relocated and partially reconstructed/partially re-imagined through a more creative interpretation, rather than a full reconstruction (refer to Figure 5 Creamery/House Proposed Perspective). The applicant’s main goal of re-imagining
the building is to preserve the overall building form and rooflines while providing flexibility for adaptive reuse in the public park setting. The western portion of the building (the Creamery portion) would be rebuilt with the same dimensions as the existing building to house public restrooms. The eastern portion of the building (the House portion) would retain the silhouette and framing of the existing structure, but would not be entirely enclosed. This portion of the structure would be more open and would include an open trellis area to facilitate a sheltered picnic and gathering space. The open trellis area will contain steps to mimic the existing grade differential between the building areas.

Figure 5. Creamery/House Proposed Perspective

The applicant proposes to complete historic and photographic documentation of the historic district and structures proposed for demolition through preparation of a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)/Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) or similar document(s). Historic dairy equipment would be donated to a local agency. Where feasible, materials (e.g., siding, roofing, iron) would be salvaged for re-use within the park, and potentially the overall Specific Plan area (refer to Attachment 2, September 26, 2016 Cultural Heritage Committee Minutes and Agenda Package, Cultural Heritage Committee Meeting: Response to April 28, 2016 Letter and Applicant Attachments; Applicant Proposed Parkland Concept).

4.3 General Plan Guidance
The LUE states that the Specific Plan design should be sensitive to environmental constraints, including historic structures, and adjust accordingly through design. The COSE provides more specific policy direction, which is provided in Attachment 2 (September 26, 2016 Cultural Heritage Committee Minutes and Agenda Package, General Plan Policies and Historic Preservation Ordinance). These policies promote the identification, preservation, and rehabilitation of significant historic and architectural resources, and adaptive reuse of historic buildings, including, but not limited to the following:

---

4 LUE Section 8.1.5. SP-3, Madonna on LOVR Specific Plan Area
“COSE Policy 3.3.1. Historic preservation. Significant historic and architectural resources should be identified, preserved and rehabilitated.

COSE Policy 3.3.2. Demolitions. Historically or architecturally significant buildings shall not be demolished or substantially changed in outward appearance, unless doing so is necessary to remove a threat to health and safety and other means to eliminate or reduce the threat to acceptable levels are infeasible.

COSE Policy 3.3.3. Historical documentation. Buildings and other cultural features that are not historically significant but which have historical or architectural value should be preserved or relocated where feasible. Where preservation or relocation is not feasible, the resource shall be documented and the information retained in a secure but publicly accessible location. An acknowledgment of the resource should be incorporated within the site through historic signage and the reuse or display of historic materials and artifacts.

COSE Policy 3.3.4. Changes to historic buildings. Changes or additions to historically or architecturally significant buildings should be consistent with the original structure and follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings. New buildings in historical districts, or on historically significant sites, should reflect the form, spacing and materials of nearby historic structures. The street appearance of buildings which contribute to a neighborhood’s architectural character should be maintained.”

4.4 Historic Preservation Program Guidelines
The Historic Preservation Program Guidelines document includes guidelines for construction on properties with historic resources, including conformance with design standards identified in the HPO, General Plan, Community Design Guidelines, and Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. This document also identifies preservation tools and incentives intended to “support and encourage the identification, preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, reconstruction and continued use of historic and cultural resources.”

4.5 Historic Preservation Ordinance
The HPO states that “listed historic resources are in irreplaceable community resource that merit special protection to preserve them for future generations.” The City’s consideration of a request to demolish a resource which has been evaluated as eligible for local, state and National Register listing is subject to review by the CHC and Council and adoption of the following findings:

---

5 Conservation and Open Space Element Policies 3.3.1 through 3.3.4, Policy 3.5.12, Policy 3.6.1, and Policies 3.6.6 through 3.6.8
6 Historic Preservation Program Guidelines Chapter 3: Treatment of Historic Resources
7 Historic Preservation Program Guidelines Chapter 4: Preservation Tools and Incentives
8 HPO Section 14.01.100 Demolition of Historic Resources
“D. Required findings for demolition of a historic resource. The decision-making body shall approve an application for demolition of a structure listed in the Inventory of Historic Resources only if it determined that the proposed demolition is consistent with the General Plan and:

(1) The historic resource is a hazard to public health or safety, and repair or stabilization is not structurally feasible. Deterioration resulting from the property owner’s neglect or failure to maintain the property should not be a justification for demolition. The applicant may be required to provide structural reports, to the approval of the Community Development Director or City Council, to document that repairs or stabilization are not feasible; or
(2) Denial of the application will constitute an economic hardship as described under findings 1-3 of Section J.”

Economic hardship findings are identified in the HPO as follows:

“(1) Denial of the application will diminish the value of the subject property so as to leave substantially no economic value, after considering other means of offsetting the costs of retaining the historic resource, including, but not limited to, tax abatements, financial assistance, building code modifications, changes in allowed uses, grants; or
(2) Sale or rental of the property is impractical, when compared to the cost of holding such property for uses permitted in the zoning district; or
(3) Utilization of the property for lawful purposes is prohibited or impractical.”

Prevention of unpermitted active demolition or demolition by neglect is also regulated by the HPO:

“A. Preservation of listed historic resources. The purpose of this Section is to prevent unpermitted active demolition or demolition by neglect by ensuring that listed historic resources are maintained in good repair, and free from structural defects and safety hazards, consistent with the International Property Maintenance Code, Property Maintenance Standards (SLO MC Ch.17.17), and standards as specified herein. Alteration or demolition in whole or part, of any significant features or characteristics of a listed historic property or resource requires City authorization, pursuant to [HPO] Section 14.01.100 [Demolition of Historic Resources].”

The HPO states that “relocation has the potential to adversely affect the significance of a historic resource and is discouraged.” Relocation of historic resources is subject to review by the CHC and Architectural Review Commission, and the following criteria:

“B. Criteria for relocation. Relocation of structures included on the Inventory of Historic Resources, or those that are determined by the CHC or the Director to be potentially historic, is the least preferred preservation method and shall be permitted only when relocation is consistent with goals and policies of the General Plan, any

---

9 HPO Section 14.01.120 Unpermitted Demolition or Destruction of Resources
10 HPO Sections 14.01.100 Demolition of Historic Resources and 14.01.110 Relocation of Historic Resources
applicable area or specific plans, and the Historic Preservation Program Guidelines, and:

(1) The relocation will not significantly change, destroy, or adversely affect the historic, architectural or aesthetic value of the resource; and
(2) Relocation will not have a significant adverse effect on the character of the historic district or neighborhood, or surrounding properties where the resource is located or at its proposed location, and
(3) The original site and the proposed receiving site are controlled through ownership long term lease or similar assurance by the person(s) proposing relocation, to the Director’s approval, and
(4) The proposed receiving site is relevant to the resource’s historic significance; and [moved to 2 above]; OR
(5) The relocation is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the site and no other measures for correcting the condition are feasible, OR
(6) The proposed relocation meets the findings required under Section J for demolition of a historic resource.

4.6 CHC Discussion Points
As described in the LUE, the purpose of the Specific Plan for this project site is to “provide design flexibility that will secure the appropriate development of the site while protecting sensitive environmental resources on the site.” Preparation of the Specific Plan presents a unique opportunity to protect environmental and community resources and maintain project flexibility and innovation through the development of site planning, guidelines, and standards, while achieving the objectives and performance standards identified in the General Plan. The CHC should discuss and provide feedback on whether the applicant’s conceptual plan moves the project towards consistency with the intent and regulations identified in the HPO, Historic Preservation Program Guidelines, and General Plan Policy stating that the design should be sensitive to environmental constraints including historic resources.

As a part of the Cultural Resources evaluation in the EIR that will be prepared for the Specific Plan, the historic resources assessment, structural analysis of historic structures, and historic buildings treatment approach and conformance review report will be peer reviewed through the EIR process. Once the Specific Plan is finalized, formal ordinance and policy evaluation will be conducted, including an assessment as to whether the proposed project would maintain the context and feel of the historic district upon relocation of the three key structures, removal of four structures, and construction of proximate new development. As a part of the formal review of the Specific Plan and EIR evaluation, feasible alternatives to the proposed demolition and relocation will be evaluated.

At this stage in the process, staff and the applicant are requesting feedback from the CHC regarding the proposed concept for the historic complex. Some key issues on which the CHC should provide feedback include the following:

11 LUE Section 8.1.5. SP-3, Madonna on LOVR Specific Plan Area
1. The proposed identification of the Dairy Barn, Creamery/House, and Main Residence as the primary contributors to the potential historic district.
2. The proposed demolition of the historic Old Barn, Bunkhouse, Granary, and Shed.
3. The loss of the historic complex resulting from proposed demolitions and relocation of the contributing structures.
4. Re-use of materials salvaged from structures proposed for demolition within the proposed park.
5. Proposed relocation and adaptive reuse of the Dairy Barn, Creamery/House, and Main Residence within the proposed park, including consideration of context and feeling (existing location compared to the proposed location).

5.0 RECOMMENDATION AND NEXT STEPS

Provide input and directional items to the applicant on the proposed conceptual treatment of the Froom Ranch Historic complex for the applicant to consider prior to finalizing plans and moving forward with environmental review of the Specific Plan under CEQA.

6.0 ATTACHMENTS

1. Vicinity Map
2. September 26, 2016 Cultural Heritage Committee Minutes and Agenda Package
5. Froom Ranch – Historical Buildings Conceptual Plans (RRM July 2017)
Cultural Heritage Committee Minutes

Monday, September 26, 2016
Regular Meeting

CALL TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the San Luis Obispo Cultural Heritage Committee was called to order on Monday, September 26, 2016 at 5:32 p.m. in the Council Chambers, located at 990 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo, California, by Chair Hill.

ROLL CALL

Present: Committee Members Sandy Baer, Craig Kincaid, Shannon Larrabee, James Papp, Leah Walthert, Vice-Chair Thom Brajkovich and Chair Jaime Hill

Absent: None

Staff: Community Development Director Michael Codron, Senior Planner Brian Leveille, Parks & Recreation Director Shelly Stanwyck, Planning Technician Kip Morais, Assistant Planner Walter Oetzell, Associate Planner Shawna Scott, Associate Planner Rachel Cohen, and Recording Secretary Brad T. Opstad

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Shannon Larrabee, San Luis Obispo, spoke from the dais and provided an update on the Leadership SLO Water-Wise Demonstration Garden.

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

Minutes for Cultural Heritage Committee Regular Meeting of July 25, 2016:

ACTION: UPON MOTION BY COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPP, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER BAER, the CHC Minutes of July 25, 2016 were approved with the following amendments:

1.) Page 3, Finding #4, end punctuation change (from ; to .)

2.) Page 4, third paragraph to read: "... provided local examples of painted wall signs from the early 1900's..."

3.) Page 5, seventh paragraph to read: Union Hardware Building; Miner's minor sign exception on the following 7:0:0 vote

   AYES: Baer, Kincaid, Larrabee, Papp, Walthert, Vice-Chair Brajkovich, and Chair Hill

   NOES: None

   ABSENT: None
PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1. **Utility Box Art in Historic District locations.** OTHR-3827-2016: Review of proposed artwork designs and traffic signal locations for the 2016 Utility Box Art project at three locations within the Old Town and Downtown Historic Districts with a categorical exemption from environmental review, C-D-H & R-2-H zones; City of San Luis Obispo, applicant.

Director Stanwyck spoke about the Utility Box Art Program and provided updates on the downtown beautification effort with the Historic Districts.

Committee Member Kincaid inquired whether the front of any given utility box is determined by it being street side or pedestrian side view.

Committee Member Baer discussed her experience as one of the fourteen (14) participants on the Art Jury.

Chair Hill inquired about a traffic safety enhancement project being undertaken at the corner of Monterey & Osos Streets; acknowledged that the Committee was in receipt of two pieces of public correspondence.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Committee Member Walthert commented that the art does not readily represent the historic nature of the City’s inhabitants or the heritage; Committee Member Baer responded by differentiating between art as specifically commissioned and art rendered via an open call to artists.

ACTION: UPON MOTION BY COMMITTEE MEMBER LARRABEE, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER BAER, the Cultural Heritage Committee adopted a draft Resolution which provides the determination for City Council that the CHC finds the box art design for the traffic signal utility boxes located in the Old Town and Downtown Historic Districts, as part of the 2016 Box Art Project, consistent with its Historical Preservation Program; on the following 7:0:0 vote:

AYES: Baer, Kincaid, Larrabee, Papp, Walthert, Vice-Chair Brajkovich, and Chair Hill
NOES: None
ABSENT: None

2. **840 Monterey Street.** ARCH-3534-2016: Review of request to place a wall sign on an elevation without a public entrance on a Contributing Historic Structure (Blackstone Hotel), with a categorical exemption from environmental review; C-D-H zone; Coast Monument Signs, applicant.
Technician Morais presented a project description, historical background, and PowerPoint slides of the proposed wall sign.

Committee Member Papp inquired about the frequency of variance requests for signs on elevations without entrances; inquired about the necessity of placing a sign on the western façade, given the existence and placement of the Monterey Street sign, and whether having a secondary sign is a commercial imperative.

Committee Member Baer qualified that the Committee was considering the sign that faces Chorro Street, as opposed to the Monterey Street sign with same logo, but also dissimilar in terms of size, proportion, and placement.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Steve Fear, Coast Monument Signs, Arroyo Grande, discussed the sign installation being low-impacted and Chorro Street being a major pedestrian thoroughfare.

Jennifer Kurtz, LuluLemon Athletica, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, discussed the location and proportions of the proposed sign; requested that the Committee disregard the banner sign indicated in the presentation materials, as it was part of an earlier sign submission.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Committee Member Papp indicated that a request for a sign of this size and discretion was reasonable unless the City was adamant that there should not be signs on sides of buildings without entrances; Director Codron informed that the City is currently in the midst of updating sign regulations and that this type of exception request is of frequent occurrence, and intent of current sign regulations is to prevent sign proliferation.

Vice-Chair Brajkovich commented that the proposed sign does not detract from the Historical Preservation Standards; commented favorably on its positioning and its repetitive use of the architecture’s round elements.

Committee Member Baer commented unfavorably on the marketing signage commercializing the Mission across the street with its placement.

Chair Hill commented further on sign’s inappropriateness in fronting Mission being sufficient reason for not granting exception; pointed out excessive signage on Court Street as exemplary of what is beginning to transpire in the downtown and is also inconsistent with the Guidelines.
ACTION: UPON MOTION BY COMMITTEE MEMBER LARRABEE, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER BAER, the Cultural Heritage Committee recommended the Community Development Director deny approval of the project, as the sign at this location is not consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and adds sign clutter at a critically sensitive location facing the Mission; on the following 6:1:0:0 vote:

AYES: Baer, Kincaid, Larrabee, Papp, Walthert, and Chair Hill
NOES: Vice-Chair Brajkovich
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

3. **1119 Garden Street**, ARCH-2588-2016: Review of proposed modifications to the façade of the Union Hardware Building, a Master List Historic Structure, with a categorical exemption from environmental review; C-D-H zone; Garden Street SLO Partners, applicant.

The Committee discussed particulars of a conflict-of-interest recusal with Community Development Director Codron; based on the discussion, Committee Member Larrabee determined she would not recuse for Garden Street Item 3.

Director Codron introduced the project as a part of recently approved Garden Street Terraces and requested feedback; Planner Oetzell provided the staff report with PowerPoint slides displaying the proposed façade modifications and character-defining architectural features.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Carol Florence, Principal Planner, Oasis Associates, presented the PowerPoint presentation which provided a historic overview and site perspectives, while underscoring the public-private partnership between the City and the project owners.

Beverly and Shaun Matthews, project partners and hoteliers, displayed PowerPoint slides of the proposed reconfigurations on Garden Street and noted the projected complete restoration of two buildings, and concepts for signage.

Robert Chattel, project preservation architect, discussed the initial Environmental Impact Report and the updated design development documents; reported that both Master List Buildings will undergo seismic retrofit as part of the project.

Chair Hill requested that the images be displayed of the windows being added to the site; Vice-Chair Brajkovich inquired whether location of delivery door would remain the same.

Committee Member Papp inquired whether the Committee was to consider the windows on the building's side elevation, the street façade solely, or both; inquired whether the bulkhead removal would be reversible; inquired about the reasoning behind shifting the original location of the traditional ingress/egress from the building's center to its side.
PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Committee Member Papp commented favorably on the removal of awnings, restoration of the transom, and retention of the structural and linear elements of the façade.

Vice-Chair Brajkovich indicated that the project’s having maintained the consistency of the façade trumps the perceived small problem he initially had with the building being overly symmetrical.

ACTION: UPON MOTION BY COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPP, SECONDED BY VICE-CHAIR BRAJKOVICH, the Cultural Heritage Committee found the proposed storefront modifications to be consistent with the Historic Preservation Ordinance and adopted the draft resolution recommending the director find the modifications consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties; on the following 7:0:0 vote:

AYES: Baer, Kincaid, Larrabee, Papp, Walthert, Vice-Chair Brajkovich, and Chair Hill
NOES: None
ABSENT: None

Chair Hill called for a five-minute recess.

4. **12165 Los Osos Valley Road, PRE-1293-2015**: Pre-application review of the conceptual plan for the multiple structures comprising the Froom Ranch Historic Complex, including structure demolition, and structure relocation and adaptive reuse within a proposed proximate park, in association with the Froom Ranch / Il Villagio Specific Plan (Madonna on Los Osos Valley Road Specific Plan); John Madonna, applicant.

Associate Planner Shawna Scott provided the background of the pre-application review of the conceptual proposal for the multiple structures comprising the Froom Ranch historic complex; requested that the CHC provide collective directional items and feedback.

Chair Hill disclosed that the Committee Members toured the site with the Applicant.

Committee Member Papp inquired about a historic survey and indicated the site was eligible for National, California and Local Historical Registers.

Committee Member Kincaid inquired whether an advisory body had authority to discuss any criteria since the property has not yet been annexed to the City; Planner Leveille indicated that the site has been evaluated as part of the General Plan and as part of one of the Specific Plan Areas; Director Codron added that none of the approvals granted by the City would apply until the site was under City jurisdiction, but would be those consulted and relied upon prior to construction.
APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Victor Montgomery, architect with RRM Design Group, spoke on behalf of the John & Susan Madonna Trust; presented PowerPoint slides of the project site's resources to either be relocated, demolished, harvested, or adaptively re-used; shared that structural analysis had not been done to determine viability for rehabilitation.

Vice-Chair Brajkovich inquired about the accumulation of historical artifacts inside the dairy barn; Chair Hill requested dimensional comparisons with the Octagon Barn.

PUBLIC COMMENT

David Brodie, San Luis Obispo, stressed the present-day obligation to retain communicated insights from the past, via the resources of remaining artifacts; urged for greater preservation efforts.

Neil Havlik, San Luis Obispo, spoke about his concerns with the development above the 150-foot elevation line; related that any such development should be strictly for public purpose, such as a trailhead park.

Ray Walters, San Luis Obispo, opined that the best location for a trailhead park is adjacent to the trailheads and that this property is better suited for some development above the 150-foot elevation line.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Committee Member Walthert shared how enamored she had become with the majestic nature of the dairy barn; lobbied for maintaining its rounded corner as a vital component of historical value. Committee Member Kincaid commented favorably on the concept of an adaptive re-use of the property.

Committee Member Larrabee spoke favorably on the direction of the project; spoke of her uncertainty for any type of restoration on site that could provide any degree of safe access; suggested that the trailhead park using established infrastructure was of sound reasoning.

Committee Member Papp indicated that the historic survey provided sufficient differentiation of structures' status but that it is a task better suited for structural engineers to analyze toward decision-making; indicated that the Committee is faced with the possibility of "demolition by neglect" and further indicated that determining a commercially viable method to maintain buildings is both an imperative aspect in preventing it and incumbent upon the developer and the City to find creative, viable ways to salvage agricultural buildings of significance; indicated that the first option should not have to be demolition.

Vice-Chair Brajkovich discussed replication and adaptive re-use options for the dairy barn.

Committee Member Baer considered the relocation of a main house as being incongruous in proximity to a Home Depot and suggested alternative sites to be considered; urged recognition of
the circular part of a dairy barn as a design motif that could be represented in other structures as a valuable reminder of architectural history.

Chair Hill commented favorably on the organization of the structures on site and that any relocation will destroy the historical narrative.

Committee Member Papp qualified that it would be difficult to arrive at a rating for each respective structure; supposed that the Committee’s predominant interest in salvaging structures, to the extent that they can be, is the overriding message to be conveyed.

Chair Hill indicated she based her own discussion points solely on information provided by the First Carbon Solution, none of which states anything about any of the structures being non-salvageable.

**ACTION:** UPON MOTION BY COMMITTEE MEMBER PAPP, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER BAER, the Cultural Heritage Committee provided feedback on the applicant’s conceptual plan for the multiple structures comprising the Froom Ranch Historic Complex, including structure demolition, structure relocation, and adaptive reuse within a proposed proximate park; made Motion indicating CHC is in favor of the preservation of structures intact and in situ, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and Secretary of Interior’s Standards, and toward maintaining the historic narrative and meaning of the complex; on the following 6:1:0:0 vote:

- **AYES:** Baer, Larrabee, Papp, Walthert, Vice-Chair Brajkovich, and Chair Hill
- **NOES:** Kincaid
- **ABSTAIN:** None
- **ABSENT:** None

5. **1027 Nipomo Street.** ARCH-3216-2016: Review of a new four-story mixed-use development proposed in the Downtown Historic District that includes 8,131 square-feet of commercial/retail space, 23 residential units and hotel use (7 rooms), with a categorical exemption from environmental review; C-D-H zone; Creekside Lofts, applicant.

Planner Cohen provided the Staff Report on the new four-story mixed-use structure.

In response to Committee Member Larrabee’s inquiry, Director Codron mentioned that the project is subject to the City’s inclusionary housing requirements such that it will be paying a fee as a percentage of the total project valuation.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Damien Mavis, Applicant representative, provided the historical and evolutionary context leading to the third iteration of the project.

Chair Hill inquired about the trash enclosure and the building code allowance for the sign across property lines between the project and Ciopinot.
Vice-Chair Brajkovich inquired how the building’s height qualified and met Design Guidelines in the low-scale neighborhood.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mary Mitchell, Soda Water Works, San Luis Obispo; qualified that her building is zoned in a Community Commercial Historic District with a Planned Development overlay (CC-HPD) area and in full conformance of the Historic Preservation Guidelines; stated her opposition to the project as presented for a variety of reasons, including that the modern and monolithic building violates City guidelines relating to infill projects adjacent to properties on the Master List of Historic Buildings.

Donna Duerk, San Luis Obispo, spoke in opposition to the project’s massing; lamented how the project not stepping back its upper levels from the street infringes on her neighborhood’s privacy.

David Brodie, San Luis Obispo, opined that the project does not conform with either Downtown Guidelines or Historic Preservation Guidelines.

Mary Neal, Sandy’s Liquor, San Luis Obispo; voiced objection to the project due to parking issues.

Nancy Hubbard, San Luis Obispo, spoke as member of development team and in favor of project; discussed how established zoning regulations are set by civic leaders and then stringently adhered to by developers in order to facilitate needs and requests for growth; discussed how the creek creates a natural setback buffer between uses.

Thom Jess, Arris Studio Architects, San Luis Obispo; addressed an insulting comment provided by a member of the public.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Committee Member Papp discussed the current state of various Downtown projects severely overshadowing the historic spatial nature of the Downtown Historic District and how to decide to respond to it accordingly.

Committee Members Baer, Brajkovich, Larrabee, and Hill commented unfavorably on the project’s scale, massing, and incompatibility with neighboring structures.

ACTION: UPON MOTION BY CHAIR HILL, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER KINCAID, the Cultural Heritage Committee continued the item to a date uncertain with direction to the Applicant to re-evaluate height, scale, massing and detailing for greater consistency with neighboring historic structures within the Downtown Historic District; on the following 7:00 roll call vote:

AYES: Baer, Kincaid, Larrabee, Papp, Walthert, Vice-Chair Brajkovich, and Chair Hill
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
AGENDA FORECAST AND STAFF UPDATES

Planner Leveille provided the Agenda Forecast:

October 24th: Two-story addition on Master List structure at 752 Buchon; sign on Chinatown project

Informal discussion ensued on the following:

A.) Length and breadth of this and future CHC Hearings;
B.) The difficulty in producing and using three-dimensional physical models for context in scale for projects but potentially using GIS mapping and form-based code as alternatives;
C.) The recent Chinatown archaeological fiasco prompted need for matrix for identifying cultural resource mitigation measures

ADJOURNMENT: 9:51 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE CULTURAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE: 11/28/2016
CULTURAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE AGENDA REPORT

SUBJECT: Pre-application review of conceptual plans for the multiple structures comprising the Froom Ranch Historic Complex, in association with the Froom Ranch/Il Villagio Specific Plan

ADDRESS: 12165 & 12393 Los Osos Valley Rd.  BY: Shawna Scott, Associate Planner
Phone Number: (805) 781-7176  e-mail: sscott@slocity.org

FILE NUMBER: PRE 1293-2015  FROM: Brian Leveille, Senior Planner

1.0 RECOMMENDATION

Provide feedback on the applicant’s conceptual plan for the multiple structures comprising the Froom Ranch Historic Complex, including structure demolition, structure relocation, and adaptive reuse within a proposed proximate park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>John Madonna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Victor Montgomery, RRM Design Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Park Site: Retail Commercial (City) Would require pre-zoning for Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>Park Site: General Retail (City) SP-3 Madonna on LOVR Specific Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>117.1 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Status</td>
<td>An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be prepared to evaluate the Specific Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.0 SUMMARY/BACKGROUND

On April 5, 2016, the City Council authorized initiation of the Madonna on Los Osos Valley Road (LOVR) Specific Plan (currently referred to as the Froom / Il Villagio Specific Plan). The applicant conceptually proposed a mix of land uses including a Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC), approximately 275 residential units, approximately 25,000 to 45,000 square feet of commercial uses, open space (50% of the project site), and park land. The applicant has identified an additional, adjacent, 7.4-acre parcel located within the City limits as the potential site for a park, which is conceptually proposed to include some historic and interpretive elements (refer to Section 4.1 Conceptual Proposal for Froom Ranch Historic Complex, below).
This is the first review of the project by the Cultural Heritage Committee (CHC). At this time, the applicant has not submitted a Draft Specific Plan for City review. The applicant is seeking early feedback from the CHC before completing the Draft Specific Plan for the project.

2.0 CHC PURVIEW

The CHC should provide feedback on the applicant’s conceptual plans for the historically significant structures identified on the site based on the Historic Preservation Ordinance, City policies, Historic Preservation Guidelines, and Secretary of Interior Standards. The intention of referring this item to the CHC at this early stage in the process is to allow the applicant to receive and consider collective CHC feedback prior to finalizing the Specific Plan and submitting the project for formal City review.

3.0 PROJECT AND SITE INFORMATION

3.1 Site Information/Setting

The project site consists of three parcels totaling approximately 117 acres located immediately west of Los Osos Valley Road. Two parcels (totaling 109.7 acres) are located within the County of San Luis Obispo’s jurisdiction, and adjacent to the City limits (APNs 067-241-030 and 067-241-031); these parcels are identified for future annexation in the Land Use Element (LUE) as the Madonna on Los Osos Valley Road (LOVR) Specific Plan Area (SP-3). One 7.4-acre parcel is located within the City limits (APN 053-510-012).

The current land use and natural setting includes livestock grazing, unpaved agricultural roads, stormwater basins, the Froom Ranch Historic Complex, John Madonna Construction office (within the historic complex), staging and materials storage, quarry area, wetlands, grasslands, stands of mature trees, Froom Creek and associated tributaries, and vacant land. The 7.4-acre parcel proposed as a trailhead plaza and park site where two of the structures from the historic complex are proposed for relocation includes an existing drainage basin, wetlands, and vacant land. Currently, this area is informally used by the public to gain access to the established Irish Hills Natural Area trail system. Surrounding uses include the Costco/Home Depot shopping center to the north, auto dealerships and commercial uses to the east, hotels and Mountainbrook Church to the south, and the Irish Hills Natural Reserve and associated trails and open space to the west.

3.2 Specific Plan

Project entitlements will include a Specific Plan, General Plan Amendments, Annexation, and related entitlements that would allow for the proposed development of the property. The applicant’s proposal includes a mix of commercial and residential land uses and a Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC). The project also includes a park, and a minimum of 50% of the site area would be designated as open space, as required by the LUE.1 The configuration of land uses and types of commercial and residential development are in the early stages of planning, and will be identified in detail in when the Specific Plan is formally submitted for review.

---

1 LUE Section 8.1.5. SP-3, Madonna on LOVR Specific Plan Area
3.3 Froom Ranch Historic Complex
The Froom Ranch Historic Complex is located within the northern portion of the project site, immediately south and southeast of Home Depot (refer to Figure 1. Historic Complex Location). The subject property was initially purchased in the late 19th century by the Froom family, who operated the Froom Ranch until the 1970s. Alex Madonna purchased the property in 1976, and Bill Froom continued to live on the ranch until 1998. The ranch was developed by John Froom, a Canada native, who came to the area in the 1870s as a laborer; he purchased the ranch in the 1890s and began dairy operations.\(^2\) The applicant submitted an evaluation of historic resources present on the project site (Attachment 4, Historic Report prepared by First Carbon Solutions, 2015). Based on this historic analysis, the complex consists of ten structures; seven of these structures contribute to the historical significance determination. These structures are described below, based on information provided in the historic report.

Main Residence (Historically Significant) – Proposed for Relocation

The main residence was built in 1915 by Hans Peterson, and is noted to be a Craftsman; however, the structure also presents elements of a neo-classic, row house architectural style. The building is in good condition, and is currently used for the John Madonna Construction offices. Alterations to the building over the years have included removal of rotted redwood sill foundations and replacement with concrete; water damaged floors have been leveled, sanded, and repaired; and some interior walls and the kitchen sink and stove were removed. Additional improvements included removal of paint and soot from the building interior, repainting, re-wiring and air circulation improvements, plumbing repairs, installation of new ceilings and a new roof, and construction of a rear building addition.

Old Barn (Historically Significant) – Proposed for Demolition

The Old Barn was constructed at an unknown time early in the 20th century on unknown property, reportedly southeast of the current ranch complex. The structure is estimated to be 125 years old, and presents a Vernacular architectural style. The building is noted to be in good condition. Noted alterations include replacement of a rotted out rear wall, installation of a new concrete floor (over dirt), and stabilization of the structure. The barn has been renovated extensively.

\(^2\) First Carbon Solutions 2015
Bunkhouse (Historically Significant) – Proposed for Relocation

The Bunkhouse was constructed by Hans Peterson for ranch workers in 1915, at the same time the main residence was built. The structure presents Craftsman style, and was known to be occupied by Bill Froom’s brother. The building is in good condition, with no major exterior alterations documented. Noted alterations include painting and installation of a new roof and floor.

Dairy Barn (Historically Significant) – Proposed for Demolition

The Dairy Barn was built in 1913 by Jim Aiken, who also built the Granary (see below) and a horse barn (no longer present). The historic report notes that the Dairy Barn is the only round barn in San Luis Obispo County, which is rare; this barn was in use until dairy operations ceased in 1977. The Vernacular-style barn is in fair condition. Structural stabilization alterations have included installation of support beams and replacement of vertical wall boards, and a small addition was constructed on the north end of the façade.

Creamery/House (Historically Significant) – Proposed for Demolition

The Creamery/House consists of two connected structures, which were built in several stages at unknown times with a Vernacular architectural style. John Froom lived in the Creamery/House prior to his marriage to Harriet Perry in 1902, and the Frooms lived in this structure until the Main Residence was constructed. Bill Froom was born in this structure. Noted alterations include an addition on the south wall (which deteriorated and was removed); a porch was added to the north wall; floors and ceiling areas were replaced by plywood sheeting; vertical siding was replaced; and walls and foundations were stabilized.

Granary (Historically Significant) – Proposed for Demolition

The Granary was built in 1913 by Jim Aiken, with a Vernacular, utilitarian style. The structure was built on stilts with tongue and groove double walls to prevent rats from getting into the structure to eat the grain. The structure is in poor condition.

Shed (Historically Significant) – Proposed for Demolition

The storage shed was constructed at an unknown time by an unknown person, although the construction date is assumed to be 1913. The Vernacular-style structure was noted to be in extremely poor condition and is “barely standing.”

Modern Structures (Not Historically Significant)

Modern structures not considered to contribute to the historical significance of the complex/district include the outhouse, storage building, and faux water tower (telecommunications facility).
According to the historic evaluation, the complex appears eligible for consideration as a local historic resource and meets National Register 15 criteria for a historic district\(^3\); the complex is an excellent example of early 20th century ranching and dairy industry development in San Luis Obispo County, is associated with the pioneering Froom family including Bill Froom and his local contributions, and the contributing structures represent predominant Craftsman and Vernacular styles of the early 20th century (First Carbon Solutions 2015).

**City Evaluation Criteria for Historic Resource Listing**

The historic evaluation assessed the Froom Ranch complex’s eligibility for the City’s Master List or Contributing List of Historic Resources. The eligibility discussion below is based on the report provided by the applicant; please note that peer review of this report would occur during preparation of the Environmental Impact Report for the Specific Plan and associated entitlements. The Historic Preservation Ordinance (HPO) contains the below historic significance criteria\(^4\) (refer to Attachment 2, General Plan Policies and Historic Preservation Ordinance). In order for a property to qualify for historic resource listing the property shall exhibit a high level of historic integrity, be at least fifty (50) years old (less than 50 if it can be demonstrated enough time has passed to understand its historical importance) and satisfy at least one of the following criteria\(^5\):

1. **Architectural Criteria (Style, Design, and/or Architect)**
   The Froom Ranch complex includes intact and good examples of Craftsman architecture, including the Main Residence (1915) and Bunkhouse (1915). The complex contains a unique example of Vernacular architecture: Dairy Barn (1913) with the rare rounded front. Additional Vernacular-style structures include the Creamery/House (unknown date), Granary (1913) and Shed (1913). The buildings represent the local farming and dairy industry development and the predominant architectural styles of the early 20th century.

2. **Historic Criteria (Person, Event, and/or Context)**
   The Froom Ranch complex is considered to have historic significance for its connection with the Froom family and Bill Froom and the development of early 20th century ranching and the dairy industry. The complex exemplifies the Early 20th Century Agricultural Development theme.

3. **Integrity**
   The Froom Ranch complex has retained its overall integrity of design, location, setting, feeling, association, materials, workmanship, and overall historic integrity. As such, the Froom Ranch complex exemplifies the early 20th century agricultural development of San Luis Obispo County.

---

\(^3\) A district possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development. A district can comprise both features that lack individual distinction and individually distinctive features that serve as focal points. It may even be considered eligible if all of the components lack individual distinction, provided that the grouping achieves significance as a whole within its historic context. In either case, the majority of the components that add to the district's historic character, even if they are individually undistinguished, must possess integrity, as must the district as a whole (National Park Service 1997).

\(^4\) 14.01.060 Listing Procedures for Historic Resources & 14.01.070 Evaluation Criteria for Historic Resource Listing

\(^5\) HPO Section 14.01.070. Evaluation Criteria for Historic Resource Listing
Based on the historic report, the complex appears eligible for consideration as a local historic resource.

**National Criteria for Evaluation and California Criteria for Designation**
The historic evaluation assessed the Froom Ranch complex’s eligibility for the National and California Registers, and determined that the Froom Ranch complex appears eligible for these Registers as a historic district (refer to Attachment 3, Summary of Federal and State Criteria Evaluation, and Attachment 4, Historic Report).

### 4.0 DISCUSSION

The discussion below includes a summary of the applicant’s conceptual proposal and a list of applicable policies and regulations for the CHC to consider when reviewing the applicant’s conceptual plan for the Froom Ranch Historic Complex.

#### 4.1 Conceptual Proposal for Froom Ranch Historic Complex

The applicant’s preliminary concept includes the demolition of five historic resources within the identified historic district, and relocation and adaptive re-use of two historic structures (refer to Table 1. Froom Ranch Historic Complex and Attachment 5, Cultural Heritage Committee Meeting: Response to April 28, 2016 Letter and Applicant Attachments; Applicant Proposed Parkland Concept).

**Table 1. Froom Ranch Historic Complex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>YEAR BUILT</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE*</th>
<th>APPLICANT PROPOSED CONCEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Residence</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Relocate into proposed park, re-use as a park ranger station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Old” Barn</td>
<td>Moved to site in early 1900s</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunkhouse</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Relocate into proposed park, re-use as a storage building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Barn</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creamery/House</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Demolish; harvest siding and incorporate into proposed park restroom building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granary</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shed</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outhouse</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Remove or demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Building</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Remove or demolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Tower</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Assume remain in place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Structure contributes to the historic character and significance of the identified historic district.
The applicant proposes to complete historic and photographic documentation of the historic district and structures proposed for demolition through preparation of a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)/Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) or similar document(s). Historic dairy equipment would be donated to a local agency. Where feasible, materials (e.g., siding, roofing, iron) would be salvaged for re-use within the park, and potentially the overall Specific Plan area (refer to Attachment 5, Cultural Heritage Committee Meeting: Response to April 28, 2016 Letter and Applicant Attachments; Applicant Proposed Parkland Concept).

The applicant’s conceptual plan includes: moving the Main Residence and Bunkhouse to new locations within the proposed park, approximately 650 feet northwest of their current location, and immediately west of the Home Depot rear wall/loading dock (refer to Figure 2. Comparative Conceptual Relocation of Main Residence and Bunkhouse, below); placement of the structures on permanent foundations; provision of utilities; and refurbishment of exterior finishes to reflect the relative historic period of construction, roof repair, and accessibility improvements in compliance with Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation (refer to Attachment 5, Cultural Heritage Committee Meeting: Response to April 28, 2016 Letter and Applicant Attachments; Applicant Proposed Parkland Concept). It is the applicant’s stated intention to relocate the Main Residence and Bunkhouse to a highly visible and publically accessible location. These structures would be part of the applicant’s proposed “historic plaza” component of the park, including interpretive signage.

Figure 2. Comparative Conceptual Relocation of Main Residence and Bunkhouse
Staff and the applicant are requesting feedback from the CHC regarding the proposed concept for the historic complex. Some key issues on which the CHC should provide feedback include the following:

1. The proposed demolition of the historic Old Barn, Dairy Barn, Creamery/House, Granary, and Shed.
2. The loss of the historic complex resulting from proposed demolitions and relocation of the Main Residence and Bunkhouse.
3. Re-use of materials salvaged from structures proposed for demolition within the proposed park.
4. Proposed relocation and adaptive reuse of the Main Residence and Bunkhouse within the proposed park, including consideration of context and feeling (existing location compared to the proposed location).

4.2 General Plan Guidance
The LUE states that the Specific Plan design should be sensitive to environmental constraints, including historic structures, and adjust accordingly through design. The COSE provides more specific policy direction, which is provided in Attachment 2, General Plan Policies and Historic Preservation Ordinance. These policies promote the identification, preservation, and rehabilitation of significant historic and architectural resources, and adaptive reuse of historic buildings, including, but not limited to the following:

"COSE Policy 3.3.1. Historic preservation. Significant historic and architectural resources should be identified, preserved and rehabilitated.

COSE Policy 3.3.2. Demolitions. Historically or architecturally significant buildings shall not be demolished or substantially changed in outward appearance, unless doing so is necessary to remove a threat to health and safety and other means to eliminate or reduce the threat to acceptable levels are infeasible.

COSE Policy 3.3.3. Historical documentation. Buildings and other cultural features that are not historically significant but which have historical or architectural value should be preserved or relocated where feasible. Where preservation or relocation is not feasible, the resource shall be documented and the information retained in a secure but publicly accessible location. An acknowledgment of the resource should be incorporated within the site through historic signage and the reuse or display of historic materials and artifacts.

COSE Policy 3.3.4. Changes to historic buildings. Changes or additions to historically or architecturally significant buildings should be consistent with the original structure and follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings. New buildings in historical districts, or on historically significant sites, should reflect the form, spacing and materials of nearby historic structures. The street

---
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appearance of buildings which contribute to a neighborhood's architectural character should be maintained.”

4.3 Historic Preservation Program Guidelines
The Historic Preservation Program Guidelines document includes guidelines for construction on properties with historic resources, including conformance with design standards identified in the HPO, General Plan, Community Design Guidelines, and Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. This document also identifies preservation tools and incentives intended to “support and encourage the identification, preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, reconstruction and continued use of historic and cultural resources.”

4.4 Historic Preservation Ordinance
The HPO states that “listed historic resources are in irreplaceable community resource that merit special protection to preserve them for future generations.” The City’s consideration of a request to demolish a resource which has been evaluated as eligible for local, state and National Register listing is subject to review by the CHC and Council and adoption of the following findings:

“D. Required findings for demolition of a historic resource. The decision-making body shall approve an application for demolition of a structure listed in the Inventory of Historic Resources only if it determines that the proposed demolition is consistent with the General Plan and:
(1) The historic resource is a hazard to public health or safety, and repair or stabilization is not structurally feasible. Deterioration resulting from the property owner’s neglect or failure to maintain the property should not be a justification for demolition. The applicant may be required to provide structural reports, to the approval of the Community Development Director or City Council, to document that repairs or stabilization are not feasible; or
(2) Denial of the application will constitute an economic hardship as described under findings 1-3 of Section J.”

Economic hardship findings are identified in the HPO as follows:

“(1) Denial of the application will diminish the value of the subject property so as to leave substantially no economic value, after considering other means of offsetting the costs of retaining the historic resource, including, but not limited to, tax abatements, financial assistance, building code modifications, changes in allowed uses, grants; or
(2) Sale or rental of the property is impractical, when compared to the cost of holding such property for uses permitted in the zoning district; or
(3) Utilization of the property for lawful purposes is prohibited or impractical.”

---

7 Conservation and Open Space Element Policies 3.3.1 through 3.3.4, Policy 3.5.12, Policy 3.6.1, and Policies 3.6.6 through 3.6.8
8 Historic Preservation Program Guidelines Chapter 3: Treatment of Historic Resources
9 Historic Preservation Program Guidelines Chapter 4: Preservation Tools and Incentives
10 HPO Section 14.01.100 Demolition of Historic Resources
Prevention of unpermitted active demolition or demolition by neglect is also regulated by the HPO:\footnote{11}

“A. Preservation of listed historic resources. The purpose of this Section is to prevent unpermitted active demolition or demolition by neglect by ensuring that listed historic resources are maintained in good repair, and free from structural defects and safety hazards, consistent with the International Property Maintenance Code, Property Maintenance Standards (SLO MC Ch.17.17), and standards as specified herein. Alteration or demolition in whole or part, of any significant features or characteristics of a listed historic property or resource requires City authorization, pursuant to [HPO] Section 14.01.100 [Demolition of Historic Resources].”

The HPO states that “relocation has the potential to adversely affect the significance of a historic resource and is discouraged.”\footnote{12} Relocation of historic resources would be subject to review by the CHC and Architectural Review Commission, and would be subject to the following criteria:

“B. Criteria for relocation. Relocation of structures included on the Inventory of Historic Resources, or those that are determined by the CHC or the Director to be potentially historic, is the least preferred preservation method and shall be permitted only when relocation is consistent with goals and policies of the General Plan, any applicable area or specific plans, and the Historic Preservation Program Guidelines, and:

1. The relocation will not significantly change, destroy, or adversely affect the historic, architectural or aesthetic value of the resource; and
2. Relocation will not have a significant adverse effect on the character of the historic district or neighborhood, or surrounding properties where the resource is located or at its proposed location, and
3. The original site and the proposed receiving site are controlled through ownership long term lease or similar assurance by the person(s) proposing relocation, to the Director’s approval, and
4. The proposed receiving site is relevant to the resource’s historic significance; and
5. The relocation is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the site and no other measures for correcting the condition are feasible, OR
6. The proposed relocation meets the findings required under Section J for demolition of a historic resource.”

4.5 Staff Response Regarding Policy and Ordinance Consistency
The proposal to demolish 5 of 7 structures found significant in the historic complex and relocate the remaining Main House and Bunkhouse would be inconsistent with the above referenced Ordinance sections unless the applicant can demonstrate the infeasibility of preservation of the structures (rehabilitation or reconstruction) found significant within the complex. If pursued in the formal Specific Plan application, the applicant’s current conceptual

\footnote{11} HPO Section 14.01.120 Unpermitted Demolition or Destruction of Resources
\footnote{12} HPO Sections 14.01.100 Demolition of Historic Resources and 14.01.110 Relocation of Historic Resources
plans will have to include justification of infeasibility or economic hardship in support of the proposal as outlined in the HPO above. As a part of the Cultural Resources evaluation in the EIR that will be prepared for the Specific Plan, the historic report will be peer reviewed through the EIR process. Once the Specific Plan is finalized, formal ordinance and policy evaluation will be conducted. As a part of the formal review of the Specific Plan and EIR evaluation, feasible alternatives to the proposed demolition and relocation will be evaluated. Consideration of a project which includes preservation of the Froom Ranch complex including rehabilitation and/or reconstruction, and adaptive reuse of the structures in place, while maintaining the context and feel of the historic district, would move the project in a direction to be consistent with the intent and regulations identified in the HPO, Historic Preservation Program Guidelines, and General Plan Policy stating that the design should be sensitive to environmental constraints including historic resources.

As described in the LUE, the purpose of the Specific Plan for this project site is to “provide design flexibility that will secure the appropriate development of the site while protecting sensitive environmental resources on the site.” Preparing of the Specific Plan presents a unique opportunity to protect environmental and community resources and maintain project flexibility and innovation through the development of site planning, guidelines, and standards, while achieving the objectives and performance standards identified in the General Plan.

5.0 RECOMMENDATION AND NEXT STEPS

Provide input and directional items to the applicant on the proposed conceptual treatment of the Froom Ranch Historic complex for the applicant to consider prior to finalizing plans and formally submitting the Specific Plan for City review.

6.0 ATTACHMENTS

1. Vicinity Map
2. General Plan Policies and Historic Preservation Ordinance
5. Cultural Heritage Committee Meeting: Response to April 28, 2016 Letter and Applicant Attachments; Applicant Proposed Parkland Concept

Note regarding Attachment 4: Please refer to updated Historic Resource Assessment (First Carbon Solutions, dated July 21, 2017)

---

13 LUE Section 8.1.5. SP-3, Madonna on LOVR Specific Plan Area
Attachment 1: Vicinity Map
3. Cultural Heritage

Cultural Background

3.0. Background
San Luis Obispo is blessed with a rich heritage, as evidenced by many noteworthy archaeological sites and historical buildings. These cultural resources constitute a precious, yet fragile, legacy which contributes to San Luis Obispo’s unique “sense of place.”

Before Europeans arrived on the central coast, native Chumash and Salinan people had lived in the area for centuries. While most reminders of these peoples are now gone, evidence of their presence remains in various archaeological, historical and spiritual sites throughout the City. These sites should be respectfully protected, preserved and studied. The Town of San Luis Obispo began with the founding of Mission San Luis Obispo de Tolosa in 1772. Since then, the community has experienced many changes. The older buildings, historic sites and landscape features that remain help us understand the changes and maintain a sense of continuity. The City wants to preserve these cultural resources – tangible reminders of earlier days in San Luis Obispo.

Starting in the early 1980s, the City of San Luis Obispo inaugurated a program formalizing and adopting policies to address historic and prehistoric cultural resources. The first of the City’s historic districts was formed, and the City Council created the Cultural Heritage Committee (CHC). The City subsequently adopted numerous policies in its General Plan that addressed the preservation and protection of historic and prehistoric resources. About 700 historic residential and commercial buildings continue to give the community its “historic” character and charm, while adapting to owners’ changing uses and needs.

After two decades, the City has made important strides with its historic preservation efforts. It has purchased and rehabilitated several historic structures, including the Jack House, the Southern Pacific Railroad Water Tower and the Southern Pacific Railroad Depot, and begun rehabilitation of several other historic railroad or adobe structures. Through the Mills Act program, the City and County of San Luis Obispo have helped owners of historic buildings maintain and improve their properties through property tax benefits.

Nevertheless, many cultural resources are under increasing threats due to development pressures, benign neglect and lack of funding for maintenance or rehabilitation. Throughout California, older established neighborhoods are
feeling the effects of growth and intensification due to contemporary development which often dwarfs or lacks the grace of older homes it replaces. Commercial areas are also feeling the impact of a changing economy with new uses, development patterns and economic realities.

Underutilized sites with historic resources are often prime targets for redevelopment projects, with the resulting loss of those resources. Moreover, some cultural resources have been lost due to unclear or conflicting public policies, incomplete information and the lack of funding. The loss of significant historic, cultural and archaeological resources can reduce the community’s uniqueness and make it a less desirable place in which to live, work or visit.

As San Luis Obispo enters the 21st century, it is prudent to look into the future to anticipate problems which may lie ahead. We have already experienced some of these same pressures, and it is reasonable to expect that we will continue to face similar challenges in the near future. Through its General Plan policies and related implementation measures, the City intends to help balance cultural resource preservation with other community goals.

3.1. **Goals and Policies**

3.2. **Historical and architectural resources.**
The City will expand community understanding, appreciation and support for historic and architectural resource preservation to ensure long-term protection of cultural resources.

3.3. **Policies**

3.3.1. **Historic preservation.**
Significant historic and architectural resources should be identified, preserved and rehabilitated.

3.3.2. **Demolitions.**
Historically or architecturally significant buildings shall not be demolished or substantially changed in outward appearance, unless doing so is necessary to remove a threat to health and safety and other means to eliminate or reduce the threat to acceptable levels are infeasible.

3.3.3. **Historical documentation.**
Buildings and other cultural features that are not historically significant but which have historical or architectural value should be preserved or relocated where feasible. Where preservation or relocation is not feasible, the resource shall be documented and the information retained in a secure but publicly accessible location. An acknowledgment of the resource should be incorporated within the site through historic signage and the reuse or display of historic materials and artifacts.

3.3.4. **Changes to historic buildings.**
Changes or additions to historically or architecturally significant buildings should be consistent with the original structure and follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings. New buildings in historical districts, or on historically significant sites, should reflect the form, spacing and materials of nearby historic structures. The street appearance of buildings which contribute to a neighborhood's architectural character should be maintained.

3.3.5. **Historic districts and neighborhoods.**
In evaluating new public or private development, the City shall identify and protect neighborhoods or districts having historical character due to the collective effect of Contributing or Master List historic properties.
3.4. **Archeological resources.**

The City will expand community understanding, appreciation and support for archaeological resource preservation.

3.5. **Policies**

3.5.1. **Archaeological resource protection.**

The City shall provide for the protection of both known and potential archaeological resources. To avoid significant damage to important archaeological sites, all available measures, including purchase of the property in fee or easement, shall be explored at the time of a development proposal. Where such measures are not feasible and development would adversely affect identified archaeological or paleontological resources, mitigation shall be required pursuant to the Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines.

3.5.2. **Native American sites.**

All Native American cultural and archaeological sites shall be protected as open space wherever possible.

3.5.3. **Non-development activities.**

Activities other than development which could damage or destroy archaeological sites, including off-road vehicle use on or adjacent to known sites, or unauthorized collection of artifacts, shall be prohibited.

3.5.4. **Archaeologically sensitive areas.**

Development within an archaeologically sensitive area shall require a preliminary site survey by a qualified archaeologist knowledgeable in Native American cultures, prior to a determination of the potential environmental impacts of the project.

3.5.5. **Archaeological resources present.**

Where a preliminary site survey finds substantial archaeological resources, before permitting construction, the City shall require a mitigation plan to protect the resources. Possible mitigation measures include: presence of a qualified professional during initial grading or trenching; project redesign; covering with a layer of fill; excavation, removal and curation in an appropriate facility under the direction of a qualified professional.

3.5.6. **Qualified archaeologist present.**

Where substantial archaeological resources are discovered during construction or grading activities, all such activities in the immediate area of the find shall cease until a qualified archaeologist knowledgeable in Native American cultures can determine the significance of the resource and recommend alternative mitigation measures.

3.5.7. **Native American participation.**

Native American participation shall be included in the City’s guidelines for resource assessment and impact mitigation. Native American representatives should be present during archaeological excavation and during construction in an area likely to contain cultural resources. The Native American community shall be consulted as knowledge of cultural resources expands and as the City considers updates or significant changes to its General Plan.
3.5.8. Protection of Native American cultural sites.
The City will ensure the protection of archaeological sites that may be culturally significant to Native Americans, even if they have lost their scientific or archaeological integrity through previous disturbance; sites that may have religious value, even though no artifacts are present; and sites that contain artifacts which may have intrinsic value, even though their archaeological context has been disturbed.

3.5.9. Archaeological site records.
The City shall establish and maintain archaeological site records about known sites. Specific archaeological site information will be kept confidential to protect the resources. The City will maintain, for public use, generalized maps showing known areas of archaeological sensitivity.

3.5.10. Sunny Acres.
Sufficient acreage should be provided around Sunny Acres to enable use of the property for a community center, urban garden, natural history museum and adjoining botanical garden, or similar uses.

3.5.11. Southern Pacific Water Tower.
The historic Southern Pacific Water Tower and adjoining City-owned land shall be maintained as open space or parkland.

3.5.12. Cultural resources and open space.
Within the city limits the City should require, and outside the city limits should encourage the County to require, public or private development to do the following where archaeological or historical resources are protected as open space or parkland:

1. Preserve such resources through easements or dedications. Subdivision parcel lines or easements shall be located to optimize resource protection. Easements as a condition of development approval shall be required only for structural additions or new structures, not for accessory structures or tree removal permits. If a historic or archaeological resource is located within an open space parcel or easement, allowed uses and maintenance responsibilities within that parcel or easement shall be clearly defined and conditioned prior to map or project approval.

2. Designate such easements or dedication areas as open space or parkland as appropriate.

3. Maintain such resources by prohibiting activities that may significantly degrade the resource.

3.6. Programs.
The City will do the following to protect cultural resources, and will encourage others to do so, as appropriate.

A. The City’s Cultural Heritage Committee will:

1. Help identify, and advise on suitable treatment for archaeological and historical resources.

2. Develop information on historic resources.

3. Foster public awareness and appreciation of cultural resources through means such as tours, a website, identification plaques and awards.

4. Provide recognition for preservation and restoration efforts.

5. Communicate with other City bodies and staff concerning cultural resource issues.

6. Provide guidance to owners to help preservation and restoration efforts.

7. Review new development to determine consistency with cultural resource preservation guidelines or standards.
3.6.2. **Financial assistance and incentives.**
The City will participate in financial assistance programs, such as low-interest loans and property tax reduction programs that encourage maintenance and restoration of historic properties.

3.6.3. **Construction within historic districts.**
The Cultural Heritage Committee and Architectural Review Commission will provide specific guidance on the construction of new buildings within historic districts.

3.6.4. **Post-disaster Historic Preservation.**
The City will be prepared to assess the condition of historic buildings that may be damaged by disasters and to foster their restoration whenever feasible.

3.6.5. **Archaeological resource preservation standards.**
The City will maintain standards concerning when and how to conduct archaeological surveys, and the preferred methods of preserving artifacts.

3.6.6. **Educational programs.**
The City will foster public awareness and appreciation of cultural resources by sponsoring educational programs, by helping to display artifacts that illuminate past cultures and by encouraging private development to include historical and archaeological displays where feasible and appropriate.

3.6.7. **Partnering for preservation.**
The City will partner with agencies, non-profit organizations and citizens groups to help identify, preserve, rehabilitate and maintain cultural resources.

3.6.8. **Promote adaptive reuse of historic buildings.**
The City will, consistent with health, safety and basic land-use policies, apply building and zoning standards within allowed ranges of flexibility, to foster continued use and adaptive reuse of historic buildings.

3.6.9. **City-owned adobes and historic structures.**
The City will preserve and, as resources permit, rehabilitate City-owned historic adobes and other historic structures by aggressively seeking grants, donations, private-sector participation or other techniques that help fund rehabilitation and adaptive reuse.

3.6.10. **Cultural Heritage Committee Whitepaper.**
The City will implement the recommendations of the Cultural Heritage Committee’s “Whitepaper”, including the adoption of a historic preservation ordinance.
historic preservation ordinance
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14.01.010 Findings and Purpose.

A. Findings.

1. The City of San Luis Obispo has a distinctive physical character and rich history that are reflected in its many cultural resources, such as historic structures and sites. These irreplaceable resources are important to the community’s economic vitality, quality of life, and sense of place, and need protection from deterioration, damage, and inappropriate alteration or demolition.

2. The City of San Luis Obispo has been fortunate to have owners who care about the history of their community and have undertaken the costly and time-consuming task of restoring, maintaining and enhancing their historic homes and commercial buildings. Their efforts have enhanced the distinctive character and sense of place of the community.

3. The California Environmental Quality Act requires special treatment of historic resources and the establishment of clear local guidance for the identification and preservation of such resources lends clarity and certainty to the review of development applications involving historic resources. See Section 3.1.4 of the Historic Preservation Program Guidelines.
B. Purpose. The broad purpose of this ordinance is to promote the public health, safety and welfare through the identification, protection, enhancement and preservation of those properties, structures, sites, artifacts and other cultural resources that represent distinctive elements of San Luis Obispo’s cultural, educational, social, economic, political and architectural history. Specifically, this ordinance sets forth regulations and procedures to:

1. Identify, protect, preserve, and promote the continuing use and upkeep of San Luis Obispo’s historic structures, sites and districts.

2. Foster the retention and restoration of historic buildings and other cultural resources that promote tourism, economic vitality, sense of place, and diversity.

3. Encourage private stewardship of historic buildings and other cultural resources through incentives where possible.

4. Implement the historic preservation goals and policies of the Conservation and Open Space Element of the General Plan.

5. Promote the conservation of valuable material and embodied energy in historic structures through their continued use, restoration and repair, and on-going maintenance of historic resources.

6. Promote the knowledge, understanding and appreciation of the City’s distinctive character, cultural resources, and history.

7. Establish the procedures and significance criteria to be applied when evaluating development project effects on historic resources.

8. Fulfill the City’s responsibilities as a Certified Local Government under State and Federal regulations and for Federal Section 106 reviews.

9. Establish the policy of the City to pursue all reasonable alternatives to achieve compliance with the Ordinance for the protection of historic resources prior to initiating penalty proceedings as set forth in Section 14.01.140 of this Ordinance.

14.01.020 Definitions. For the purposes of this ordinance, certain terms, words and their derivatives are used as follows:

1. Accessory Structure: a structure which is subordinate or incidental and directly related to a permitted use or structure on the same parcel. “Accessory structures” that include habitable space, as defined by the California Building Code, shall be no larger than 450 square feet. (Ord. 941-1(part), 1982: prior code – 9204.11 (part)) “Accessory structures” are located on the same parcel and are related to the primary structure but are subordinate or incidental, but may include
structures that have achieved historic significance in their own right, as determined by the Director, Committee or Council. (see “primary structure”).

2. **Adjacent**: located on property which abuts the subject property on at least one point of the property line, on the same property, or located on property directly across right-of-way from subject property and able to viewed concurrently.

3. **Adverse Effects**: effects, impacts or actions that are detrimental or potentially detrimental to a historic resource’s condition, architectural or historical integrity.

4. **Alteration**: change, repair, replacement, remodel, modification, or new construction to: (1) the exterior of an historic resource or adjacent building, (2) the structural elements which support the exterior walls, roof, or exterior elements of the historic resource or adjacent building, (3) other construction on a lot, or (4) character defining features of the interior of a historic resource if the structure’s significance is wholly or partially based on interior features and the resource is publicly-accessible. “Alteration” does not include ordinary landscape maintenance, unless the landscaping is identified as significant at the time a property is listed. “Alteration” also does not include ordinary property maintenance or repair that is exempt from a building permit, or is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties.

5. **Archaeological Site**: those areas where archaeological resources are present and may be larger or smaller than the project site. An archaeological site may include prehistoric Native American archaeological site, Historic archaeological sites; sites or natural landscapes associated with important human events; and Native American Sacred Places and Cultural landscapes.

6. **ARC**: the Architectural Review Commission as appointed by the City Council.

7. **California Register**: California Register of Historical Resources defined in California PRC 5024.1 and in CCR Title 14 Chap 11.5, Sec 4850 et seq. as it may be amended.

8. **CHC**: the Cultural Heritage Committee as appointed by the City Council.

9. **Character Defining Features**: as outlined in the U.S. Department of the Interior’s National Register Bulletin 15 and Preservation Brief 17: “How to Identify Character Defining Features”, the architectural character and general composition of a resource, including, but not limited to, type and texture of building material; type, design, and character of all windows, doors, stairs, porches, railings, molding and other appurtenant elements; and fenestration, ornamental detailing, elements of craftsmanship, finishes, etc.

10. **City**: the City of San Luis Obispo.

11. **Community Design Guidelines**: the most recent version of the City’s Community Design Guidelines as adopted and amended from time to time.
12. **Contributing List Resource or Property**: a designation that may be applied to buildings or other resources at least 50 years old that maintain their original or attained historic and architectural character, and contribute either by themselves or in conjunction with other structures to the unique or historic character of a neighborhood, district, or to the City as a whole. They need not be located in a historic district. In some cases, buildings or other resources that are less than 50 years old, but are nonetheless significant based on architecture, craftsmanship or other criteria as described herein may be designated as a Contributing List resource.

13. **Council**: the Council of the City of San Luis Obispo.

14. **Cultural Resource**: any prehistoric or historic district, site, landscape, building, structure, or object included in, or potentially eligible for local, State or National historic designation, including artifacts, records, and material remains related to such a property or resource.

15. **Demolition**: for the purpose of this ordinance, “demolition” refers to any act or failure to act that destroys, removes, or relocates, in whole or part a historical resource such that its historic or architectural character and significance are materially altered.

16. **Deterioration**: the significant worsening of a structure’s condition, architectural or historic integrity, due to lack of maintenance, organisms, neglect, weathering and other natural forces.

17. **Director**: the Director of the Community Development Department, or another person authorized by the Director to act on his or her behalf.

18. **Feasible**: capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account cultural, economic, environmental, historic, legal, social and technological factors. **Structural feasibl**ity means that a building or other structure can be repaired or rehabilitated so as to be safe and usable without significant loss of historic fabric. Factors to be considered when making this determination include the existence of technology that will allow the design of the work and the ability to repair, supplement or replace load-bearing members and the thermal and moisture protection systems required for continued use of the structure; and the physical capacity of the structure to withstand the repair and/or rehabilitation process without the danger of further damage.

19. **Historic Building Code**: the most recent version of the California Historical Building Code, Title 25, Part, 8, as defined in Sections 18950 to 18961 of Division 12, Part 2.7 of Health and Safety Code (H&SC), a part of California State law.

20. **Historic Context**: Historic context are those patterns, themes or trends in history by which a specific occurrence, property, or site is understood and its meaning and significance is made clear.

21. **Historic District/Historical Preservation District**: areas or neighborhoods with a collection or concentration of listed or potentially contributing historic properties or archaeologically significant sites, where historic properties help define the area or neighborhood’s unique
architectural, cultural, and historic character or sense of place. Historic districts are delineated on the official zoning map as Historic (H) overlay zone under San Luis Obispo Municipal Code Chapter 17.54.

22. **Historic Preservation Program Guidelines:** the most recent version of the Historic Preservation Program Guidelines, as adopted and amended from time to time.

23. **Historic Preservation Report:** a document which describes preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction measures for a historic resource, based on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, and which includes standards and guidelines for recommended treatments for preserving the resource.

24. **Historic Property:** a property, including land and buildings, which possesses aesthetic, architectural, cultural, historic or scientific significance, and which is included in, or potentially eligible for local, State or National historic designation.

25. **Historic Resource:** any building, site, improvement, area or object of aesthetic, architectural, cultural, historic or scientific significance, and which is included in, or potentially eligible for local, State or National historic designation.

26. **Historic Status:** historic designation of a listed resource or property as approved by Council.

27. **Improvement:** any building, structure, fence, gate, landscaping, hardscaping, wall, work of art, or other object constituting a physical feature of real property or any part of such feature.

28. **Inappropriate Alteration:** alterations to historic resources which are inconsistent with these provisions and/or the Historic Preservation Program Guidelines.

29. **Integrity, Architectural or Historical:** the ability of a property, structure, site, building, improvement or natural feature to convey its identity and authenticity, including but not limited to its original location, period(s) of construction, setting, scale, design, materials, detailing, workmanship, uses and association.

30. **Inventory of Historic Resources:** the list of historically designated resources and properties consisting of Master List and Contributing Properties List of Historic Resources, and any properties, objects, sites, gardens, sacred places and resources subsequently added to the inventory as determined to meet criteria outlined herein and approved by the City Council.

31. **Listed Resource:** properties and resources included in the Inventory of Historic Resources.

32. **Massing:** the spatial relationships, arrangement and organization of a building’s physical bulk or volume.
33. **Master List Resource:** designation which may be applied to the most unique and important historic properties and resources in terms of age, architectural or historical significance, rarity, or association with important persons or events in the City’s past meeting criteria outlined herein.

34. **Minor Alteration.** Any structural or exterior change to a historic resource which the Director determines to be consistent with the Historic Preservation Program Guidelines, Secretary of the Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties and other applicable standards.

35. **Modern Contributing Resources:** designation which may be applied to properties and resources which are less than 50 years old, but which exemplify or include significant works of architecture or craftsmanship or are associated with a person or event significant to the City’s history.

36. **National Register of Historic Places:** the official inventory of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, engineering, archaeology and culture which is maintained by the Secretary of the Interior under the authority of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

37. **Neglect:** the lack of maintenance, repair or protection of a listed property, resource, site or structure, which results in significant deterioration, as determined by the Director or City Council based on visual and physical evidence.

38. **Non-Contributing Resource:** designation which may be applied to properties and resources in historic districts which are typically less than 50 years old and do not support the prevailing historic character of the district or other listing criteria as outlined herein.

39. **Preservation:** the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain a historic site, building or other structure’s historically significant existing form, integrity, and materials through stabilization, repair and maintenance.

40. **Property Owner:** the person or entity (public or private) holding fee title interest or legal custody and control of a property.

41. **Primary Structure:** the most important building or other structural feature on a parcel in terms of size, scale, architectural or historical significance, as determined by the Committee.

42. **Qualified Professional:** an individual meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (36 CFR Part 61 Appendix A) in history, architectural history, historic architecture and other designated categories, or an individual determined by the CHC to have the qualifications generally equivalent to the above standards based on demonstrated experience.

43. **Reconstruction:** the act or process of recreating the features, form and detailing of a non-surviving building or portion of building, structure, object, landscape, or site for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.
44. **Rehabilitation**: the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its architectural, cultural, or historic values.

45. **Relocation**: removal of a resource from its original site and its re-establishment in essentially the same form, appearance and architectural detailing at another location.

46. **Responsible party**: any person, business, corporation or entity, and the parent or legal guardian of any person under the age of eighteen (18) years, who has committed, permitted, directed or controlled any act constituting a violation of this ordinance.

47. **Restoration**: the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.

48. **Scale**: the proportions of architectural design that relate to human size or other relative size measure.

49. **Secretary of the Interior’s Standards**: the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties as published by the U.S. Department of the Interior and as amended from time to time.

50. **Setting**: the physical area, environment or neighborhood in which a resource is located.

51. **Sensitive Site**: a site determined by the Community Development Director, Planning Commission, Architectural Review Commission or Council, upon recommendation of the Cultural Heritage Committee, to have special characteristics, constraints or community value such as: historic significance, historic context, creek side location or visual prominence, requiring more detailed development review than would otherwise be required for other similarly zoned lots.

52. **Site**: as used in this ordinance, the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure.

53. **Siting**: the placement of structures and improvements on a property or site.

54. **Stabilization**: the act or process of applying measures designed to reestablish a weather resistant enclosure and the structural stability of an unsafe or deteriorated property while maintaining the essential form as it exists at present.
55. **Statement of Historic Significance:** An explanation of why a resource is important within its historic context. It explains how the resource meets the eligibility criteria and integrity thresholds as established by local, state or federal government.

56. **Structure:** as used here, “structure” includes anything assembled or constructed on the ground, or attached to anything with a foundation on the ground, including walls, fences, buildings, signs, bridges, monuments, and similar features.

57. **Survey:** a systematic process for identifying and evaluating a community’s historic resources using established criteria. “Survey” may also refer to the documentation resulting from a survey project.

58. **Threatened Resource:** properties or resources at risk of loss of architectural, cultural or historic value due to physical alteration, relocation or demolition.

59. **Zoning Code:** Title 17 of the City’s Municipal Code, as amended from time to time.

### 14.01.030 Cultural Heritage Committee (CHC).

**A. Committee membership and terms.**

The City shall have a Cultural Heritage Committee (the “CHC” or “Committee”), consisting of seven members who shall be appointed by the City Council (“Council”) for terms of up to four years, which shall commence immediately upon appointment by the Council consistent with Resolutions 6157 (1987 Series) and 6593 (1989 Series), and CHC Bylaws or as subsequently amended. The CHC shall function within the guidelines and policies of the *Advisory Body Handbook* and perform other duties as assigned by Council.

**B. Duties.**

The CHC shall make recommendations to decision-making bodies on the following:

1. Historic and Archaeological Resource Preservation Program guidelines that implement this ordinance and provide guidance to persons planning development projects subject to Cultural Heritage Committee review, and for City and property owner decisions regarding cultural resources in San Luis Obispo. Once adopted by the City Council, a record copy of the guidelines shall be maintained in the office of the City Clerk and in the Community Development Department. Copies shall be available on the City’s website and printed versions will be available at cost.

2. Properties for inclusion on the City’s List of Historic Resources - those properties, areas, sites, buildings, structures or other features having significant historical, cultural, architectural, community, scientific or aesthetic value to the citizens of San Luis Obispo.

4. Actions subject to discretionary City review and approval that may affect significant archaeological, cultural or historic resources.

5. The application of architectural, historic, and cultural preservation standards and guidelines to projects and approvals involving historic sites, districts, and structures.

6. Consolidation of information about cultural resources and promotion, participation in, or sponsorship of educational and interpretive programs that foster public awareness and appreciation of cultural resources.

7. Alterations related to development or demolition applications involving listed resources and properties within historic preservation districts.

8. Incentive programs approved by the Council that are directed at preserving and maintaining cultural resources.

9 Information for property owners preparing local, state and federal historic nominations to utilize preservation incentives, including the Mills Act and federal tax incentives, such as rehabilitation tax credits.

C. Actions Subject to Cultural Heritage Committee Review.

The Committee shall review and make recommendations to the Director, Architectural Review Commission, Planning Commission or City Council on applications and development review projects which include any of the following:

1. Changes to the Inventory of Historic Resources.

2. Changes to historic districts and applications to establish new historic districts.

3. Statements of historic significance and historic inventories for existing and proposed historic districts.

4. New construction, additions or alterations located in historic districts, or on historically listed properties, or sensitive archaeological sites.

5. Applications to demolish or relocate listed historic resources or structures.

6. Referrals to the Committee by the Community Development Director (“Director”), Architectural Review Commission, Planning Commission, or Council.
7. Proposed actions of public agencies that may affect historic or cultural resources within the City.

14.01.040 Community Development Director Role

The CHC is assisted by staff of the Community Development Department. The Community Development Director (“Director”) is responsible for interpreting and implementing this ordinance and helping the CHC carry out its duties. Notwithstanding Section 14.01.030C 1-5 and 7 of this ordinance, the Director may determine that CHC review is not required for actions or projects that: 1) do not adversely affect historic resources, or 2) are consistent with this ordinance, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and the Historic Preservation Program Guidelines and no public purpose would be served by requiring CHC review.

14.01.050 Historic Resource Designation

The following classifications shall be used to designate historic resources and properties. The primary categories of historic significance are “Master List” and “Contributing” properties. Contributing properties include those properties that by virtue of their age, design and appearance, contribute to and embody the historic character of the neighborhood or historic district in which they are located.

A. Master List Resources. The most unique and important resources and properties in terms of age, architectural or historical significance, rarity, or association with important persons or events in the City’s past, which meet one or more of the criteria outlined in Section 14.01.070.

B. Contributing List Resources or Properties. Buildings or other resources at least 50 years old that maintain their original or attained historic and architectural character, and contribute, either by themselves or in conjunction with other structures, to the unique or historic character of a neighborhood, district, or to the City as a whole. They need not be located in a historic district. In some cases, buildings or other resources that are less than 50 years old, but are nonetheless significant based on architecture, craftsmanship or other criteria as described in Section 14.01.070 may be designated as a Contributing Resource.

C. Non-Contributing. Buildings, properties and other features in historic districts which are less than 50 years old, have not retained their original architectural character, or which do not support the prevailing historic character of the district.

14.01.055 Historic Gardens, Site Features, Signs, and Other Cultural Resources

A. Historic Site and landscape features. Historic gardens, site features and improvements, accessory structures, signs, Native American Sacred Places, cultural landscapes and areas or objects of archaeological, architectural, cultural or historic significance not part of a designated
property may be added to the Inventory of Historic Resources through CHC review and Council approval as specified herein.

**B. Cultural Resources on public property.** Cultural and historic features on public property, such as Bishop’s Peak granite walls and curbing, sidewalk embossing, ornamental manhole covers and hitching posts, may be added to the Inventory of Historic Resources through CHC review and Council approval as specified herein.

**C. Sign.** A sign which contributes to the unique architectural or historic character of a building, site or historic district may be designated as a historic sign. Signs that meet at least one of the following criteria may be designated historic:

1. The sign is exemplary of technology, craftsmanship or design of the period when it was constructed, uses historic sign materials and means of illumination, and is not significantly altered from its historic period. Historic sign materials shall include metal or wood facings, or paint directly on the façade of a building. Historic means of illumination shall include incandescent light fixtures or neon tubing on the exterior of the sign. If the sign has been altered, it must be restorable to its historic function and appearance.

2. The sign is well integrated with the site and/or architecture of the building.

3. A sign not meeting either criterion may be considered for inclusion in the inventory if it demonstrates extraordinary aesthetic quality, creativity, or innovation.

**14.01.060 Listing Procedures for Historic Resources**

**A. Application for historic listing.** The property owner may request that a resource to be added to the Master or Contributing List of Historic resources by submitting a completed application to the Community Development Department (“Department”), accompanied by all available information documenting the historic significance and architectural character of the resource. The CHC, ARC, Planning Commission may also recommend, or City Council may directly request, the addition of a resource to the Master or Contributing List of Historic Resources.

**B. Review process.** The CHC shall review all applications for historic listing, whether initiated by the City or a property owner, to determine if a property proposed for listing meets eligibility criteria for historic listing. The CHC will review the eligibility criteria for a proposed listing at a noticed public hearing. The Director shall provide notification to the property owner and public, as required by City standards. At the public hearing, or in no case more than 60 days from the hearing date, the CHC shall forward a recommendation on the application to the City Council. The City Council will take an action on the application to add or not add the resource to the Master or Contributing List of Historic Resources. The decision of the City Council is final.

**C. Removal from historic listing.** It is the general intention of the City not to remove a property from historic listing. Council may, however, rezone a property to remove Historic Overlay
14.01.070. Evaluation Criteria for Historic Resource Listing

When determining if a property should be designated as a listed Historic or Cultural Resource, the CHC and City Council shall consider this ordinance and State Historic Preservation Office (“SHPO”) standards. In order to be eligible for designation, the resource shall exhibit a high level of historic integrity, be at least fifty (50) years old (less than 50 if it can be demonstrated that enough time has passed to understand its historical importance) and satisfy at least one of the following criteria:

A. Architectural Criteria: Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.

(1) **Style:** Describes the form of a building, such as size, structural shape and details within that form (e.g. arrangement of windows and doors, ornamentation, etc.). Building style will be evaluated as a measure of:

a. The relative purity of a traditional style;

b. Rarity of existence at any time in the locale; and/or current rarity although the structure reflects a once popular style;

c. Traditional, vernacular and/or eclectic influences that represent a particular social milieu and period of the community; and/or the uniqueness of hybrid styles and how these styles are put together.

(2) **Design:** Describes the architectural concept of a structure and the quality of artistic merit and craftsmanship of the individual parts. Reflects how well a particular style or combination of styles are expressed through compatibility and detailing of elements. Also, suggests degree to which the designer (e.g., carpenter-builder) accurately interpreted and conveyed the style(s). Building design will be evaluated as a measure of:

a. Notable attractiveness with aesthetic appeal because of its artistic merit, details and craftsmanship (even if not necessarily unique);

b. An expression of interesting details and eclecticism among carpenter-builders, although the craftsmanship and artistic quality may not be superior.

(3) **Architect:** Describes the professional (an individual or firm) directly responsible for the building design and plans of the structure. The architect will be evaluated as a reference to:
a. A notable architect (e.g., Wright, Morgan), including architects who made significant contributions to the state or region, or an architect whose work influenced development of the city, state or nation.

b. An architect who, in terms of craftsmanship, made significant contributions to San Luis Obispo (e.g., Abrahams who, according to local sources, designed the house at 810 Osos - Frank Avila's father's home - built between 1927 – 30).

B. Historic Criteria

(1) **History – Person:** Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history. Historic person will be evaluated as a measure of the degree to which a person or group was:

   a. Significant to the community as a public leader (e.g., mayor, congress member, etc.) or for his or her fame and outstanding recognition - locally, regionally, or nationally.

   b. Significant to the community as a public servant or person who made early, unique, or outstanding contributions to the community, important local affairs or institutions (e.g., council members, educators, medical professionals, clergymen, railroad officials).

(2) **History – Event:** Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States. Historic event will be evaluated as a measure of:

   (i) A landmark, famous, or first-of-its-kind event for the city - regardless of whether the impact of the event spread beyond the city.

   (ii) A relatively unique, important or interesting contribution to the city (e.g., the Ah Louis Store as the center for Chinese-American cultural activities in early San Luis Obispo history).

(3) **History-Context:** Associated with and also a prime illustration of predominant patterns of political, social, economic, cultural, medical, educational, governmental, military, industrial, or religious history. Historic context will be evaluated as a measure of the degree to which it reflects:

   a. Early, first, or major patterns of local history, regardless of whether the historic effects go beyond the city level, that are intimately connected with the building (e.g., County Museum).

   b. Secondary patterns of local history, but closely associated with the building (e.g., Park Hotel).
C. **Integrity:** Authenticity of an historical resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance. Integrity will be evaluated by a measure of:

1. Whether or not a structure occupies its original site and/or whether or not the original foundation has been changed, if known.

2. The degree to which the structure has maintained enough of its historic character or appearance to be recognizable as an historic resource and to convey the reason(s) for its significance.

3. The degree to which the resource has retained its design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.

14.01.080 Historic District Designation, Purpose and Application

A. **Historic (H) District designation.** All properties within historic districts shall be designated by an “H” zoning. Properties zoned “H” shall be subject to the provisions and standards as provided in Ordinance 17.54 (Zoning) of the Municipal Code.

B. **Purposes of Historic Districts.** The purposes of historic districts and H zone designation are to:

1. Implement cultural resource preservation policies of the General Plan, the preservation provisions of adopted area plans, the Historic Preservation and Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines, and

2. Identify and preserve definable, unified geographical entities that possess a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development;

3. Implement historic preservation provisions of adopted area and neighborhood improvement plans;

4. Enhance and preserve the setting of historic resources so that surrounding land uses and structures do not detract from the historic or architectural integrity of designated historic resources and districts; and

5. Promote the public understanding and appreciation of historic resources.

C. **Eligibility for incentives.** Properties zoned as Historic Preservation (H) shall be eligible for preservation incentive and benefit programs as established herein, in the Guidelines and other local, state and federal programs.
D. Where applied. The (H) designation may be applied to areas or neighborhoods with a collection or concentration of listed historic properties or archaeologically significant sites, or where historic properties help define an area or neighborhood’s unique architectural and historic character or sense of place.

E. “H” district combined. A Historic Preservation Overlay District (H) may be combined with any zoning district, and shall be shown by adding an “H” to the base zone designation. H district boundaries shall be drawn to follow property lines or right-of-way lines, and as set forth in the Zoning Regulations.

14.01.090 Process for Establishing or Amending Historic Districts:

A. Initiating or amending Historic Districts. Any person may initiate the process to establish or alter the boundaries of a Historic Preservation District. The process can also be initiated by the CHC, ARC, Planning Commission or City Council.

B. Application. An application to establish or alter the boundaries of a Historic Preservation District shall be submitted to the Department. The application shall meet the requirements for rezoning as described in the Zoning Regulations. The application and supporting information and plans shall be submitted to the Department and shall include:

(1) A map (8-1/2” x 11”) from the official zoning map, with the area to be changed shaded or outlined in a heavy, black line, with the proposed area to be changed clearly labeled, and

(2) Information showing how the application meets the criteria to establish or alter a historic district designation.

(3) A Statement of historic significance. A statement of historic significance shall be prepared by a qualified professional, as listed in the City’s List of Qualified Historians. The Director may waive the requirement that the statement be prepared by a qualified professional if the applicant provides adequate information to enable informed review of the proposed district.

C. Contents. Statements of Historic Significance shall include, but not be limited to the following;

(1) A visual and written description of the district’s boundaries.

(2) A description of the district’s architectural, historic, and cultural resources, character and significance, including a historic survey documenting the period of significance and how historic properties meet adopted local, state and where applicable, federal criteria for historic listing.

(3) Preservation goals and concerns for the district including but not limited to;
q Identification of preservation priorities, important features, goals and objectives, and
b. Identification of potential obstacles to preservation, and
c. Identification of historic land use policies and goals for future land use, and
d. Special considerations for development review of projects both involving and not involving historic resources.

(4) Graphic and written design guidelines applicable to the district’s preservation goals, historic character and features which shall include, but not be limited to:

(a) Guidelines for projects involving historic resources, focused on preserving the district’s character and significant archeological, architectural, and historic features; and

(b) Guidelines for projects within the district but not involving historically designated properties, focused on maintaining street character and compatibility with the district’s historic character while not necessarily mimicking historic styles.

D. Review. The CHC shall review the application and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission shall review the CHC recommendation and rezoning application and make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council shall review the application and the recommendations of the CHC and Planning Commission, and approve or disapprove the application. The CHC, Planning Commission and the City Council shall each conduct a public hearing on the application and the notice of such hearings shall be completed as provided in the City’s Notification Procedures.

E. Review criteria. When considering a Historic Preservation District application, the reviewing body shall consider the both of the following criteria:

(1) Environmental Design Continuity: The inter-relationship of structures and their relationship to a common environment; The continuity, spatial relationship, and visual character of a street, neighborhood, or area. Environmental design continuity is comprised of:

a. Symbolic importance to the community of a key structure in the area and the degree to which it serves as a conspicuous and pivotal landmark (e.g., easily accessible to the public, helps to establish a sense of time and place); or

b. Compatibility of structures with neighboring structures in their setting on the basis of period, style (form, height, roof lines), design elements, landscapes, and natural features; and how these combine together to create an integral cultural, historic, or stylistic setting; or
c. Similarity to and/or compatibility of structures over 50 years of age which, collectively, combine to form a geographically definable area with its own distinctive character.

(2) Whether the proposed district contains structures which meet criteria for inclusion on the City’s List of Historic Resources.

14.01.100 Demolition of Historic Resources

A. Intent. Listed historic resources are an irreplaceable community resource that merit special protection to preserve them for future generations, and shall not be demolished unless the City Council makes all of the findings specified in Section 14.01.100 D, provided however, that these thresholds shall not apply to repairs to listed historic resources that do not require a building permit, or where the CHC or the Director has determined such work is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and with the Historic Preservation Program Guidelines.

B. Demolition review. The CHC shall review and make recommendation to the City Council concerning demolition applications for structures listed in the Inventory of Historic resources.

C. Demolition thresholds. Demolition permits for structures which are included on the Inventory of Historic resources shall be required for:

(1) Alterations to or removal of greater than 25% of the original building framework, roof structure, and exterior walls; and

(2) Relocation of such resources to a site outside the city limits.

D. Required findings for demolition of a historic resource. The decision-making body shall approve an application for demolition of a structure listed in the Inventory of Historic Resources only if it determines that the proposed demolition is consistent with the General Plan and:

(1) The historic resource is a hazard to public health or safety, and repair or stabilization is not structurally feasible. Deterioration resulting from the property owner’s neglect or failure to maintain the property should not be a justification for demolition. The applicant may be required to provide structural reports, to the approval of the Community Development Director or City Council, to document that repairs or stabilization are not feasible; or

(2) Denial of the application will constitute an economic hardship as described under findings 1-3 of Section J.

E. Demolition timing. City regulations provide for a 90-day waiting period before demolition of a listed historic resource to allow consideration of alternatives to preserve the building through relocation and/or property trades. The Chief Building Official shall not issue a permit for
demolishing a historic resource, except where the Chief Building Official determines a listed historic resource may pose an imminent demonstrable threat to human life and safety, until:

(1) public notice requirements in the City’s Demolition and Building Relocation Code have been met; and
(2) a construction permit is issued for a replacement building; and
(3) all permit fees for the new development are paid. Where no new development is proposed, the property owner shall provide to the Director’s satisfaction, financial guarantees to ensure demolition plans and conditions of approval are implemented.

F. Historic and architectural documentation. Before the issuance of a demolition permit for structures listed in the Inventory of Historic Resources, the resource and its site shall be documented as specified in City standards, to the satisfaction of the CHC and the Director. The documentation shall be retained in a secure, but publicly accessible, location.

G. Historic acknowledgement. An acknowledgment of demolished resources shall be provided through historic signage and/or the reuse or display of historic materials and artifacts on site, at the owner’s expense, to the Director’s approval.


I. Expiration of demolition approval. Demolition approval of a listed historic resource shall expire two years after its date of approval, unless a building permit has been issued and construction has begun. A one year extension may be granted by the Director. Additional time extensions shall require reapplication to, and approval by the CHC.

J. Economic Hardship. An economic hardship provision is established to ensure that denial of a demolition permit does not impose undue hardship on the owner of a historical resource. If the applicant presents evidence clearly demonstrating to the satisfaction of the CHC or the City Council that the action will cause an extreme hardship, the CHC may recommend approval, and the Council may approve or conditionally approve a demolition or other application to modify a listed historic resource even though it does not meet one or more standards set forth herein. The applicant shall be responsible for providing substantiation of the claim to the Director, who shall review the information with the Director of Finance and make a joint recommendation to the CHC on the hardship request. The CHC shall consider and make a recommendation to the Council regarding the financial impacts of denial of the demolition permit. Private financial information shall be maintained in confidence by the City. The CHC is authorized to request that the applicant furnish information, documentation and/or expert testimony, the cost of which shall be paid by the applicant, to be considered by the Committee in its related findings. All additional required information shall be provided by a qualified individual or firm approved by the Director. In determining whether extreme hardship exists, the Committee and Council shall consider evidence that demonstrates:
(1) Denial of the application will diminish the value of the subject property so as to leave substantially no economic value, after considering other means of offsetting the costs of retaining the historic resource, including, but not limited to, tax abatements, financial assistance, building code modifications, changes in allowed uses, grants,; or

(2) Sale or rental of the property is impractical, when compared to the cost of holding such property for uses permitted in the zoning district; or

(3) Utilization of the property for lawful purposes is prohibited or impractical;

14.01.110 Relocation of Historic Resources.

Relocation has the potential to adversely affect the significance of a historic resource and is discouraged. Relocation applications shall be evaluated as follows:

A. Review. The CHC and ARCH shall review applications to relocate structures listed on the Inventory of Historic Resources.

B. Criteria for relocation. Relocation of structures included on the Inventory of Historic Resources, or those that are determined by the CHC or the Director to be potentially historic, is the least preferred preservation method and shall be permitted only when relocation is consistent with goals and policies of the General Plan, any applicable area or specific plans, and the Historic Preservation Program Guidelines, and:

(1) The relocation will not significantly change, destroy, or adversely affect the historic, architectural or aesthetic value of the resource; and

(2) Relocation will not have a significant adverse effect on the character of the historic district or neighborhood, or surrounding properties where the resource is located or at its proposed location, and

(3) The original site and the proposed receiving site are controlled through ownership long term lease or similar assurance by the person(s) proposing relocation, to the Director’s approval, and

(4) The proposed receiving site is relevant to the resource’s historic significance; and [moved to 2 above]; OR

(5) The relocation is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the site and no other measures for correcting the condition are feasible, OR

(6) The proposed relocation meets the findings required under Section J for demolition of a historic resource.
C. **Relocation timing.** The historic resource shall not be relocated unless the Chief Building Official issues a permit for relocation and all permit or impact fees for new development are paid; or where no new development is proposed, an appropriate security is posted to guarantee that relocation plans are implemented, to the Director’s approval.

D. **Historical and architectural documentation.** Prior to issuance of a construction permit for relocation, the resource and its site shall be historically documented as specified herein, to the satisfaction of the CHC and the Director. An acknowledgment of the resource, such as a permanent, weatherproof historic plaque shall be incorporated on the resource’s original site as provided by the applicant or property owner, subject to the approval of the CHC.

E. **Relocation plan and procedures.** Relocations shall follow a plan approved by the CHC or the Director, standards and procedures in the Demolition and Building Relocation Code, the California Building Code, and the following:

(1) Application for relocation shall be made on forms provided by the Department and shall include information to respond to the criteria in subsection B of this Section.

(2) The CHC shall hold a noticed public hearing and recommend action to the ARC or City Council on the application for relocation of a historic resource, and the ARC or Council shall consider the CHC’s recommendation in making the final determination to approve or deny the permit.

(3) The ARC or the City Council will not grant an approval for the relocation of a listed historic resource unless the criteria for relocation under subsection B of this Section can be met.

14.01.120 Unpermitted Demolition or Destruction of Resources

A. **Preservation of listed historic resources.** The purpose of this Section is to prevent unpermitted active demolition or demolition by neglect by ensuring that listed historic resources are maintained in good repair, and free from structural defects and safety hazards, consistent with the International Property Maintenance Code, Property Maintenance Standards (SLO MC Ch. 17.17), and standards as specified herein. Alteration or demolition in whole or part, of any significant features or characteristics of a listed historic property or resource requires City authorization, pursuant to Section 14.01.100.

B. **Enhanced Penalties for Unpermitted Demolition.** In addition to penalties otherwise provided for violations of the San Luis Obispo Municipal Code and this Chapter, the City Council, following notice and a public hearing, may impose the following enhanced penalties for unpermitted demolition of a listed resource, as defined herein, where a property owner has willfully demolished, or directed, or allowed the demolition of a listed resource, or where the property owner has failed to comply with notices to correct violations of this Code, such that the continuance of such violations may result in the unpermitted demolition of the listed historic resource (either active or by neglect):
(1) Restoration: The owner may be required to restore the property or structure to its appearance prior to the violation to the satisfaction of the Director.

(2) Building permit restriction. City may prohibit the owner(s), successors, or assigns from obtaining a building permit for development of the subject property for a period of up to five (5) years from the date of violation, unless such permit(s) is for the purpose of complying with provisions of this ordinance. In cases where this penalty is imposed, the City shall:
   a. Initiate proceedings to place a deed restriction on the property to ensure enforcement of this restriction.
   b. Require the property owner to maintain the property during the period of development restriction in conformance with standards set forth in this ordinance.
   c. Initiate action to remove any such deed restriction within ten (10) days of correction or compliance. Subsequent development applications shall be subject to CEQA review and conditions of development shall address the demolition of the historic resource.

(3) Loss of preservation benefits. Any historic preservation benefits previously granted to the affected property may be subject to revocation.

(4) Other remedies. These enhanced penalties are non-exclusive, in addition to and not in lieu of, penalties otherwise provided for violations of the San Luis Obispo Municipal Code and this Chapter, including, but not limited to, administrative citations, criminal prosecution, civil fines, and public nuisance proceedings.

14.01.130 Historic and cultural resource preservation fund established.

The Historic and Cultural Resource Preservation Fund ("Fund") is hereby established to provide for the conservation, preservation, restoration and rehabilitation of historic and cultural resources in the City of San Luis Obispo. The Council shall provide the policy direction for funding and expenditures from the Fund.

A. Program Administration. The Director shall administer the Fund, following specific procedures and funding priorities adopted by the Council.

B. Purpose. The purpose of the Fund is to provide funds for historic preservation projects within the City. All funds deposited in the Fund shall be used for the conservation, preservation, restoration and rehabilitation of historic or cultural resources, as provided in this section and as directed by the Council.

   1. Financial Administration. Financial administration of the Fund shall be by the City Finance Director or designee, in accordance with State and local law.
Any interest earned on the fund shall accrue to the funds, unless Council specifically designates such funds for another purpose.

2. Grants, Gifts and Donations. The Finance Director shall deposit into the fund any grants, gifts, donations, rents, royalties, or other financial support earmarked by Council for historic or cultural resource preservation.

C. Cultural Heritage Committee Role. The Committee shall advise the Council on the Fund regarding:

1. Criteria for use and award of funds;
2. Entering into any contract, lease, agreement, etc. for use of funds;
3. Any other action or activity necessary or appropriate to achieve the Fund purposes and the intent of this ordinance.

D. Uses of Fund. The Fund may be used for: 1) the identification and protection of cultural resources, including preparation of historic surveys and design guidelines, 2) for the repair, restoration, rehabilitation, preservation and maintenance of historical buildings, features, or archaeological sites, 3) for public education on cultural resources, 4) for real property acquisition if there is a willing property owner, including lease, purchase, sale, exchange or other forms of real property transfer or acquisition to protect significant historic resources, or 5) any other historic preservation related purpose approved by the Council. Council decisions on the use of funds are final.

E. Loans and Grants. The Fund may be used, upon Council approval and recommendation by the Committee, for loans and grants to public agencies, nonprofit organizations and private entities to carry out the purposes of this ordinance.

F. Preservation Agreements. Loans, grants or other financial assistance shall require execution of an agreement between the City and the recipient to ensure that such award or assistance carries out the purposes of this ordinance and is consistent with applicable State and local standards.

G. Funding Eligibility: The Fund shall be used to benefit properties on the Master or Contributing Properties List, or for other properties or uses deemed eligible by the Council upon recommendation by the Committee.

14.01.140 Enforcement.

A. The Director, Chief Building Official and City Attorney and their designees are hereby authorized to enforce the provisions of this ordinance.
**B. Time to correct.** Prior to assessment of any penalty or initiation of any prosecution for any violation of this Chapter, the Director shall provide written notice of non-compliance to property owners. Notice shall be by certified and regular mail. Following mailing of notice, property owner shall have 60 days to correct the violation or to inform the City why an extension is warranted. Additional time to correct the violation may be allowed where the property owner is exercising due diligence in acting to correct noticed violations. The Director shall have the authority to place reasonable conditions on such an extension. Notwithstanding these provisions, if the Director or the Chief Building Official determines there is an imminent threat to a listed historic or cultural resource, the Director shall notify the property owner of the imminent threat and property owner shall be required to provide urgent measures deemed reasonable and necessary to protect the public health and safety and for the protection of the resource within 72 hours of notification.

**C. Work stoppage.** In addition to any other fines, penalties or enforcement provisions set forth in this ordinance, failure to comply with an approved application shall constitute grounds for immediate stoppage of the work involved in the noncompliance until the matter is resolved.

**D. Violation – Penalty.** Every property owner and/or responsible party, as defined in this chapter who violates provisions of this chapter is subject to penalty as set forth in chapter 1.12 or administrative enforcement as set forth under chapter 1.24 of the Municipal Code.

**14.01.150 Appeals**

Decisions of any city official or body under the provisions of this chapter are appealable in accordance with the provisions of Ordinance 1.20 of the Municipal Code, except that fees for appeals under this Chapter by the property owner concerning the Master or Contributing list property in which said owner is residing at the time of appeal, shall be waived.

**14.01.160 Severability.**

Should any section or other portion of this ordinance be determined unlawful or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining section(s) and portion(s) of this ordinance shall be considered severable and shall remain in full force and effect.
# Attachment 3. Federal and State Criteria Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEDERAL AND STATE CRITERIA</th>
<th>EXPLANATION¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Federal Criterion A (Event):** Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. | **Meets Criteria A / (1)**  
Historical evidence was found that would support the determination that the property was associated with events that made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, the development of San Luis Obispo County and the dairy industry.  
The Froom Ranch, is one of the oldest dairy properties in the history of San Luis Obispo County. The Froom family was a pioneering ranching family and was part of the overall development of the important dairy industry in the San Luis Obispo area. |
| **State Criterion (1) (Association with Events):** Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States. |  |
| **Federal Criterion B (Person):** Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. | **Meets Criteria B / (2)**  
Historical evidence was found that would support the determination that the property was associated with the lives of persons important to local history.  
The Froom family purchased the ranch in the late 19th century as one of the area’s pioneering families. Bill Froom, son of John Froom, inherited the property in 1929 and continued to operate a dairy and ranching operation for the next 50 years. Bill Froom was also an important local leader and made many contributions to the development of the local school system and community. |
| **State Criterion (2) (Association with Persons):** Property is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or National History. |  |
| **Federal Criterion C (Design/Construction):** Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction. | **Meets Criteria C / (3)**  
Evidence was found that would support the determination that the property embodied the distinctive characteristics of a significant type, period, region or method of construction.  
- The exterior of the Main Residence remains similar to 1915 appearance, and possesses character defining features.  
- The Dairy Barn is a Vernacular-style structure. The barn is unusual, the only one in the County with a rounded front.  
- The Creamery/House structure is a local Vernacular-style building with a history indicative of the local area. The building displays the features of local building styles and its utilitarian function.  
- The Dairy Barn and Creamery/House buildings are examples of the type of local Vernacular architecture and their period of construction at the turn of the 20th century. |
<p>| <strong>State Criterion (3) (Design/Construction):</strong> Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values. |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEDERAL AND STATE CRITERIA</th>
<th>EXPLANATION¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Criterion D (Information Potential):</strong> Properties have yielded or are likely to yield information important in prehistory or history. This criterion is intended to address archaeological resources.</td>
<td><strong>Does Not Meet Criteria D / (4)</strong> These criteria are not applicable within the area of the Froom Ranch Historic complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Criterion (4) (Archaeology):</strong> Property has yielded or has the potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 28, 2016

Shawna Scott, Contract Planner
City of San Luis Obispo
Community Development Department
c/o SWCA
1422 Monterey Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

RE: Cultural Heritage Committee Meeting; Response to April 28, 2016, Letter

Dear Shawna,

This letter responds to your outline of the information needed to facilitate a discussion with the Cultural Heritage Committee (CHC) contained in the subject letter referenced above. As a first step, the applicant team believes that a CHC field trip to the site is in order to provide Committee members with a clear understanding of the appearance and physical condition of the historical ranch structures located on the project site. The field trip would be considered a special meeting and be noticed, but would precede a formal meeting to deliberate on the status of the historical buildings. This strategy has been used in the past with other projects and really helps CHC members understand the historical resources that they are evaluating.

Applicant’s Responses to April 28, 2016, Letter (Attachment 1)
The following list includes the City’s information request (in bold), followed by the applicant’s response.

1. Brief summary of the existing components of the Froom Ranch Historic Complex, and historic significance (federal, state, and local).

   Applicant’s Response: The applicant commissioned both pre-historic and historic resource reports from First Carbon Solutions (FCS) which are dated 2/20/2015. Both electronic and hard copies of these reports have been previously submitted to the City. The requested summary of the existing components of the Froom Ranch historic complex and their historic significance are included in the historic report. Included as attachments to this response are:
   - Attachment 2 – Summary of Pre-Historic Report; and
2. **Map or exhibit showing the Historic Complex with individual structures specifically identified, and the location of proposed improvements or changes.**

**Applicant’s Response:** Attachment 3 is a map showing the location of each specific structure along with the name of the structure as referenced in the FCS Historic Report.

3. **Renderings and/or elevations of the proposed Historic Complex, including proposed conceptual improvements.**

**Applicant’s Response:** The historic report includes photographs of all the existing historical ranch buildings on the site. Given severe structural deficiencies and other condition issues with buildings, the project proposes the removal of several structures after appropriate documentation. The current proposal is to relocate and adaptively reuse two of the historic buildings which are still in relatively good condition (the main ranch house and the bunk house). The relocation/re-use of these two buildings is shown on the attached Conceptual Park Site Plan. The conceptual parks plan is scheduled for review by the Parks & Recreation Commission on August 3, 2016.

4. **Illustrate/describe the City/public benefit of the historical component of the project.**

**Applicant’s Response:** The applicant and his family have a deep commitment to the ranching history of San Luis Obispo. The Froom Ranch has been in the Madonna family since 1973. With the preservation and adaptive reuse of the main ranch house as a ranger station and the bunk house as park storage within the trailhead park, the project will be paying homage to the site’s ranching past and providing usable structures for City services as a public benefit. The park provides an opportunity for signage & exhibits to further document the importance of the ranching heritage of the site, including the assemblage of buildings and their uses. The location of the proposed park (remainder parcel) was actually part of the Froom Ranch property. This reinforces the appropriateness of the park as a location for the relocated historic structures.

5. **Describe the proposed plan for the Historic Complex and associated park, such as:**
   
a. **Relocation of structures, including specific locations for relocation on-site and how those structures would be moved (if proposed) – if relocation is no longer proposed, please specifically state this;**

   **Applicant’s Response:** As previously mentioned, the main ranch house and the bunk house buildings would be moved to the proposed Primary Park trailhead area. The
moving operation would likely be accomplished through the use of a semi-trailer with two drops in deck height (low boy trailer), which make them particularly useful in building relocation.

Where existing buildings are proposed to be retained and reused within the project, the applicant would generally ready them for occupancy and be responsible for the following:

- Moving structures to their new location
- Placing them on permanent foundations
- Providing them with utilities
- Refurbishing their exterior finishes to reflect their period of construction
- Repairing roofs
- Making necessary accessibility improvements

The City would be responsible for the completion of interior improvements to buildings.

b. **Demolition or removal of structures (identify specific structures if proposed for demolition);**

**Applicant’s Response:** See the attached site map (Attachment 4) with notations regarding all of the structures to either “remove & document” or “relocate and reuse.”

c. **Any modifications to individually specified structures;**

**Applicant’s Response:** Buildings to be demolished would be documented in accordance with applicable Secretary of the Interior (SOI) standards and materials from them recycled for use in the project. The two buildings to be retained and adaptively reused in the park would be prepared for occupancy as discussed in the applicant’s response to Item 5.a. above.

d. **Addition of any interpretive elements (i.e. signage, kiosk), both internally and externally (also note this is a good opportunity to ask the CHC what type of interpretive elements they would like to see incorporated into the project).**

**Applicant’s Response:** The conceptual park plans do not reflect this level of detail, but the narrative notes that historic plaza would include interpretive signage. The applicant is seeking the PRC’s feedback on creative ideas for reuse of site materials into interpretive elements.
6. **Describe in general how you anticipate the project would comply with the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance and Secretary of Interior Standards.**

**Applicant's Response:** The main ranch house and the bunk house buildings would be moved to the proposed Primary Park trailhead area as part of a historic plaza (Attachment 5). In accordance with alternatives discussed on Pages 37-39 of the Historic Report, the relocated buildings would be:

- Placed in a highly visible area and publicly accessible location.
- Part of an interpretive center/historic plaza with interpretive signage that documents the history of the Froom Ranch.
- Stabilized and/or rehabilitated according to the SOI Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.

All buildings proposed for demolition would be documented as required by SOI standards and City Standards, prior to removal. In addition, the ranching and dairy operations of the site would be historically documented consistent with guidance in the Historic Report, including:

- Keeping a portion of the historic viewshep intact in open space and including an interpretive signage program discussing the historic structures and early San Luis Obispo farm life and the dairy industry.
- Completing historic and photographic documentation of the structures to the HABS/HAER level of documentation, and placing this documentation in local repositories and in the park's interpretive center.
- Placing the Froom Ranch historic documentation in local San Luis Obispo historic repositories, including the History Room at the San Luis Obispo County Library and San Luis Obispo History Center.
- Donating the historic dairy equipment to the San Luis Obispo History Center or another appropriate agency.

Where feasible, recycled materials from demolished buildings will be reused in various parts of the project. All recycled materials would be inventoried and stored on the project site. These materials would be available to the City for use in the park site, as well as to the applicant for use for site features in other areas of the project.

One idea would be to use recycled materials in the exterior design of the new public restroom at the proposed public park. Typical materials that may be recycled include wood siding, metal roofing, cast or wrought iron building components, etc. An exterior sketch of the public restroom facility sketch is attached to illustrate the re-use of select recycled materials from the on-site buildings (Attachment 6).
7. Any additional information pertinent to the Cultural Heritage Committee's purview that would facilitate meaningful review, discussion, and feedback.

**Applicant’s Response:** The project team is prepared to address the condition of each of the historical ranch buildings with the CHC members in the field where they can observe firsthand the current conditions. In addition to the observations and alternatives described in the FSC report, the applicant team has the benefit of the firsthand knowledge of the applicant and property owner, John Madonna, regarding the history of this property and these buildings. Mr. Madonna is an experienced general contractor and has informed, professional opinions regarding the feasibility of retaining these buildings, or not. The information from the FCS report combined with Mr. Madonna’s experience has informed the applicant’s proposal.

We look forward to the opportunity to discuss a CHC processing strategy and schedule as soon as possible. Please let us know the required number of copies of materials that will be needed for the CHC and due dates for submittals.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (805) 543-1794.

Sincerely,

**RRM DESIGN GROUP**

Victor Montgomery  
Principal

cc: Doug Davidson, Deputy Director  
Brian Levene, Senior Planner

Attachments:
1. Letter from Shawa Scott dated 4/28/16
2. Summary of Pre-Historic Report
3. Portions of Historic Report
4. Site Plan - Historical Buildings
5. Conceptual Park Site Plan (Sheet L-2.1)
6. Public Restroom Facility Sketch
April 28, 2016

John Madonna
12165 Los Osos Valley Road
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

Subject: PRE 1293-2015 (12165 and 12393 Los Osos Valley Road): Madonna on LOVR
Specific Plan Cultural Heritage Committee Review Information Request

Dear Mr. Madonna:

Please provide the following information, in order to facilitate meaningful review, discussion, and feedback from the Cultural Heritage Committee:

1. Brief summary of the existing components of the Froom Ranch Historic Complex, and historic significance (federal, state, and local).

2. Map or exhibit showing the Historic Complex with individual structures specifically identified, and the location of proposed improvements or changes.

3. Renderings and/or elevations of the proposed Historic Complex, including proposed conceptual improvements.

4. Illustrate/describe the City/public benefit of the historical component of the project.

5. Describe the proposed plan for the Historic Complex and associated park, such as:
   a. Relocation of structures, including specific locations for relocation on-site and how those structures would be moved (if proposed) – if relocation is no longer proposed, please specifically state this;
   b. Demolition or removal of structures (identify specific structures if proposed for demolition);
   c. Any modifications to individually specified structures;
   d. Addition of any interpretive elements (i.e. signage, kiosk), both internally and externally (also note this is a good opportunity to ask the CHC what type of interpretive elements they would like to see incorporated into the project).

6. Describe in general how you anticipate the project would comply with the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance and Secretary of Interior Standards.

7. Any additional information pertinent to the Cultural Heritage Committee’s purview that would facilitate meaningful review, discussion, and feedback.
If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (805) 543-7095 extension 6811.

Sincerely,

Shawna Scott  
Contract Planner  
Community Development Department  
sscott@swca.com
NOTE: This component of report contains sensitive information regarding archaeological resources, and is therefore not provided for public view.

Prepared for:
John Madonna Construction Company
12165 Los Osos Valley Road
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
Contact: John Madonna, Owner

Prepared by:
FirstCarbon Solutions
1350 Treat Blvd. Suite 380
Walnut Creek, CA 94597
925.357.2562
Contact: Mary Bean, Project Director
Carrie D. Wills, M.A., RPA, Senior Scientist, Archaeology
Report Date: February 20, 2015
Froom Ranch/El Villagio Specific Plan
Section 106 Historic Report
San Luis Obispo, San Luis Obispo County, California

NOTE: Complete Historic Report provided as Agenda Item Attachment 4.
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Prepared by:
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1350 Treat Blvd. Suite 380
Walnut Creek, CA 94597
925.357.2562
Contact: Mary Bean, Project Director
Carrie D. Wills, M.A., RPA, Senior Scientist, Archaeology
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CHC2-76
Froom Ranch/ Il Villaggio Specific Plan
Description of Proposed Parkland

INTRODUCTION
Two park areas are proposed to be dedicated to the City of San Luis Obispo. At this conceptual stage we have described them as the Primary Park and the Trailhead. Both areas are adjacent to existing City owned open space areas, and will provide additional linkages to the existing trail system within the Irish Hills Natural Reserve.

- The Primary Park is located at the terminus of Froom Ranch Way, and is adjacent Home Depot. The Primary Park will provide much needed trailhead parking and also conveniently link the project to surrounding commercial land uses and open space.
- The Trailhead is located along Froom Creek, at the existing trail connection into the open space areas. This area will provide trailhead facilities at the base of the Irish Hill Natural Reserve trail system.

The landscaping for the parks will primarily consist of drought-tolerant trees and shrubs. Landscaping along creeks and drainages will include native riparian and drought-tolerant plants, located in naturalistic spacing and groupings to enhance and blend with the surrounding open space. Dense evergreen vegetation is proposed to screen unsightly existing views such as the Home Depot service areas and existing basin fencing. Vegetation will also be utilized between the park and residential lots where needed to provide screening and to soften fence lines and walls.

Paving in the parks will primarily be decomposed granite, with paved plaza spaces in key gathering areas, and an asphalt parking area. Paved plaza areas are envisioned to be permeable pavers, colored decomposed granite, and/or colored and scored concrete. Pedestrian pathways will be 6-feet to 8-feet wide, and paved with stabilized decomposed granite surfacing. Trail rest areas are suggested to be paved with decomposed granite. Wooden bridges are proposed to span across existing drainages, and will only be utilized by pedestrians and bicyclists. Rail fencing is suggested to delineate the boundaries of the parks and adjacent open space areas.

Lighting is not currently proposed within any of the parks or open space areas. The park and open space areas are intended for daytime use only. If lighting is required, it is suggested to be minimal and placed within the Primary Park at the parking area and historic plaza.

PRIMARY PARK
The Primary Park parcel is approximately 7.4 acres in size, and contains an existing fenced drainage basin, creek, and wetland. Approximately 4.7 acres will to be dedicated to the City for public parkland, and approximately 2.7 acres of the Primary Park parcel will remain in open space.
The Primary Park is proposed to include the following areas for recreation and play:

- **Off-Street Parking**
  - Approximately 26 spaces, which includes 1 space for ranger parking and 1 space for handicapped parking.

- **Historic Plaza**
  - The plaza would contain a public restroom, the relocated historic main residence, and the relocated historic bunkhouse. The main residence is envisioned to be utilized as a park ranger station, and the bunkhouse used for storage.
  - The buildings would be surrounded by a plaza containing interpretive and directional signage, drinking fountain, benches, trash cans, and bike racks.
  - The plaza could also contain decorative paving and/or public art.
  - Picnic areas are proposed adjacent to the plaza.

- **Playground Area (ages 5 to 12)**
  - The playground would contain informal play features made from natural elements such as wood, rope, and boulders. The playground area would also utilize the adjacent creek and contain boulders, sand play, and wood timbers.
  - See the Conceptual Park Site Plan for examples of amenities.

- **Dog Park Area**
  - Two fenced areas proposed to accommodate both large and small dogs, and contain a central common entry and plaza. The dog park will contain benches, trash cans, leash and bag holders, and an area for obtaining water for dogs.
  - The dog park may also contain stepped terraces and natural play features such as tunnels, wood elements, and boulders.
  - See the Conceptual Park Site Plan for examples of amenities.

- **Wetland Overlook**
  - An overlook area is proposed over the wetland area. The overlook is envisioned to be a deck with benches, interpretive signs, and/or kiosk describing the wetlands.
  - The overlook could also contain decorative paving and/or public art.
  - See the Conceptual Park Site Plan for examples of amenities.

- **Trail Rest Area**
  - Two trail rest areas are proposed in key locations in the Primary Park, and will link with others proposed along the project’s trail system.
  - Trail rest areas and will contain benches, directional signage, trail maps, workout stations, and/or interpretive signs about the surrounding natural environment and history of the site.

**TRAILHEAD**

The Trailhead is proposed to include the following areas for recreation:

- **Trailhead Plaza**
  - The trailhead plaza would contain a directional kiosk, benches, bike racks, and boulders.
  - The trailhead may also include a workout station and decorative accent paving.
  - Picnic areas are proposed adjacent to the plaza.
  - See the Conceptual Park Site Plan for examples of amenities.
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SECTION 1: MANAGEMENT SUMMARY, PROPERTY HISTORY, AND STRUCTURE HISTORIES AND DESCRIPTIONS

1.1 - Management Summary

At the request of John Madonna Construction Company (Madonna), FirstCarbon Solutions (FCS) prepared a Historic Resource Assessment for the Froom Ranch/Villaggio Specific Plan (Specific Plan area) project that included record search reviews and a field survey of the proposed Specific Plan area located in San Luis Obispo County, California. The subject property (or property) was evaluated for historical and architectural significance by FirstCarbon Solutions (FCS) Architectural Historian, Kathleen A. Crawford, MA. Ms. Crawford meets the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Architectural Historian and is also listed on the City of San Luis Obispo Consultants List (Appendix A). The Froom Ranch complex portion of the Specific Plan area was identified as a potential historic district. California Department of Parks and Recreation survey forms document the contributing and non-contributing structures.

On April 24, 2017, John Madonna hired historic preservation consulting firm Chattel, Inc. (Chattel) to provide consulting services related to the Specific Plan area. As part of this work, Chattel President Robert Chattel, AIA, historic architect, and Associate II Caroline Raftery, architectural historian, reviewed the February 20, 2015 version of this report, and on May 1, 2017 conducted a site visit with RRM Design Group Principal Victor Montgomery, AIA, and Principal Planner Pam Ricci, AICP, and CEO John Madonna and CFO Connie Walter. Based on the site visit and subsequent research, Chattel provided minor edits to Project Director Mary Bean and the edits have been incorporated into this Historic Resource Assessment.

1.2 - Property History

The property is located at 12165 Los Osos Valley Road (Exhibits 1, 2, and 3). The Assessor’s Parcel Numbers for the property are 067-241-030 and 067-241-031. According to Brian Leveille, Senior Planner for the City of San Luis Obispo, the property is currently located just outside the city limits. However, for the purposes of the evaluation, Mr. Leveille suggested the property be evaluated under City of San Luis Obispo criteria, as the property will be eventually annexed by the City.

The property contains a flat level area that extends along Los Osos Valley Road. A long driveway leads into the property. The front portion of the property is unused and is currently fenced. At the end of the driveway is a large, flat, open space that contains the Main Residence, “Old” Barn, Bunkhouse, Dairy Barn, Creamery, Granary, Outhouse, Storage Building, and Shed with slated roof. This group of buildings and structures (structures) comprises the Froom Ranch complex. The area around these buildings is currently used for equipment storage for the John Madonna Construction Company.

Alex Madonna purchased the property in a tax lien sale in 1976. According to Mr. Madonna’s son, John (the current owner), Alex Madonna purchased numerous old ranches in the area. The Madonna family is one of the pioneering families in San Luis Obispo County, and Mr. Madonna was interested in preserving the heritage of the area. John Madonna stated that his father had a policy
of lifetime tenancy for any of the properties he purchased. In accordance with his policy, Mr. Froom resided on the ranch property until ill health required that he move in to San Luis Obispo to live with his brother in 1998. The Main Residence is currently used as office space by the John Madonna Construction Company.

The John Madonna Construction Company was responsible for the construction of many buildings in the area, and the buildings that were to be demolished still had valuable materials in them. Mr. Madonna salvaged these materials and stored them on his various properties.

In addition, Alex Madonna was friends with William Randolph Hearst and shared his love of old buildings and the preservation of the local heritage. Some of the materials came from various Hearst structures that were also salvaged over the years. John Madonna has continued this family tradition and used much of this salvaged material to repair the buildings on the Froom Ranch.

The land rises west of the house complex and contains the Dairy Barn, the Creamery/Old House, the Granary, the Water Tower, and the foundation of the Horse Barn. The remainder of the property is currently open space with no buildings. Froom Creek runs through the property, and some of the land is considered possible wetlands. The area contains two recorded prehistoric sites, which are discussed in the Cultural Resource Assessment.
Specific Plan Area Map

Legend

Specific Plan Area

Source: ESRI Imagery
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1.3 - Structure Histories and Descriptions

1.3.1 - History of the Main Residence

The Main Residence was built in 1915 by Hans Peterson. The building was constructed as the Froom family was continuing to grow and needed better living conditions for its young children. The family had lived in the house attached to the Creamery building on the upper slopes of the property to the west. The Main Residence was occupied by members of the Froom family until 1998, when Bill Froom moved in with his brother in San Luis Obispo. When the property was purchased by the Alex Madonna, arrangements were made to allow Mr. Froom to reside in the home until he chose to leave.

Description of the Main Residence

The Main Residence is a one-story, asymmetrical, irregularly shaped, Craftsman-style, single-family residence. The residence was constructed in approximately 1915 by Hans Peterson. The building has a redwood sill and concrete foundation, wood horizontal shiplap siding, a partial width front porch, and a hipped roof with shingles and a modest eave overhang. A brick chimney is present on the roof and extends downward into the residence, terminating about 3 feet from the floor. The building was heated by a wood stove and there was no interior fireplace.

East Facade

The east facade is the main elevation for the residence and faces Los Osos Valley Road. The facade contains a partial width front porch, accessed by a short flight of wood stairs. The front gable roof is supported by three round columns—two at the entrance area and one on the south end. The main entrance includes a single wood door with a wood screen door. A pair of wood-framed, double-hung, focal windows are located south of the off center front door. A front gable roof is present over the porch and the triangular space created by the roof design is infilled with fish scale shingles.
Windows vary in size, shape, and placement around the facades and include wood-framed, double-hung, sash-style windows.

**North Facade**
The north facade is the side of the residence that includes multiple wood-framed double-hung sash-style windows. A bay section projects forward from the main mass of the structure. A dormer section is present on the side of the roof directly above the bay section.

A rectangular-shaped addition is located on the northwest corner of the building. The addition was constructed in two parts at two different times. The front portion of the addition has wood shiplap siding and was built by Bill Froom to store firewood. The rear portion of the addition has vertical board and batten siding and was built by John Madonna to house electronic equipment. Several single doors are present around the three facades.

**West Facade**
The rear of the residence contains a screened porch with a screen door and screened window openings. The porch wraps around the house, extending onto the south facade. A single wood and glass door leads into the rear of the house. The back wall of the house contains wood-framed windows.

**South Facade**
The south facade is the side of the house facing the open area. Multiple window openings are present.

The building is in good condition and is currently used as offices for the John Madonna Construction Company.

**Alterations**
According to John Madonna, the house has undergone a number of alterations. Both John Madonna and his father, Alex, have made many changes to restore the building. The original foundation was redwood sills. Portions of the north and south redwood sill foundations were completely rotted, and these were removed and replaced with concrete foundations. The house was then leveled, as it had sunk significantly. At some point, the house flooded and the floors were uneven and buckled. The floors were leveled, sanded, and repaired. Several interior walls were removed to form larger office spaces. The kitchen sink and stove were removed and the area was converted to general office use.

The only heat in the house was provided by a wood stove that produced significant amounts of soot. The walls had been painted over the years and the soot was sealed into the layers of paint. The walls were scraped, the soot and paint were removed, and they were completely repainted. The house was rewired for all new electrical service, plumbing repairs were made, an HVAC system was installed, new ceilings were put in, a new roof was put on, and general tenant improvements were conducted.
The rear addition was altered by adding an extra section at the rear of the addition. This new section is used by the John Madonna Construction Company to store its electronic equipment.

**History of the “Old” Barn**

The barn was constructed at an unknown time on another property owned by the Froom family. The other property was reportedly southeast of the current ranch complex. The building was moved by placing it on logs and rolling it over the land and the creek (presumably with the aid of a team of horses) until it was located on its new site. The relocation took place at an unknown time early in the 20th century, and the barn has been in its present location since that time. The barn is estimated to be over 125 years old.

**Description of the “Old” Barn**

![Image of the “Old” Barn](image)

The “Old” Barn is located west of the main residence. The barn structure is a one-story, rectangular-shaped, Vernacular-style barn building. The barn has a concrete floor, vertical wood siding, and a front gable roof with corrugated metal roofing.

**East Facade**

The main doors are located on the east facade and include sets of sliding doors. A door for a hayloft is present on the upper portion of the building. The building does not contain any window openings.

**North and South Facades**

The north and south facades contain vertical wood siding. No windows are present.

**West Facade**

The west facade contains vertical wood siding. The rear wall was rotted and the boards were replaced with historic boards salvaged from nearby barns.
The building is in good condition.

**Alterations**

John Madonna made a wide range of changes to the barn structure. The barn was in poor condition when it was moved to its current location. The barn was leaning more than 2 feet, the rear wall was rotted, and the barn was twisted. Mr. Madonna poured a new concrete floor, replacing the original dirt floor. The building had originally been set down directly on the dirt when it was moved to the site. Mr. Froom used the barn to store his pickup truck. The rear wall was replaced because of dry rot and vertical boards from other local farm buildings were used to replace the rotted boards. Considerable expense was incurred to stabilize the barn and restore it to a stable condition.

**History of the Bunkhouse**

The building was constructed as a bunkhouse for the workers on the property by Hans Peterson in 1915. However, according to John Madonna, the building is one small room that was used by Bill Froom’s brother, who lived in the small residence for many years.

**Description of the Bunkhouse**

The small bunkhouse is a one-story, Craftsman-style building used as a residential structure. The building has a concrete foundation, wood horizontal shiplap siding and a front gable roof with shingles. The building was constructed by Hans Peterson in 1915 when he built the main residence.

**East Facade**

A set of concrete steps leads to the single wood entrance door on the east elevation. The concrete steps have the Froom “brand” pressed into the wet concrete. This detail is seen on many of the other buildings as well. A single wood entrance door provides access to the interior and a small metal slider-style window is present.
South Facade
The south facade contains a wood-framed, double-hung, sash-style window.

West Facade
The west facade also contains a wood-framed, double-hung, sash-style window.

North Facade
The north facade is blank with a large metal sign propped up against the wall. The building is in good condition.

Alterations
According to John Madonna, the building has been altered by general tenant maintenance, including painting, a new roof, and a new floor. The building was used for paper file storage and rats were a problem; to solve the problem, a new floor was installed.

History of the Dairy Barn
Jim Aiken lived in a tent by the creek on the property and built the dairy barn, the granary, and the horse barn in 1913 for $1,800.00, which included labor and materials. The dairy barn was designed to hold 10 cows at either end and 10 at each side. The barn contained a 4-inch carrier track designed to bring hay into the barn.

Description of the Dairy Barn

The Dairy Barn is a 60-foot x 80-foot, one-story, asymmetrical, irregularly shaped, Vernacular-style barn used for milking cows. The barn has a wood pier and concrete block foundation, vertical wood siding walls, and a gabled roof.
East Facade
The east facade contains a door at the south end of the facade that opens to a slanting concrete ramp. The ramp area includes a wide concrete apron covering the ground, located between the Dairy Barn and the Creamery/House structures. The concrete apron had a specific function that allowed mud to be removed from the cows’ feet prior to entering the barn for milking.

The east wall contains a small addition on the north end of the facade that houses a variety of windows that appear to be remnants from other structures. The windows are of wood frame construction in various shapes and sizes. Each of the three walls contains a single door opening. A concrete trough is present on the east wall near the addition.

North Facade
The north facade contains two door openings. The east door opening is a single sliding door. The other door is the main door into the space and includes a wide opening with a sliding door. The west end of the facade slopes steeply down to the ground. A large metal hook is present at the peak of the gable roof.

West Facade
The west facade contains an open entrance on the south end of the facade and a concrete entrance area that leads into the interior space. The shed roof slopes steeply down to the lower level of the wall.

South Facade
The south facade contains a unique feature. The facade is curved and a portion of the curved section has no foundation and hangs out over the slope. The wall has vertical siding and a sloping curved roof. The wall was specifically constructed in this manner to accommodate the movement of the cows within the interior space. Because their size and breadth, it was easier to move the cows through a round space.

The building is in fair condition. Corrals are present on the south side of the slope near the barn.

Alterations
The barn has been altered by both Alex and John Madonna over the years to stabilize the building. New support beams replaced unstable sections, portions were propped up and repaired, beams were placed in portions of the roof system to keep the roof in place, vertical wallboards were replaced, and overall general maintenance has kept the structure standing over the years.

Archival research indicates the barn is the only round barn in San Luis Obispo County. A variety of early dairy farm equipment is still located within the barn structure. The barn was used to milk the cows, and start the butter and cheese production, and it was utilized until the dairy operations ceased in 1977.
History of the Creamery/House Building

The east portion of the building was used as the Creamery, an essential part of the dairy operations. According to Bill Froom, his father lived in the Creamery for a period of time when he first began to operate the dairy. The residence was constructed at an unknown time, possibly after John Froom’s marriage to Harriet and the need for more space. The young family lived in the house portion of the building until 1915, when Hans Peterson built the Main Residence. Bill Froom was born in the house, and presumably, any of the children born before 1915 were also born in the house. After the family moved into the “new” residence built by Hans Peterson in 1915, the space was possibly used as additional living space for the workers on the ranch.

Description of the Creamery/House

The Creamery/House is a one-story, irregularly shaped, asymmetrical, Vernacular-style building that was built in several stages at unknown times. The building is divided into three sections, each with a gabled roof. The west portion of the building faces the Dairy Barn and was used as the Creamery. The east portion of the structure was used as a residence. The overall structure comprises two buildings separating the east wall of the Creamery from the west wall of the House by approximately one foot.

South Facade

The south facade contains the two buildings—the Creamery and the House. Each section contains a single door opening, and a window is present in each of the three sections that comprise the two buildings.

The south facade contains a combination of vertical and horizontal wood siding. The building has a wood pier foundation with rock footings and infill of the open areas.
An addition was constructed on the south wall on the house portion but deteriorated to the point where it was removed.

**West Facade**
A single wood entrance opening faces the Dairy Barn on the west wall. The interior contains two small rooms. A root cellar is present under the building and the adjoining structure. The roof on this portion of the structure slopes down to a low level and is covered with shingles.

**North Facade**
The north facade contains vertical and horizontal siding. The entrance to the cellar area is located at the base of the north wall under the Creamery portion of the building. A secondary entrance is located further down the wall. A small, narrow door is present in the area where the two buildings are separated. The door is located on the north wall and there is no corresponding door on the south wall. An open porch was added to the east end of the north wall of the house structure at an unknown time.

**East Facade**
The east facade serves as the end wall of the residential portion of the structure. A rectangular-shaped window opening is present.

**Alterations**
The building has been altered by additions to the structure. At one time, an addition was present on the south wall of the house portion but was in extremely poor condition and was removed by Alex Madonna. The porch on the north wall of the house was added at an unknown time.

Alex and John Madonna undertook a series of changes to the building because of its instability. Floors and ceiling areas were replaced with plywood sheeting, vertical siding was replaced, walls and foundations were stabilized, and general maintenance kept the building standing over the years.

**History of the Granary**
The Granary was built in 1913 by Jim Aiken in a way that eliminated the rat problem that was destroying other buildings on the Ranch. The building was secure and many of the local farmers stored their grain in the building to keep it safe from rats.
Description of the Granary

The Granary is located on the hill close to the Dairy Barn and the Creamery/House. The Granary is a small, one-story, double-walled, rectangular-shaped, asymmetrical, Vernacular-style utilitarian building. The building has a wood pier foundation, vertical tongue-and-groove wood siding walls, and a gabled roof. One window is present on the south facade. A single door is present on the east facade. The interior contains storage areas. Tongue-and-groove siding was used to prevent the grain from being eaten by animals. No grain was present during the site visit, and the floor and walls were covered with horse harnesses and equipment. The building is in poor condition.

Alterations
None noted.

History of the Outhouse
The Outhouse was originally the parking kiosk at Reilly’s Department Store in downtown San Luis Obispo. Alex Madonna obtained the contract to demolish the building and construct the replacement building, so he moved the kiosk structure to the Ranch. The ranch workers requested an outdoor bathroom, so John Madonna converted the building into an outhouse. A septic tank was located near the barn, and the parking kiosk was repurposed and moved to the location over the septic tank.
Description of the Outhouse

The Outhouse is a small, one-story, asymmetrical, Vernacular-style building. The building has wood shiplap siding walls and a front gabled roof with a shed roof extension on the east wall. The building has a single door with a moon cutout in the door. A small toilet room is present. The building appears to be in good condition. Because the Outhouse is modern (less than 45 years old) and was moved to its current location, it was not evaluated for historic significance or recorded on a Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) form.

Alterations

Conversion of the building from a parking kiosk to a bathroom.

History of the Storage Building

The Storage Building was moved to this location by John Madonna. It was a simple, mobile storage unit obtained by Mr. Madonna from a local friend and brought to the site.
Description of the Storage Building

The Storage Building is a one-story, rectangular-shaped, asymmetrical, Vernacular-style structure that is located currently to the north of the Old Barn. The building has no true foundation; its walls are horizontal wood shiplap siding and it has a gable roof with shingles. A single door is present and small windows are present on the elevations. The building is in good condition. Because the building is modern (less than 45 years old) and was moved to its current location, it was not evaluated for historic significance or recorded on a DPR form.

Alterations
None noted.

History of the Shed
The building is located north of the Main house and was built at an unknown time by an unknown person. John Madonna stated that Bill Froom lived through the Great Depression and cultivated habits of thrift. At one point, the shed building was full of so many cans of dog food that it took several trips to remove them all. The building contains a seeder machine that Mr. Madonna has allowed to remain in the structure, since it holds up the building.
Description of the Shed Building with Slanted Roof

The Shed Building is a one-story, irregularly shaped, asymmetrical, Vernacular-style storage building. The shed roof has a steep slant. The building has no true foundation; it was constructed with vertical wood siding walls and a steeply slanted shed roof. Entrance doors are on the north wall. An addition has a flat roof and a single entrance door. The building is in extremely poor condition and is barely standing.

**Alterations**

No significant changes have been made to the building.

**History of the Water Tower**

The water tower was constructed by Verizon Wireless for use as a cell tower. The structure has no historic importance because it was constructed in the last 2 years.
Description of the Water Tower

The Water Tower appears to be a water tower, but it is actually a stealth cell tower site that was designed to appear to be a structure compatible with farm landscapes. The circular structure stands on metal legs, and has metal siding and a dome roof. Because the Water Tower is modern (2 years old), it was not evaluated for historic significance or recorded on a DPR form.

Alterations

None noted.
SECTION 2: HISTORIC BACKGROUND

2.1 - History of San Luis Obispo County

San Luis Obispo is located along the Central Coast of California, approximately 200 miles north of Los Angeles and 230 miles south of San Francisco. The area is bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west and the Santa Lucía mountain range to the north, east, and south. The mountains are the source of San Luis Obispo Creek, which runs through the City of San Luis Obispo and empties into the Pacific Ocean.

The San Luis Obispo County area was first settled by the Chumash tribes who built a series of villages along the local creeks. The region was largely unexplored by Europeans until the arrival of the Spanish in the late 1700s.

The Spanish government had begun exploration of the New World in the late 1400s, and its process of settlement and development in the Americas continued into the late 1700s. During this period, the Russian government had created settlements along the coast of Canada and into the Northern California area. The establishment of a settlement at Fort Ross led the Spanish crown to consider a more active presence in California to halt the encroachment of Russia into the western portion of the Spanish empire in the Americas.

In 1769, a joint military and religious expedition led by Gaspar de Portolá was sent to the Alta California area in conjunction with Franciscan missionary Father Junipero Serra to create a chain of missions and presidios to control Alta California for Spain. The group first journeyed to the San Diego area, establishing the Mission San Diego de Alcalá, the first in a chain of 21 missions extending northward into Alta California.

In addition to his other duties, Portolá was tasked with finding Monterey Bay and establishing a presidio in Monterey. After accomplishing this process, the expedition proceeded to the San Luis Obispo area to continue exploring the region. In 1772, the Mission San Luis Obispo de Tolosa was founded in the Valley de Los Osos (Valley of the Bears) near the banks of San Luis Obispo Creek. The mission became the fifth mission founded in California by Father Serra.

The Spanish crown granted numerous land grants to the soldiers who accompanied Portolá and Father Serra, thus enabling the overall settlement of the region. Large ranchos were established and California’s cattle-based economy developed over the next decades.

After the independence movement by Mexico, Alta California, and other parts of the Southwest, became part of the Mexican empire. Transition from Spanish control to Mexican control did not result in major changes in the early years of the 1820s. However, as time went on, the overall system of government and settlement changed. American traders, fur trappers, explorers, and settlers gradually filtered into California. Many of these men married daughters of the old Spanish families, thus acquiring title to many of the ranchos. As the United States was expanding across the continent, eyes were turning to California as a necessary access to the China trade.
A variety of governmental and economic changes in California during the first half of the 1800s led to a decline in the mission system. Secularization was officially declared in 1833: the mission system was disbanded, lands were sold, the priests left the missions, and the local tribes were left to fend for themselves. In 1845, Governor Pio Pico decreed that the Mission lands were for sale. All the land of Mission San Luis Obispo was sold except for the church, which still stands today. The church fell into ruins during secularization and the priests left the mission grounds.

California became a state in 1850, and, as the County of San Luis Obispo developed, the church property served as the first courthouse and jail in the county. Some restoration on the building began in the 1870s but full restoration was not accomplished until 1933. The Mission serves as a parish church in the Monterey Diocese at the present time.

2.1.1 - Rancho Canada de Los Osos y Pecho y Islay

Rancho Canada de Los Osos y Pecho y Islay was a 32,341-acre Mexican land grant in the Los Osos Valley in San Luis Obispo County. The grant consisted of Rancho Canada de Los Osos (northern portion) granted to Victor Linares by Governor Juan B. Alvarado in 1842, and Rancho Pecho y Islay (southern portion) was granted to Francisco Badillo by Governor Manuel Micheltorena in 1843. The grants were consolidated by Governor Pio Pico in 1845. The grant extended from the Pacific Coast to along Los Osos Creek and the Los Osos Valley to the outer boundaries of present-day City of San Luis Obispo.

The Rancho Canada de Los Osos land was purchased from Linares in 1844 by Scottish Captain John (Juan) Wilson and his Scottish business partner, James (Diego) Scott. Wilson married into the Carrillo family, linking him to the prominent Spanish families, including the Vallejos. Wilson, a sea captain and trader, had come to California in 1837 and with his business partner, James Scott, purchased other rancho lands in San Luis Obispo County and Sonoma County.

After California's statehood in 1850, one of the major issues was the ownership of Hispanic land grants. The Land Act of 1851 required owners to file paperwork to prove their claim; Wilson's claim to the Rancho Canada de Los Osos grant was patented in 1869. After Wilson's death in 1861, the land passed to his widow, Ramona Carrillo Wilson and their children. Over the next forty years, the land was gradually sold and a new era began on the former rancho lands.

2.2 - History of the City of San Luis Obispo

The development of the City of San Luis Obispo grew out of the overall settlement of the County. In 1850, California became a state and fell under the control of the United States government. Sorting out the old Spanish and Mexican land grants, ranchos, and mission lands was an arduous process. Little formal paperwork existed, land boundaries were vague and unclear, and many of the old Hispanic families had no way to prove title to the lands that had been in their families for decades. With the implementation of the California Land Act of 1851, attempts were made to sort out the ownership and sale of the valuable land. Many of the old ranchos were subdivided into smaller parcels, and farms and ranches began to develop under the new system. Many families moved into
San Luis Obispo and the City began to grow and develop. San Luis Obispo was officially designated the San Luis Obispo county seat in 1868.

Following a major drought in 1862 to 1864, the local economy shifted from cash crops to cattle production. A booming dairy industry was established that continued well into the mid-20th century. Improvements in the development of the railroad system brought increased expansion to the area. New lines connected the isolated region to the coast and the area soon became a central hub for trade moving both north and south to the major centers and to the coast. With the arrival of the Southern Pacific Railroad in the 1880s, the town and county areas expanded greatly. Union Oil of California established centers of operation in the County, and the agricultural and dairy development within the county thrived.

In 1901, California Polytechnic Institute was established in the City. The Institute created a strong focus on vocational and agricultural training and over the decades provided an important fundamental training for local residents. The implementation of the Institute and its influence on the community greatly influenced the development of San Luis Obispo during the 20th century.

Another significant influence on the local area was the development of San Simeon Ranch (known as Hearst Castle) by newspaper publisher William Randolph Hearst. The development of these two important landmarks, in addition to the Mission San Luis Obispo, served to stimulate the regional economy and influence the growth in and around San Luis Obispo.

In the 20th century, the development of the automobile made it possible to expand the growth of the City beyond the downtown core area. City services, roads, and utilities expanded and improved to meet the needs of the expanded city. Tourism, and particularly automobile tourism, added another element to the local economy.

The Great Depression of the 1930s slowed the local economy, as it did with the rest of the county. The establishment of Camp San Luis Obispo, a military training camp, helped to improve the local economy. Military preparation increased as World War II loomed, and the population of the City grew significantly, providing an economic boost well into mid-century. During the post-war period of the 1950s and 1960s, the demand for single-family homes rose dramatically and the City expanded by annexing areas in the County. Large residential subdivisions were constructed outside of the city core, and some of the former agricultural land began to transition to residential and commercial use.

The City of San Luis Obispo Historic Context Statement includes the following information regarding the agricultural development of the area.

The development of ranching and agriculture as the region’s main commercial enterprises influenced the development of San Luis Obispo. In the early 20th century, the primary agricultural crops ranged from flower seeds to winter peas, bush beans, pole beans, and celery. Japanese farmers were particularly successful with these crops through the 1930s.
With the United States entrance into World War I in 1917, there was an enormous demand for agricultural products, which provided an economic boom to Central California. During the War, many farmers turned to the production of navy beans, since these were subsidized by the War Relief Administration. Before reliable refrigeration, navy beans could be shipped to the troops in Europe without spoiling and San Luis Obispo’s economy boomed.

In the early 20th century, oil derricks were erected in the area and drilling for oil began. The first lucrative oil fields were located south of San Luis Obispo and were controlled by families outside of the region, including the Doheny family from Los Angeles. The Producers Transportation Company represented the largest oil interest in San Luis Obispo County, accommodating the transport of oil from the Union Oil Company and the Independent Production Agency via 500 miles of pipeline to the Port of San Luis . . .

2.2.1 - History of Froom Ranch

The history of the Froom Ranch was compiled from a variety of sources. The ranch property lies within the boundaries of the former La Laguna or Laguna Rancho. The following information was taken from the 1998 report, Historical Evaluation for the Froom Ranch Complex, San Luis Obispo, written by San Luis Obispo County historian Betsy Bertrando.

The area known as the Froom Ranch originally contained Lost 60, 67, 68, and 69 as portrayed on the 1869 map—Subdivisions of the Rancho Canada de Los Osos and La Laguna, surveyed by James Stanton. A total of 867.87 acres made up the original Froom Ranch parcel. Today, the Ranch consists of approximately 500 acres. The ranch/farm complex sits on Lot 68 of the original subdivision bordering the southwest boundary of the Laguna Rancho.

The Laguna Rancho was originally part of the Mission San Luis Obispo de Tolosa lands. In 1844, after the Mission rancho lands had been regranted by the Mexican government, Governor Micheltorena granted the church “one square league (4157 acres) in the place called ‘Laguna’” (Engledhardt 1964). This was included with two garden plots and the church in San Luis Obispo. In 1845, the new governor, Pío Pico, sold off all the remaining mission lands and buildings. Captain John Wilson, and two partners, Scott and McKinley, bought the San Luis Obispo Mission and the Laguna Rancho for $500 (Angel 1883). The properties were later claimed by the church and confirmed by the American government in 1855 (Koeber 1972). In 1859, Bishop Alemany sold the Laguna property to Captain John Wilson.

W.W. Stow, from San Francisco, eventually acquired the Wilson estate. Stow was known locally as a major benefactor of the first library in San Luis Obispo. Contributing books not money, Stow felt ‘there was too much reading of fiction, which might be stopped if history and biographical works were placed on the shelf’ and wanted to make the selections himself (Togazzani 1992).
In 1875, Stow sold the property to S.W. (Henry) Foreman, a surveyor. Henry and his wife built a rather elaborate house (for the time) that remains today at the end of Madonna Road and is known as the De Vaul Ranch House (Bertrando 1997).

In 1884, Ludwig Nelson purchased Lot 60 of the La Laguna subdivision from Foreman. Nelson came from Norway to California in 1859 and arrived in the county in 1868. By 1883, the land acquired a dairy and 856 acres in the Harmony District. Nelson is listed as a farmer in 1884 and as a dairyman in the 1982 San Luis Obispo Great Register. The ranch eventually grew to contain Lots 67, 68, and 69 as well, for a total of 867.87 acres. When Ludwig died, the property was run by his wife Annie Nelson. Annie Nelson owned four ranches; one in Estero, two in Cambria/Harmony, and the Froom Ranch on Los Osos Valley Road (Bill Froom pers. comm.).

John R. Froom was born in Prescott, Grantville County, Canada in 1864. When he was sixteen years old he left Canada for Iowa. After six months he made his way to California and did ranch work for a year near Santa Rosa. Then in 1886, he came to work for Ludwig Nelson in Laguna, living in a little room attached to the creamery (Structure E; See Results Section). In 1890, he leased 500 acres and began dairying with fifty cows.

Harriet Perry was a native of Ireland who first came to Illinois with her brother and later to San Luis Obispo where she settled. Harriet and John Froom were married on December 14, 1904 and had seven children: Harry, Annie, Minnie, Willie, Robert, Bunny and John (Morrison 1917). From the estate of Annie Nelson, Harriet Perry Froom acquired Lots 60, 67, 68, and 69 in 1904. In 1905, the H.P. Froom Ranch consisted of 412.65 acres. They lived in the small addition at the east end of the creamery that appears to be, but is not, attached to the creamery (Structure E). In 1915, they moved into the ‘new’ four bedroom house (Structure C).

According to Bill Froom, a dairy had been on the property since the 1850s. The subdivision map of 1868 gives no information regarding land use or existing structures. The plat map of 1858 shows one house near the eastern border of the Laguna Rancho. A ‘thatched’ house is shown just to the outside of the southern point of the rancho.

For several years the ranch has been owned by Alex Madonna and used as an equipment storage yard. Madonna ran cattle on the ranch as well. He has been responsible for the upkeep of the ranch structures and has painted most of the buildings. Bill Froom, until this fall, continued to reside in the house he has spent most of his life in. Health problems have recently necessitated Bill living with his brother in San Luis Obispo. Currently no one resides on the ranch.

A variety of local sources obtained from the files of the Local History Room at the San Luis Obispo County Library were used to add information to the overall history of the ranch. Local newspapers interviewed Bill Froom many times and some of his stories about the ranch were recounted in the articles.
Local San Luis Obispo historian Joan Sullivan conducted a series of interviews with Bill Froom, which were published in The Bay News in 1993. An article entitled “The Froom Family Ranch” included the following information:

Mr. Froom stated that his father had originally leased the ranch for $1500. His lease included the ranch lands (much larger than today’s ranch property), the harnesses for the horses, wagon and hay. Bill retained the receipt his entire life. His father worked the ranch for 31 years and lived in the Creamery house for the first ten years. Froom said his father “bached it” until 1902 when he married his mother, Harriet Perry, when she was 18.

The Frooms began having seven children and Bill was the middle child born in 1910 in the house attached to the Creamery building. As the family expanded, a new house was needed. Hans Peterson built the Craftsman-style residence in 1915 and boarded with the family while it was under construction. Peterson also built a woodshed, the washing room, the storeroom, and the bunkhouse.

Bill Froom first attended the Laguna Elementary School when he was six years old. He attended the school for 8 years and was also hired to care for the grounds for one dollar. Many years later, from 1948 to 1966, he served as a Trustee for the Laguna School District that had been formed in 1877. The school was constructed in 1870 on land donated by Harry Forma. John Froom worked for Forma as a hired hand prior to buying the Froom Ranch property. In 1870, John Froom planted cypress trees around the schoolhouse that Froom had traveled to Monterey to obtain. Some of the trees were still standing in the 1990s.

When Bill Froom was 8 years old, his father asked him if he could milk a cow and that is when he began helping with feeding and milking the family herd of Durham cows. Bill Froom continued to milk cows by hand until 1945, when the milking machine was installed. By age 15, Bill was taking teams of horses out to track hay and farm.

John Froom died when Bill was 17, during the Great Depression in 1929. Bill took over the farm and ran it until 1977. Like most ranch families, the family weathered the hard times of the 1930s. Bill took work outside the farm and worked for local families making 15 cents an hour. He recounted that the most money he ever made during that period was 50 cents an hour.

The ranch was an ideal location for dairy cows and the Froom family owned Durham cows, which produced milk with a high butter fat content. The cows were milked twice a day and produced 200 gallons of milk a day. Eventually the family switched to Guernsey cows. The dairy was profitable until the 1950s, when the local dairy economy began to fade. The high cost of operating the dairy led the family to slowly reduce the herd. They decided to switch over to raising beef cattle. Bill commented in the Bay News article that “we could always pay our taxes ($160 per acre) dairying and I found out the hard way that one good dairy cow was worth much more than any beef cow. One year cattle brought in $11,000 and cost me $13,000.”
Bill Froom told Joan Sullivan the story of the barns on the property. Jim Aiken lived in a tent by the creek on the property and built the dairy barn, the granary, and the horse barn in 1913 for $1,800.00, which included labor and materials. Every day he came up from his tent by the creek and worked on the buildings. The dairy barn was 80 feet by 60 feet and was designed to hold 10 cows at either end and 10 at each side. The barn contained a 4-inch carrier track designed to bring hay into the barn.

Froom told the story of how difficult it had been to learn to use the milking machine when it was first installed. It took him 4 hours to do the milking on the first day because the noise of the machine made the cows nervous. By the second day, the cows were leaking and uncomfortable so they were much more agreeable to the machine. Froom eventually purchased four milking machines. Each machine could milk one cow at a time, the most modern method at the time. Froom stated that “everyone says it would spoil my cows but they liked them better than hand milking . . . .” Apparently, the cows felt it was more like a calf than a machine. Froom’s farm was considered one of the most modern in the area, and he routinely gave tours to college classes that learned his techniques and operation. His horse-powered churn fascinated his students.

Froom started the County Farm Bureau and served as a director for the Cattlemen’s Association. He volunteered as a docent at the local history museum. In addition, he traveled around the County giving demonstrations of how to sharpen tools, explained the production process for butter and cream, and demonstrated a wide range of farm skills that were being lost.

More information about the buildings was included in the article. The Granary was double walled and rat free, the only one in the County. A bull pen, built in 1930, had been constructed on the property after John Froom died, since he had objected to the idea. The horse barn was originally divided into three sections: wagons were on the left, horse stalls were on the right (two horses to a stall), and the hay wagon was placed in the middle of the barn.

An article in the San Luis Obispo Telegram-Tribune, dated July 11, 1989, detailed an interview with Bill Froom. Froom had been hired as a teenager in the mid-1920s by a local banker and worked for only 3 days. He had to wear a “necktie and nice shoes” and he discovered very quickly he was not cut out for banking. He listened to his father and returned to the ranching life, which sustained him for the next 50 years.

Froom took over the farm in 1927 when his father became sick and he was only a junior in high school. Bill was chosen to take over the farm because the older brother who was first in line to take the farm was not home, working in the oil fields making $4 a day—big money in those days. Froom stated that “I had already made my letter in track and so I could skip athletics and come home in the afternoon to deal with the cows.”

During the difficult years of the Great Depression, the farm did not produce enough income. Bill went to work as a farm hand on the Dalidlio property across the road from the ranch. He made 15 cents an hour working for the neighbors and was glad to have it, as that wage was considered good money during the hard times.
During the World War II years of the 1940s, chromium was mined on the ranch property. The deposit was a large one and has been untouched since the war years. Chromium is mixed with other ores to make a high-grade steel. The expense of extraction and transportation of the ore proved too costly for any further production after the war.

Froom told a story about the Creamery building. Apparently, one of the workers on the ranch liked to drink during the day crawled under the Creamery building to do this. He shifted the rock foundation stones around so that he could sleep in the shade. When John Froom saw what he had done, he decided to dig out a cellar under the building.

John Froom’s ingenuity led to the design of the Granary building. Rats would chew through the burlap sacks in which grain was stored, so John Froom built the Granary on stilts with tongue and groove double walls to prevent rat damage. Farmers from all over the valley brought their grain to the Froom Ranch for rat-free storage.

An oral interview was conducted with John Madonna, current owner of the property (Madonna pers. comm.). The Madonna family is one of the oldest pioneer families in the area and owns the Madonna Inn, a local landmark, and numerous ranches in the San Luis Obispo County area. John Madonna stated that Bill Froom had been a boxer in the United States Army during World War II. He said that Froom had never married and had no children. However, Bill Froom had been heavily involved with the local school system, contributing a great deal of his time to local education. John Madonna commented that Bill Froom had named all his cows over the years—names such as Rosie and Betsy. The dairy operation had approximately 50 cows, though possibly not all at the same time.

Mr. Madonna stated that his father, Alex Madonna, had purchased the property in a tax lien sale in 1976. Dairy operations ceased in 1977 when Bill Froom retired after having run the ranch since 1927. Mr. Madonna raised beef cattle on the property for several years. The property is currently used as the office and equipment storage area for the John Madonna Construction Company.

### 2.3 - Methods and Results of Historic Assessment

#### 2.3.1 - Introduction

The subject property was evaluated for historic and architectural significance and its potential to meet National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, and local City of San Luis Obispo criteria. This report presents the results of the assessment. The Froom Ranch complex was assessed for its historic and architectural significance by FCS Architectural Historian, Kathleen A. Crawford, MA. Ms. Crawford conducted the archival research and on January 6, 2015 visited the property. During the site visit, Ms. Crawford personally inspected and photographed each structure on the property for this report.

#### 2.3.2 - Archival Research

In order to fully assess the Froom Ranch complex, varieties of archival sources were accessed for information related to the property and its history. Sources consulted include the San Luis Obispo
County Assessor’s Office records; the San Luis Obispo County Recorder’s Office records; the City of San Luis Obispo Planning Department files, including an interview with Senior Planner Brian Leveille; the City of San Luis Obispo Building Department building permit files and additional records; the San Luis Obispo County Public Library, Local History Room files; the History Center of San Luis Obispo files; a variety of internet sources; two films about the Froom Ranch produced by Joan Sullivan, local San Luis Obispo historian; miscellaneous documents, including Environmental Impact Reports and previous assessments; and an oral interview conducted on January 27, 2015 with John Madonna, current owner of the property. One of the most important documents regarding the history of the Froom Ranch is the report written by local San Luis Obispo historian, Betsy Bertrando, in 1998. Ms. Bertrando’s report was a valuable source of information, as she had personally interviewed Mr. Bill Froom, owner of the property, and reviewed a wide range of local maps, oral interviews, historic documents, and other local sources to complete her assessment of the property. She visited the site at various times over the years and was able to observe the changes to the property. Her observations were important in the current assessment of the remaining buildings on the Froom Ranch property.

In addition, invaluable information was obtained from the City of San Luis Obispo Historic Context Statement, written in 2013. This document provided important historic context information for fully assessing the Froom Ranch complex.

2.3.3 - Froom Ranch Historic and Architectural Survey Results

The 1998 Bertrando report provided a base of information to compare the current conditions with the previous developments on the Froom Ranch property. Conditions on the Froom Ranch have changed since the report was written: buildings have been removed and the remaining structures are in various states of repair. The property currently contains the buildings/structures described below.

1. Main Residence (c. 1915)

The building is a one-story, Craftsman-style, single-family residence located on the lower level near the front of the property.

Bertrando Report: House/Structure C

The four bedroom house was built by Hans Peterson in 1915. Peterson also built a wood shed, the washing room, store room and bunkhouse during the same period. The washing room and store room were added to the rear of the house in a long addition that is partially of board and batten construction. The main part of the house has shiplap siding. The building sits on a redwood sill foundation. The entrance is from a porch supported by three columns that face the east. Above the porch are decorative shingles under the eaves.

2. “Old” Barn (date unknown)

The building was moved to its current location at an unknown time from another location in the Los Osos Valley. The “Old” Barn is a one-story, wood barn structure. The building is over 100 years old.
**Historical Background**

**Bertrando Report: Old Barn/Structure A**

The barn near the house was moved to its present location and is over 100 years old. The original location was on the south east (sic) side of the ranch until it was moved slowly over logs over the creek to the present site. The barn has a corrugated roof and is formed from vertical boards. There is no foundation. Double entry doors face east at the end of the long driveway.

3. **Bunkhouse (c. 1915)**

The Bunkhouse is a small Craftsman-style, residential building located between the Main Residence and the “Old” Barn on the lower level.

**Bertrando Report: Bunkhouse/Structure B**

A small structure in good condition sits between the old barn (A) and the house (C). It is built of the same shiplap boards as the house (C). It has sash windows and a door opening onto a corner stoop on the east side. It was built by Hans Peterson in 1915 at the same time as the house (Sullivan 1993).

4. **Shed with slanted roof (date unknown)**

The Shed is a small wooden shed with a small addition. The Shed is located to the north of the Main Residence on the lower level of the property.

**Bertrando Report: Wood Shed/Structure D**

The shed has a corrugated roof and vertical board siding. There is a door on the east and north sides of the structure. A shed roof that abuts a flat roof suggest the flat roof was a later addition. The shed was in the process of being emptied of great piles of tin cans. One cleared area has exposed a piece of farm equipment in good condition. It was a horse drawn seeder labeled ‘California Green Seed Sower.’ It appeared there may be other pieces of equipment amongst and under the remaining cans although it was difficult to tell.

5. **Outhouse (date unknown)**

The Outhouse is a small, one-story structure located behind the “Old” Barn.

**Bertrando Report**

Not included.

6. **Storage Building (date unknown)**

The Storage Building is a small, one-story wood structure that is located on the lower level north of the “Old” Barn. The building was probably moved to this location from an unknown location.

**Bertrando Report**

Not included.
7. **Creamery/House (date unknown)**

The Creamery/House structure is composed of two wood buildings. The west structure is the Creamery building; the east portion is the house that the family lived in prior the construction of the Main Residence. The Creamery/House structure is located on the hillside on the upper level.

**Bertrando Report: Old Creamery/House/Structure E**

One of the most interesting structures within the ranch, the Old Creamery/House is also complex, having been built in at least three episodes. The west side of the wood shingled structure includes a room that was home to Bill Froom’s father for many years. The board and batten creamery housed a horse powered churn and a butter break table. Only the corn sheller remains. Most of the equipment is now gone. The author remembers visiting this site in the 1970s and noticing piles of old bottles under the floor boards on the ground floor. This time it was clean and no bottles remained.

The middle of the structure was built with shiplap and may have been an addition to the creamery. The west side appears to be attached to the creamery but is actually separated by a space about a foot wide. The living space consisted of two rooms that had been muslin over board and batten construction. Currently the north facing room is stripped of boards. A later porch addition is on the south side. The condition of the structure is very weathered and the flooring is unstable.

8. **Dairy Barn (c. 1913)**

The Dairy Barn is a large, wood barn building with a curved front wall. The Dairy Barn is sited on the hillside above the house complex.

**Bertrando Report: Dairy Barn/Structure F**

Another structure of interest is the Dairy Barn. This structure has an unusual rounded end on the south side that hangs along the edge of the slope. The dairy barn, as well as the granary and the horse barn, were constructed by Jim Aiken in 1913 for $1800. The barn roof has wood shingles and the walls of vertical planks rest on formed concrete.

9. **Granary (c. 1913)**

The Granary is a small, wood structure located on the hillside north of the Dairy Barn and west of the Horse Barn foundation.

**Bertrando Report: Granary/Structure G**

The small rectangular granary is in fairly good condition and is composed of vertical plank walls that rest on concrete and block wood posts. The granary was constructed by Jim Aiken in 1913.
10. Horse Barn (date unknown)

The Horse Barn is no longer extant; only the foundation remains. The Horse Barn was located north of the Dairy Barn and Creamery/House buildings and east of the Granary.

**Bertrando Report: Horse Barn/Structure H**

The barn is constructed of vertical boards on a concrete foundation. The wood shingle roof is missing approximately 12% of the shingles. The barn doors open on the north side and was used for wagons, horses and hay storage. The horse barn was constructed by Jim Aiken in 1913. The barn is a style typical of the period.

**Additional information**

John Madonna stated that the Horse Barn had been used for storage of salvaged materials during the period of ownership by the Madonna family. Alex Madonna collected salvaged materials from local ranches, businesses, and homes and stored some of these materials in the barn. The barn was in extremely poor condition and the sides were falling down. John Madonna attempted to stabilize and prop up the building but eventually the deterioration was too great. The building collapsed and the materials were hauled away.


The Water Tower structure is located on the hillside above the Granary area. It is a Verizon Wireless cell tower site and was constructed within the last 2 years. The Bertrando report did not address this structure, as it had not been built at the time of the 1998 evaluation.
SECTION 3: SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA AND EVALUATIONS: FROOM RANCH

3.1 - Application of National Register of Historical Places Criteria

Criterion A: Event: Properties can be eligible for the National Register if they are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Historical evidence was found that would support the determination that the property was associated with events that made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. The subject property, the Froom Ranch, is one of the oldest dairy properties in the history of San Luis Obispo County. The Froom family was a pioneering ranching family and was part of the overall development of the important dairy industry in the San Luis Obispo area. The subject property does merit designation under National Register Criterion A: Event at the local level.

Criterion B: Person: Properties may be eligible for the National Register if they are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

Historical evidence was found that would support the determination that the property was associated with persons significant in our past. The property is associated with the Froom family and Bill Froom in particular. The Froom family purchased the ranch in the late 19th century as one of the area’s pioneering families. Bill Froom, son of John Froom, inherited the property in 1929 and continued to operate a dairy and ranching operation for the next 50 years. Bill Froom was also an important local leader and made many contributions to the development of the local school system and community. The subject property does merit designation under National Register Criterion B: Person.

Criterion C: Design/Construction: Properties may be eligible for the National Register if they 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.

Evidence was found that would support the determination that the property embodied the distinctive characteristics of a significant style of architecture, which this criterion includes within the term “type.” A property is eligible as a specimen of its type or period of construction under this criterion if it is an important example of building practices of a particular time in history. The Main Residence is a typical example of the Craftsman-style of architecture and the interior has been altered extensively over the years. The building was transitioned to an office use over the last two decades. However, its exterior appearance has remained essentially the same since it was constructed by Hans Peterson in 1915. Its appearance includes the following character defining features as listed in the San Luis Obispo Historic Context Statement:

- Horizontal massing
- Low-pitched gable roof
- Wood exterior wall cladding
• Projecting partial-width front porch
• Wood-frame double-hung sash windows
• Extensive use of natural materials—wood

Therefore, the Main Residence is considered to meet the criteria under style.

The Dairy Barn is a Vernacular-style structure. The barn is unusual, the only one in the County with a rounded front. The rounded front was designed to facilitate the milking process and move the cows through the barn efficiently.

The Creamery/House structure is also a local Vernacular-style building with a history indicative of the local area. The building was constructed as a creamery and a residence. The building displays the features of local building styles and its utilitarian function.

The Dairy Barn and Creamery/House buildings are examples of the type of local Vernacular architecture and their period of construction at the turn of the 20th century.

The remaining buildings are not considered to retain, or embody, enough of the distinctive features, type or method of construction to be considered significant.

A “master” under this criterion is a figure of generally recognized greatness in a field. Hans Peterson and Jim Aiken were responsible for the construction of the majority of the current buildings on the site. Neither has been identified as a master builder, architect, or craftsman.

“High artistic values” under this criterion refers to properties that so fully articulate a particular concept of design that they express an aesthetic ideal, which is not the case here. The terminology referring to “components of an entity” are intended to address historic districts.

The subject property does merit designation under National Register Criterion C: Architecture at the local level.

Criterion D: Information Potential: Properties may be eligible for the National Register if they have yielded or are likely to yield information important in prehistory or history. This criterion is intended to address archaeological resources. To be designated under this criterion the property must have information to contribute to our understanding of human history and prehistory and that information must be important. This criterion is not applicable to this property. The subject property may merit designation under National Register Criterion D: Information Potential at the local level, see FirstCarbon Solutions Cultural Resource Assessment.

3.2 - Application of California Register of Historical Resources Criteria

Properties that are subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) must be evaluated for historical significance under the California Register of Historical Resources.
The criteria for evaluating the significance of historical resources require that the resource must be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the following four criteria:

(1) Association with Events: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

Historical evidence was found that would support the determination that the property was associated with events that made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, the development of San Luis Obispo County and the dairy industry. The subject property does merit designation under California Register Criterion (1).

(2) Association with Persons: It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or National History.

Historical evidence was found that would support the determination that the property was associated with the lives of persons important to local history. The property is associated with the pioneering Froom family and Bill Froom in particular. The subject property does merit designation under California Register Criterion (2).

(3) Design/Construction: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.

Evidence was found that would support the determination that the property embodied the distinctive characteristics of a significant type, period, region or method of construction. The Main Residence is a good example of local Craftsman architecture and the Dairy Barn and Creamery/House buildings exemplify local Vernacular architecture and building techniques. The buildings were not constructed by master builders or architects, as Hans Peterson and Jim Aiken have not been identified as masters in these fields. None of the buildings on the property possessed high artistic values. The subject property does merit designation under California Register Criterion (3).

(4) Archaeology: It has yielded or has the potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

To be designated under this criterion, the property must have information to contribute to our understanding of human history and prehistory and that information must be important. The subject property may merit designation under California Register Criterion (4), see FirstCarbon Solutions Cultural Resource Assessment.
3.3 - City of San Luis Obispo Criteria

The following criteria and guidelines for evaluation were taken from the City of San Luis Obispo Historic Context Statement.

Local Designation Guidelines

In 2010, the City of San Luis Obispo adopted a Historic Preservation Ordinance that outlines the process and criteria for the inclusion of historic resources on the City’s Master List or Contributing List of Historic Resources. In order to be eligible for designation, the resource must exhibit a high level of historic integrity, be at least fifty (50) years old and satisfy at least one of the following criteria.

A. Architectural criteria: Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possess high artistic values.
   1. Style: Describes the form of a building, architectural details within the form (e.g., arrangement of windows and doors, ornamentation, etc.). Building style will be evaluated as a measure of:
      a. The relative purity of a traditional style;
      b. Rarity of existence at any time in the locale; and/or current rarity although the structure reflects a once popular style;
      c. Traditional, vernacular, and/or eclectic influences that represent a particular social milieu and period of the community; and/or the uniqueness of hybrid styles and how these styles are put together.

2. Design: Describes the architectural concept of a structure and the quality of artistic merit and craftsmanship of the individual parts. Reflects how well a particular style or combination of styles are expressed through compatibility and detailing of elements.
   
   Also suggest degree to which the designer (e.g., carpenter-builder) accurately interpreted and conveyed the style. Building design will be evaluated as a measure of:
   a. Notable attractiveness with aesthetic appeal because of its artistic merit, details, and craftsmanship (even if not necessarily unique);
   b. An expression of interesting details and eclecticism among carpenter-builders, although the craftsmanship and quality may not be superior.

3. Architect: Describe the professional (individual or firm) responsible for the building design and plans for the structure. The architect will be evaluated as a reference to:
   a. A notable architect (e.g., Wright Morgan) including architects who made significant contributions to the state or region, or an architect whose work influenced the development of the city, state, or nation;
   b. An architect, who in terms of craftsmanship made significant contributions to San Luis Obispo (e.g., Abraham who according to local sources designed the house at 810 Osos—Frank Avila’s father’s home—built between 1927 and 1930).
B. Historic Criteria

1. History—Persons associated with the lives of persons important to local, state, or national history. Person will be evaluated as a measure of the degree to which a person or group was:
   a. Significant to the community as a public leader (e.g., mayor, congress leader, etc.) and for his or her fame and outstanding recognition—locally, regionally or nationally;
   b. Significant to the community as a public servant or as a person who made early, unique, or outstanding contributions to the community, local affairs or institutions (e.g., Council member, education, medical professional, clergymen, public officials)

2. History—Event Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States. Historic events will be evaluated as a measure of:
   i. A landmark, famous, or first of its kind event for the city—regardless of whether the impact of the event spread beyond the city;
   ii. A relatively unique, important or interesting contribution to the city (e.g., The Ah Louis Store as the center for Chinese-American activities in early San Luis Obispo history).

3. History—Context. Associated with and also a prime illustration of prominent patterns of political, social, economic, cultural, medical educational, governmental, military, industrial, or religious history. Historic context will be evaluated as to the measure of the degree to which it reflects:
   a. Early, first or major patterns of local history, regardless of whether the historic effects go beyond the city level that are immediately connected with the building (e.g., County Museum).
   b. Secondary patterns of local history, but closely associated with the building (e.g., Park Hotel).

C. Integrity—Authenticity of historical resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance. Integrity will be evaluated by a measure of:

1. Whether or not a structure occupies its original site and/or whether the original foundation has been changed, if known;
2. The degree to which the structure has maintained enough of its historic character or appearance to be recognizable as an historic resource and to convey the reasons for its historic significance;
3. The degree to which the resource has retained its design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.

In assessing a property’s integrity, the National Park Service recognizes that properties change over time. National Register Bulletin 15 states:
To retain historic integrity, a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. It is not necessary for a property to retain all its historic physical features or characteristics. The property must retain, however, the essential physical features that allow it to convey its historic identity.

A property that has lost some of its historic materials or details can be eligible if it retains the majority of the features that illustrate its style in terms of massing, spatial relationships, proportion, pattern of windows and doors, texture of materials, and ornamentation. The property is not eligible if it retains some basic features conveying massing, but has lost the majority of the features that once characterized its style.

For properties that are considered significant under National Register Criteria A and B, National Register Bulletin 15 states:

A property is significant for its historic association is eligible if it retains the essential physical features that make up the character or appearance during the period of its association with the important event, historical pattern, or person.

A property important for illustrating an architectural style or construction technique must retain most of the physical features that constitute the style or technique.

A property that has sufficient integrity for listing at the national, state or local level will typically retain a majority of the character defining features, and will retain sufficient integrity to convey its significance. The required aspects of integrity are dependent on the reasons for a property's significance. Increased age and rarity of the property type are also considerations when assessing integrity thresholds.

For example, for properties that are significant for their architectural merit (Criterion C3, A1-A3) a higher priority is placed on integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. For properties that are significant for events or persons, integrity of feeling and/or association may be more important.

The Froom Ranch complex was assessed for all aspects of its historical significance and historic integrity. The property meets six of the seven criteria for integrity. The following integrity criteria were applied to the buildings and the complex as a whole.

### 3.4 - Integrity

In addition to determining the significance of a property under local, state, and federal criteria, it is necessary to assess whether the property has integrity. Integrity is the ability of a property to convey and maintain its significance. A property must not only be shown to be significant under the established criteria, it must also have integrity. In order to retain historic integrity, a property must possess several, and usually most, of the seven key aspects of integrity, which are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.
Application of the City’s Guidelines for Finding Integrity

1. Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical integrity clearly indicated by the retention of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance.

2. Integrity relates to the presence or absence of historic materials and character defining features.

Application of the Seven Aspects of Integrity

Location: The place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred. The subject buildings remain at their original location. The “Old” Barn was moved to the current location but has remained in this location for over 100 years.

Design: The combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. The buildings retain their basic original design and, therefore, have retained this aspect of integrity.

Setting: The physical environment of a historic property. Review of historic maps, archival materials, and aerial photographs, as well as physical inspection of the surrounding area, indicates that the majority of the Froom Ranch has retained its original appearance. However, the surrounding neighborhood has changed from its original agricultural setting to a mixed-use commercial and residential setting. The property has not retained its overall setting.

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.

The buildings have retained their original appearance with no significant changes to their overall materials component. Alex and John Madonna undertook a series of repairs on the buildings over the decades. Because they were able to salvage materials from old local barns and other sources, they were able to use old, appropriate materials to do the repairs and renovations. Therefore, the overall integrity has been retained.

Workmanship: The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory. The quality of the original workmanship has basically been maintained from the original construction.

Feeling: A property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. The Froom Ranch farm complex has basically maintained the original feeling of the property.

Association: The direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property. The property has been determined to be directly linked to an important historic event, the development of agriculture and the dairy industry in the Los Osos Valley; and a person important in local San Luis Obispo history, Bill Froom. Therefore, it has an associative element.
3.4.1 - Conclusion

Of the seven aspects of integrity, the property retains all but one: Setting. Therefore, it passes the integrity test.

3.5 - Historic Themes

In addition to the above City of San Luis Obispo standards and guidelines, the City has created historic context themes that allow further evaluation of the property and is historic significance. The property was evaluated under the City of San Luis Obispo Theme: Early 20th Century Agriculture and Industrial Development.

In general, agriculture and industrial properties are generally not associated with particular architectural styles. Vernacular industrial buildings of brick and reinforced concrete are the predominate form, and significance is frequently derived from historic association, rather than aesthetic qualities. Agricultural and industrial resources from this period may be eligible under several 20th-century themes.

3.5.1 - Early 20th Century Agriculture and Industrial Development

Associated Property Types, Integrity Consideration & Eligibility Standards

Property Types

Examples of industrial properties from this period include railroad-related warehouse, rail yards, rail lines, and rail spurs. Agricultural property types include: warehouses, farmhouses, and related outbuildings.

An agricultural or industrial building from this period may be significant:

- As a rare, intact example of a particular type of agricultural or industrial development; or for its association with the development of an important local industry—Criterion 1A, B2 (Event).
- As a rare example of a specific agricultural or industrial property type—Criterion C3, A1, A2 (Design/Construction).
- As a property type that has a direct association with the railroad—Criterion C3, A1, A2 (Design/Construction).

Integrity Considerations

In order to be eligible for listing at the federal, state, or local levels, a property must retain sufficient integrity to convey its historic significance under Early 20th Century Agricultural and Industrial themes:

- Agricultural and industrial properties from this period eligible under Criteria A1,B2 (Event) should retain integrity of location, design, feeling and association.
- Agricultural and industrial properties significant under Criterion C3, A1, A2 (Design/Construction) should retain integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship and feeling.
Eligibility Standards

To be eligible, a property must:

- Date from the period of significance;
- Display most of the character-defining features of the type; and
- Retain the essential aspects of integrity.
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SECTION 4: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 - Potential Historic District

Upon application of National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, and local City of San Luis Obispo criteria, standards, and guidelines, the conclusion was reached that the Froom Ranch complex portion of the subject property is considered eligible as a potential historic district. The following City of San Luis Obispo criteria apply to the Froom Ranch complex. These criteria parallel National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources criteria.

4.1.1 - Architecture: A1, A2

The Froom Ranch complex includes examples of Craftsman architecture: the Main Residence and the Bunkhouse. The structures are both intact and good examples of the style and contain the main character defining features of the Craftsman style. In addition, the Froom Ranch complex contains a unique example of Vernacular architecture: the Dairy Barn with the rounded front, the only such structure in San Luis Obispo County. Additional Vernacular-style structures include the Creamery/House building, Granary and Shed. The structures represent the local farming and dairy industry development and the predominant architectural styles of the early 20th century.

4.1.2 - Historic Criteria—Person and Event: B1, B2

The Froom Ranch complex is considered to have historic significance for its connection with the Froom family and Bill Froom and the development of early 20th century ranching and the dairy industry. The complex exemplifies the Early 20th Century Agricultural Development theme.

4.1.3 - Integrity: C1, C2, C3

The Froom Ranch complex has retained its overall integrity of design, location, feeling, association, materials, workmanship, and overall historic integrity. As such, the Froom Ranch complex exemplifies the early 20th century agricultural development of San Luis Obispo County.

The Froom Ranch complex is also locally significant under Criteria 1, 2, and 3 of the State of California Historical Register and the National Register of Historic Places Criteria A, B, and C. The property is significant for its association with the overall development of the San Luis Obispo area and the dairy industry; for its association with the pioneering Froom family and for Bill Froom and his local contributions; and for the Craftsman and Vernacular architecture of the buildings located on the property.

In addition, the Froom Ranch complex is considered to meet the criteria for a historic district, since the various buildings and structures comprise a significant entity.

National Register Bulletin 15 includes the following information regarding historic districts:
A district possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of site, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.

A district derives its importance from being a unified entity, even though it is often composed of a wide variety of resources. The identity of a district results from the interrelationship of its resources, which can convey a visual sense of the overall historic environment or be an arrangement of historically or functionally related properties. For example, a district can reflect one principal activity, such as a mill or a ranch, or it can encompass several interrelated activities, such as an area that includes industrial, residential or commercial buildings, sites, structures, or objects. A district can also be a grouping of archaeological sites related primarily by their common components; these types of districts often will not visually present a specific historic environment.

A district must be significant, as well as being an identifiable entity. It must be important for historical, architectural, archaeological, engineering, or cultural values. Therefore, districts that are significant will usually meet the last portion of Criterion C plus Criterion B, Criterion B, or Criterion D.

A district can encompass both features that lack individual distinction and individually distinctive features that serve as focal points. It may even be considered eligible if all of the components lack individual distinction, provided that the grouping achieves significance as a whole within the historic context. In either case, the majority of the components that add to the district’s historic character, even if they are individually undistinguished, must possess integrity, as must the district as a whole.

A district can contain buildings, structures, sites, objects, or open spaces that do not contribute to the significance of the district. The number of non-contributing properties a district can contain yet still convey the sense of time and place and historical development depends on how these properties affect the district’s integrity . . .

The Froom Ranch complex is considered to meet the necessary criteria as a historic district. The Froom Ranch complex contains seven contributing structures and three non-contributing structures. The Froom Ranch complex is considered an excellent example of early 20th century ranching and dairy industry development in San Luis Obispo County; its association with the pioneering Froom family and Bill Froom and his local contributions; and for its examples of Craftsman and Vernacular architecture.

### 4.2 - Contributing Structures

#### 4.2.1 - Main Residence

The c. 1915 Craftsman-style residence served as the Froom family home from 1915 to 1998. The building is a good example of Craftsman architecture in the San Luis Obispo area.
4.2.2 - “Old” Barn
The “Old” Barn was built at an unknown time, possibly c. 1900, and moved to the current location early 20th century. The barn has been renovated extensively.

4.2.3 - Bunkhouse
The c. 1915 Bunkhouse is a Craftsman-style residential building once occupied by Bill Froom’s brother.

4.2.4 - Dairy Barn
The c. 1913 Dairy Barn is a unique example of local dairy industry Vernacular construction. The barn is the only barn in San Luis Obispo County with a rounded facade.

4.2.5 - Creamery/House
The Creamery/House building dates to the early period of the Froom Ranch construction. It served as both the dairy production area and the first residence on the site.

4.2.6 - Granary
The c. 1913 Granary building was used for grain storage. The building has a unique construction to pre-vent damage from animals.

4.2.7 - Storage Building
The c. 1913 Storage Building was built as part of the early Froom Ranch development and has served as a storage shed for the property.

4.3 - Non-Contributing Structures

4.3.1 - Outhouse
The Outhouse is a Modern parking kiosk structure repurposed as an outhouse for the John Madonna Construction Company staff and has no historic significance.

4.3.2 - Storage Building
The Storage Building is a Modern mobile storage unit moved to the site for use by the John Madonna Construction Company and has no historic significance.

4.3.3 - Water Tower
The Water Tower is a Modern-style Verizon stealth cell tower site and has no historic significance.
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Overview

- 23 Years Experience
- Master’s degree, Anthropology – California State University, Hayward
- Bachelor’s degree, Anthropology – California State University, Hayward
- Registered Professional Archaeologist #11138

Carrie Wills, RPA, M.A. has worked in the areas of prehistoric and historic archaeology on tasks that included pre-field assessments, archival research, pedestrian field surveys, site evaluation and testing, and data recovery and analysis since 1991. She has extensive experience conducting field research, evaluating sites and features for historic significance and preparing reports that comply with the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act. Her experience includes evaluating and assessing historic structures and resources for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources. In addition, Ms. Wills has conducted numerous consultations with Native American tribal representatives and has good working relationships with numerous governmental agencies. She has provided feasible mitigation that protects significant resources while staying within budgetary constraints.

Related Experience

**Historic American Buildings Survey Documentation – Larkspur 16.8-Acre Project, City of Larkspur, Marin County.** Serving as project archaeologist, conducted a field survey, records and map review, and historic building evaluation for more than 20 buildings and structures associated with the circa 1920–1980 Niven Nursery in the City of Larkspur. The existing buildings and greenhouses that retained their historic integrity were evaluated for historic significance, recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms, and documented to Historic American Building Survey (HABS) standards. Additionally, two prehistoric sites were previously recorded and archaeologically tested within the project area, and although neither of the sites was found during the pedestrian survey, to ensure site protection, construction monitoring was recommended during all ground-disturbing activities in these areas.

**Section 106 Cultural Resources Assessment – DSRSD Central Dublin Recycled Water Distribution and Retrofit Project, City of Dublin, Alameda County, California.** As project archaeologist/manager, conducted a cultural resource investigation that included record search reviews, historic map reviews, and a limited field survey of the proposed Central Dublin Recycled Water Distribution and Retrofit Project Area of Potential Effect (APE) that fulfilled the protocols associated with Section 106 of NHPA. The results of the investigation were submitted to archaeological staff at the Bureau of Reclamation and received concurrence with MBA’s findings of effect.

**Lake Solano Regional Park Visitor’s Center Project, County of Solano.** As project archaeologist, Ms. Wills conducted a cultural resource investigation that included record search reviews and a pedestrian field survey. As the project had a federal nexus, the work included a comprehensive report that met the criteria in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The lead agency was the Bureau of Reclamation which has specific procedures that must be followed when unanticipated human remains or cultural resources are discovered. In addition to complying with the Bureau of Reclamation procedures, the results of the research
and field survey were submitted to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for concurrence with the stated recommendations.

**KB Home Monte Vista, Historic American Buildings Survey, City of San Jose.** Served as project manager for the KB Home Monte Vista Project. Conducted Historic American Buildings Survey Level III documentation for a large multi-structure canning facility, Del Monte Plant #3, in San Jose. Tasks included producing over 200 large-format, black, and white photographs of exterior and interior views of the existing structures. The MBA historic report augments the photographic documentation by placing the structures within the appropriate historic context and addressing both the architectural and historical aspects of the site’s significance. Specifically, the historical report focused on the Plant’s contribution to the growth of the canning industry in San José. The plant was also assessed for historic significance and found to meet the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places as a District along with two other local Del Monte canneries. MBA coordinated with state, federal, and city agencies including, but not limited to, City of San Jose Department of Planning and the National Park Service HABS/Historic American Engineering Record coordinator.

**Section 106 Cultural Resources Assessment/HABS Documentation – St. Regis Napa Valley Project, City of Napa, Napa County.** Served as the lead technical consultant for a historical and architectural analysis of a historic structure in the County of Napa. Also served as the project archaeologist. Following the evaluation of the historic significance of the building and recording it to HABS standards, the results were sent to SHPO and received concurrence with MBA’s findings of no effect to historic resources.

**Section 106 Evaluation – Dixon Veterans Memorial Hall Project and the Benicia Veterans Memorial Hall Project, County of Solano.** Served as the lead technical consultant for a historical and architectural analysis of two historic structures in the County of Solano. After evaluating and recording the buildings to Section 106 standards, the results were sent to SHPO and received concurrence with MBA’s findings of no effect to historic resources.

**Section 106 Evaluation – Solano County Free Library Center Project, County of Solano.** Served as the lead technical consultant for a historical and architectural analysis of an historic structure in the County of Solano. Also served as the senior project archaeologist. After evaluating and recording the building to Section 106 standards, the results were sent to SHPO and received concurrence with MBA’s findings of no effect to historic resources.

**Section 106 Evaluation – Suisun Veterans Memorial Building Project, Suisun City.** Served as the lead technical consultant for a historical and architectural analysis of an older structure in the City of Suisun City. After evaluating and recording the building to Section 106 standards, the results were sent to SHPO and received concurrence with MBA’s findings of no effect to historic resources.

**Cultural Resources Assessment – Zone 3A, Line D Capacity Improvements Project and Zone 5, Line A West Levee Improvements Projects, County of Alameda.** Served as project manager and senior archaeologist, conducting a cultural resource assessment for the Zone 3A Line D Capacity Improvements Project, Hayward, and the Zone 5 Line A West Levee Improvements Project, Union City. The assessment consisted of record searches, review of historic literature, and more than 20 historic aerials to provide an understanding of development within the project areas and a historical context for the projects.

**Off-road Vehicle Park, City of Bakersfield.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted an intensive field survey of 2,500 acres outside the City of Bakersfield. The project area included rolling hills, large flat valleys, and steep ravines. The survey resulted in discovery of over 150 prehistoric resources including bedrock mortars, grinding slicks, and rock art. The resources were recorded and evaluated for eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources. Following the evaluation, a comprehensive report detailing the findings was produced.

**Bel Lago Project, City of Moreno Valley.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted a site specific field assessment of the Kerr Ranch and recorded 23 extant buildings and structures on Department of Parks and
Recreation forms; both Primary and Building, Structure and Object forms. Detailed descriptions and measurements were taken as part of the assessment process and each building and structure was evaluated individually for listing to the California Register of Historical Places or local registers or landmarks.

**Westlake Shopping Center, City of Daly City.** As senior project archaeologist for this major refurbishing effort for a shopping center located in Daly City, assessed the shopping center for historic significance under CEQA Section 150.64 by reviewing historic maps, photos, and record and archival search results obtained from the Northwest Information Center and the Daly City Planning Department. Scope included conducting a visual appraisal of the existing buildings, structures, and signage.

**San Demas Project, City of Sacramento.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted a record search and field investigation for a built environment covering one city block in downtown Sacramento. As this was a built environment, there was no native ground surface to be surveyed; the investigation consisted of comprehensive research to determine the possibility of historic structures.

**Cabrillo Corners Commercial Project, City of Half Moon Bay.** As cultural resources specialist, conducted a record search at the Northwest Information Center and a pedestrian field survey of the proposed project area that borders Pilarcitos Creek in Half Moon Bay to determine the presence or absence of cultural resources prior to project development.

**Gustine Municipal Airport Project, County of Merced.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted a record search and pedestrian field survey of a 45-acre parcel located in Merced County to determine the presence or absence of cultural resources prior to improvements to the Airport.

**Scheiber/White Projects, County of El Dorado.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted record searches and field investigations for a 226-acre parcel and a 286-acre parcel of undeveloped land and completed Phase I Reports detailing the record search and field survey results.

**Protzel Project, County of El Dorado.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted a record search and field investigation for a 35-acre parcel of land. The field survey resulted in discovery of a site that contained both prehistoric and historic components located adjacent to one another.

**Miller Ranch Property, City of Lincoln.** As senior project archaeologist for this 130-acre residential development, reviewed record search results from the North Central Information Center, Sacramento and conducted a pedestrian field survey. A negative survey report was prepared detailing the record search and survey results to meet CEQA requirements.

**Fahren’s Creek Development Project, County of Merced.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted a record search and field investigation on a parcel of undeveloped land, a portion of which was immediately adjacent to Fahren’s Creek. A negative survey report was prepared detailing the record search and survey results to meet CEQA requirements.

**McBride R.V. and Self Storage Project, City of Chino.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted a record search and pedestrian field survey of a 21.15-acre parcel of land to determine the presence or absence of cultural resources prior to project development. Prepared a negative survey report detailing the record search and survey results to meet CEQA requirements.

**Brehm Communities, City of Chino.** As senior project archaeologist for this 35-acre residential development, conducted a record search at the San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center and a modified field survey. Performed a visual assessment from various vantage points rather than a typical pedestrian survey and prepared a negative survey report detailing the record search and survey results to meet CEQA requirements.

**Albers Barnes & Kohler LLP’s Palm Ranch Dairy Project, County of Kern.** As senior project archaeologist, was responsible for CEQA compliance issues related to cultural resources on a 120-acre parcel. Conducted a
Phase I survey to determine the presence or absence of cultural resources within the project area, resulting in the discovery of artifactual material on the ground surface. Conducted a Phase II testing program to determine the presence or absence of subsurface cultural resources, resulting in inconclusive findings. Provided mitigation measures to protect any previously undiscovered resources during project excavation activities.

**Albers Barnes & Kohler LLP’s Bonanza Farm Dairy Project, County of Kern.** As cultural resources specialist, conducted a record search and pedestrian field survey of two 200-acre parcels to determine the presence or absence of cultural resources prior to project development. Prepared a negative survey report detailing the record search and survey results to meet CEQA requirements.

**Montezuma Wetlands Project, County of Solano.** Served as project manager for Solano County’s Montezuma Wetlands Project. Provided technical direction of a 4,700-acre archeological survey in Solano County, resulting in recording and subsurface testing of 12 sites. Co-authored the technical report that included extensive impacts and mitigation measures.

**Arizona Pipeline Reconditioning Project, Phoenix and Tucson, Arizona.** Project manager for a 45 mile pipeline replacement project located along an existing pipeline route in southern Arizona. Project tasks included archival and record searches, pedestrian field survey, and a comprehensive report detailing the findings. Various types of historic resources were recorded during the course of the field survey and recommendations were provided as part of a larger environmental studies report produced for the project.

**Costco’s Warehouse Project, City of San Francisco.** Served as project manager for Costco’s Warehouse Project. Surveyed, excavated, and monitored the proposed site, located in downtown San Francisco, for a new Costco store. Supervised lab procedures and analysis of over 1,400 artifacts.

**Mills Associates’ Tassajara Valley Project, County of Solano.** As project manager, provided technical direction of a 2,500-acre archeological survey that resulted in recording and subsurface testing of 14 historic and one prehistoric archeological site. Analyzed artifacts and prepared technical reports.

**Future Urban Areas, Mundie and Associates, County of Contra Costa.** As field director, conducted a 4,500-acre archeological survey that resulted in recording of 11 historic archeological sites, including the previously unrecorded historic town sites of West Hartley, Empire, and Star Mine associated with the Mount Diablo coalfield developments of 1850-1885. Recorded features including foundations, privies, cisterns, basements, and dumps. Hundreds of surface artifacts were examined. Also directed artifact analysis and prepared technical reports.

**Military Projects**

**Cultural Resources Overview Project, Concord Naval Weapons Station.** Served as project manager for the Cultural Resource Overview Project at Concord Naval Weapons Station. Tasks included review of archival records and record search results for previously recorded sites within the Station. In addition, more than 500 World War II buildings and structures were evaluated for National Register of Historical Places eligibility and documented on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation forms. An archaeological site prediction model was developed to determine the likelihood of the presence of cultural resources within specific areas of the Station. An extensive context document was prepared to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of the Naval Weapons Station in terms of its historic presence within Contra Costa County and the City of Concord. Following assessment of the Station and its historic components, a Cultural Resource Overview Report for the 13,000-acre facility was developed.

**NAVFAC Centerville Beach and Point Sur Projects, Counties of Humboldt and Monterey.** Served as project archaeologist with responsibilities including a review of archival and site records prior to pedestrian field surveys at each of the locations. Following the surveys, documentation on Department of Parks and Recreation forms was prepared for each of the World War II buildings/structures located within the Station boundaries. Subsequent efforts included development and submittal of a historic context report and structural
assessments of the buildings to determine National Register of Historic Places eligibility status. Prepared a preliminary Historic and Archeological Resource Protection Plan evaluating known archeological site locations and preparing maps depicting areas of archaeological sensitivity.

**Civil Engineering Laboratory Archaeological and Historic Resources Assessment Project, Port Hueneme.** Served as project archaeologist for the CBC Port Hueneme Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory, Archaeological, and Historic Resources Assessment Project. The cultural resource evaluation included review of archival records and historic Port Hueneme documents at the base, review of previously recorded sites records from the South Central Coastal Information Center, CSU, Fullerton, and research at Ventura Historical Society. Architectural documentation was prepared for nine World War II buildings on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation forms and a single prehistoric site located within the base was assessed. A historic context report was developed and each of the buildings/structures was individually evaluated for National Register of Historic Places eligibility. Following assessment and documentation, an EIR/EIS technical report including a detailed historic setting, an overview of each of the types of buildings within the project area, an impacts assessment section, and appropriate mitigation for the impacts was prepared.

**Navy Construction Battalion Center Historic and Archaeological Resources Protection Plan Project, Port Hueneme.** Served as project manager/archaeologist for the Port Hueneme Navy Construction Battalion Center Overview; Historic and Archaeological Resources Protection Plan Project. The project tasks included archival research of Battalion Center documents a record search review at the South Central Coastal Information Center, CSU, Fullerton, and a pedestrian field survey. Subsequent to the archival research, architectural documentation of 130 World War II buildings/structures was completed on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms. The forms typically included DPR Primary forms for each building or structure although in some instances, e.g., for large non-descript warehouse structures, a representative building was documented and identical buildings were listed on the form as having identical attributes. In addition to the Primary forms, a Building, Structure, Object (BSO) form providing additional descriptive and evaluative information was completed when appropriate. Following the archival research for previously recorded cultural resource sites and the field survey, an archaeological site prediction model was developed for the Battalion Center. Following documentation, a historic context for the Battalion Center was prepared. In addition, each building was assessed for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility and a Historic and Archaeological Resources Protection (HARP) Plan was prepared.

**H Street Extension Project, Lockheed Missiles, and Space Company Property.** The project consisted of an extension of H Street within the western portion of the Lockheed Missiles and Space Company facilities. Archaeological efforts were part of mitigation for construction within a National Register listed prehistoric shell mound. As project archaeologist, the work included pre-construction site testing using various means including shovel and backhoe investigations, surface collection for the entire project area, and a Phase III data recovery program in coordination with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). Disposition of human remains found within the site was decided upon an agreement with the MLD. A construction-monitoring program was conducted during initial grading activities at the site to ensure protection of previously unknown cultural resources and/or additional human remains.

**Naval Fuel Depot Point Molate Historic Resources Assessment Project, City of Rohnert Park.** As project manager, conducted an archival records review at various repositories as well as a record search at the Northwest Information Center in Rohnert Park for previously recorded cultural resource sites. Conducted a field survey and general site reconnaissance of the project area. Subsequent to the archival research and survey, documentation of ten World War II buildings/structures were completed on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation forms. The buildings and structures were evaluated for eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, one prehistoric archaeological site was assessed within the project area. A preliminary Historic and Archeological Resource Protection Plan was prepared evaluating known archeological site locations with maps depicting areas of archaeological sensitivity. A historic context
was prepared for the project area and a technical report detailing all of the research, field survey, building, and structure evaluations, and the assessment of the prehistoric site was provided to the client.

**Energy, Utilities & Pipelines**

**Santa Cruz Water District’s Pipeline Project, County of Santa Cruz.** Served as resource team leader for this project that proposed modifications to the current operation and maintenance of an existing pipeline through implementation of the Santa Cruz North Coast Pipeline Rehabilitation Project. Reviewed compliance issues related to cultural resources found along four major waterways in Santa Cruz County and prepared a CEQA Initial Study to determine environmental impact associated with project implementation. Also provided necessary details to aid in the decision-making process for the project’s next phase.

**Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Relicensing Project, County of Kern.** As resource team leader, reviewed cultural resources to meet the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in preparation of a new FERC license application. Directed the Section 106 review and prepared the preliminary draft of the license application, evaluated project impacts, and authored the Historic Properties Management Plan and a Programmatic Agreement.

**Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Relicensing Project, Kilarc-Cow Creek.** As resource team leader, provided NHPA Section 106 compliance review in preparation of a new FERC license application. Following the survey effort, prepared the preliminary draft of the license application, evaluated the project impacts, prepared a comprehensive report, and finalized the Historic Properties Management Plan and a Programmatic Agreement.

**Calypso Project Environmental Impact Statement, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.** Served as resource team leader for Tractebel North America, Inc.’s Calypso Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a new natural gas pipeline extending from the Exclusive Economic Zone in the Atlantic Ocean to Port Everglades. Conducted the NHPA Section 106 review of both offshore and onshore cultural resources and prepared the preliminary drafts of the third-party EIS for the jurisdictional portion of the pipeline.

**Rock Creek Hydroelectric Project, Oregon.** Served as project archaeologist for Oregon Trail Electric Consumer Cooperative’s Rock Creek Hydroelectric Project. Conducted a reconnaissance survey and evaluation of archaeological and historic resources to meet the requirements of NHPA Section 106.

**Patriot Natural Gas Pipeline Project, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina.** Served as resource team leader for a project consisting of the Mainline Expansion and Patriot Extension three states. The Mainline Expansion involved improvement along East Tennessee Natural Gas Company’s existing pipeline in Tennessee and Virginia, including approximately 187 miles of new pipeline, replacement of old pipeline, additional compression at existing facilities, and five new compressor stations. The Patriot Extension involves approximately 100 miles of new pipeline in Virginia and North Carolina, including three new meter stations. Provided third-party review of cultural resources reports and prepared third-party EIS.

**Northwest Transmission Line Project, Oregon and Washington.** Served as project archaeologist for Wallula Generation, LLC’s Northwest Transmission Line Project. Conducted a 28-mile reconnaissance survey in Oregon and Washington along the Columbia River, evaluated and recorded archaeological sites, and completed appropriate forms for submittal to Washington.

**El Paso Energy’s and Broadwing Communications’ Fiber Optic Line, Texas and California.** Served as resource team leader for a proposed fiber-optic transmission line reaching from El Paso, Texas, to Los Angeles, California. Prepared a Proponent’s Environmental Assessment demonstrating CEQA compliance that was submitted with an application to the California Public Utilities Commission.

**Fiber Optic Project, Cities of San Jose, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.** Served as project manager for a Level Three Communications Fiber Optic Project. Conducted cultural resources studies and supervised construction monitoring to address CPUC mitigation measures during the “city build” portions of the project in...
San Jose, San Francisco, and the Los Angeles Basin. Prepared workbooks for each construction spread in each city to address potential cultural resources impacts and necessary mitigation required to preclude significant impacts.

**Fiber Network Project, Northern and Southern California.** Served as project manager for 360 Networks’ Fiber Network Project. Responsible for all aspects of project management for this linear project spanning the length of California, including coordination, budget, consultation, and compliance issues.

**Santa Fe Pacific Pipeline, State of California.** As field supervisor for Santa Fe Pacific Pipeline’s Concord-to-Colton Project, performed records search and intensive archaeological survey of a corridor stretching from Fresno, through Bakersfield and Mojave, to San Bernardino. Recorded and evaluated for eligibility for listing on National Register of Historic Places more than 150 historic properties.

**CPUC Alturas Transmission Line Project, California and Nevada.** As archaeological monitor, documented compliance with mandated mitigation measures during the construction of this high-voltage power line reaching from Alturas, California, to Reno, Nevada.

**Mine Reclamation Plans and Environmental Analysis**

**Abandoned Mine Inventory Project, Washington Bureau of Land Management.** As project manager, managed a five-person survey crew who conducted an intensive archaeological survey of 1,700 acres of difficult terrain and conditions in the City of Spokane. Recorded over 100 mining features and archaeological properties on appropriate State of Washington forms and prepared Determination of Eligibility forms for submittal to Washington’s State Historic Preservation Officer.

**Black Diamond Mine Project, Merced County.** As project archaeologist, conducted record search and pedestrian field survey for approximately 29 acres of a 136 acre parcel of land in Merced County. During the field survey, a cemetery with headstones dating back to the mid-1800s was discovered. Although the cemetery had a fence completely around it, it is often the case with cemeteries of this age that burials are located outside the defined cemetery area. Thus, archival research was conducted to determine the actual age and the size of the cemetery as it grew over the years. Recommendations for procedures to be followed if the proposed project moved forward were presented to the County of Merced in the form of an Initial Study report.

**KRC Aggregates Quarry Expansion Project, San Joaquin County.** As project archaeologist, conducted record searches and a pedestrian field survey for approximately 340 acres that would be utilized for aggregate resource extraction. Approved mine land reclamation in accordance with the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act would begin immediately following the completion of aggregate extraction. The field survey resulted in recordation of 4 historic resources and the preparation of a comprehensive report meeting the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the California Environmental Quality Act.

**Valley Rock Quarry Project, San Joaquin County.** As project archaeologist, conducted record searches and a pedestrian field survey of approximately 315 acres in San Joaquin County. Although no resources were recorded for this project, a small prehistoric site had been previously recorded near the project’s southern border. As the boundaries for this prehistoric site were rather vague, the field survey transects were narrowed to 3 meters in the southern boundary area to determine the presence or absence of the site within the project area. No evidence of the prehistoric site was found. The findings of the record searches, the field survey, and the search for the prehistoric site were detailed in an Initial Study report and presented to San Joaquin County.

**Environmental Impact Reports for General Plan Updates**

**General Plan Update, County of Monterey.** As senior project archaeologist, assisted in updating the General Plan with new policies including archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources. Tasks included a review of existing policies and suggestions for alternatives and updates relevant to current trends. Worked
closely with Monterey County staff, agency personnel, and sub-consultants to ensure a high quality, timely Plan Update.

**Trails Specific Plan Project, City of Livermore.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted archival and record searches, including review of the 2000 North Livermore Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report and the 2003 City of Livermore General Plan Update Master Environmental Assessment that specifically focuses on cultural resources within the proposed project area. Conducted a 235-acre pedestrian survey to determine the significance of previously recorded cultural resources and the presence or absence of previously unknown cultural resources, resulting in the recording of five historic resources using California Department of Parks and Recreation forms with context analysis and detailed maps. Prepared a comprehensive report including a detailed setting section with impacts and mitigation measures to ensure protection of significant cultural resources.

**Educational Facility Environmental Analysis**

**Delta View and Kit Carson Schools Project, Kings County Office of Education.** As senior project archaeologist, conducted archaeological and historical resource assessment at two proposed telecommunication tower sites located at two school sites. Conducted a record search at the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center and pedestrian surveys at both schools to determine the presence or absence of cultural resources. Determined negative survey results, and prepared a report detailing the record search and survey results that was presented to the Kings County Office of Education.

**High Desert Power Plant Project, County of San Bernardino.** As project manager, conducted an approximately 2,000-acre field inventory of block and linear project areas located near the City of Victorville. Recorded and evaluated more than 30 historic and prehistoric sites.

**Maya Caves Project, Punta Gorda, Belize, Central America.** As excavation team member, worked two field seasons examining prehistoric cave deposits. Conducted surveys and excavations, analyzed and cataloged artifacts, and prepared technical report sections.

**Professional Affiliations**

- Society for Historical Archaeology
- Society for California Archaeology
- Register of Professional Archaeologists #11138
Overview

Kathleen has over 28 years of experience in the preparation of a wide range of historical and architectural projects. She meets the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Architectural History and History (36 CFR Part 61). She also meets the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) standards as an Architectural Historian. She has extensive experience with 19th- and 20th-century architecture in California and has prepared over 12,000 historic and architectural assessments of structures in California for a variety of historical projects conducted for various types of city, state, and federal agencies. The majority of these projects required compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Ms. Crawford has extensive experience in the implementation of Section 106 in reference to historic buildings from all historic periods and architectural styles. The vast majority of these projects required preparation of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms for submittal to the State Historic Preservation Office. She has prepared several Historic American Building Survey (HABS) surveys and documentation over the years and has worked with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties in the course of the historic and architectural evaluations. In addition, Ms. Crawford has participated in the production of numerous cultural resources reports and assessments, environmental impact reports, and historic building surveys of potential historic districts in California, Arizona, and Kentucky. She has been a Lecturer in the History Department at San Diego State University since 1989, and her extensive teaching experience in U.S. History has aided her understanding of the historical assessment and evaluation process.

Education

- Master’s degree, History – University of San Diego. 1987
- Bachelor’s degree, History – University of San Diego. 1984
- Bachelor’s degree, Anthropology – University of San Diego. 1984

Project Experience


Leamington Hotel, Oakland. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1920s National Register-eligible hotel in downtown Oakland.
Kathleen Crawford, M.A. - Architectural Historian

East Bay Alliance Chinese Church, Oakland. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1940s church complex.

Piedmont Apartments, Oakland. Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1930s apartment complex, Oakland.

Oakland Coliseum, Oakland. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1960s sports stadium.

Sheraton Palace Hotel, San Francisco. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1900 National Register-listed landmark historic hotel for cell tower construction.

University of San Jose Stadium, San Jose. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1950s sports stadium.

University of Santa Clara, Swig Hall, San Jose. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1960s residence hall.


Seton Medical Center, San Francisco. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1950s Seton Medical Center for cell tower construction.

United Pipe Foundry, Union City. Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1930s historic water tank on historic foundry property.


Petaluma Hotel, Petaluma. Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1920s hotel in National Register-listed historic downtown business district.

Paramount Studios, Los Angeles. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of several buildings on Paramount Studios lot that dated to earliest development of the Paramount Studios Corporation in the 1920s.

St. Mary’s Hospital, Tucson, Arizona. Historic and Architectural Assessment of circa 1930s hospital in Tucson.


Sunwest Building, Roswell, New Mexico. Preparation of Historic and Architectural Assessment of potentially circa 1950s National Register-eligible building in Roswell, New Mexico.

San Diego Naval Training Center – Preparation of National Register nomination for property including approximately 400 buildings.

Chollas Heights Radio Station – Preparation of Historic American Buildings Survey for radio station for approximately 100 buildings.
Seal Beach Naval Weapons Station – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessment of properties including approximately 300 buildings.

Long Beach Naval Station and Shipyard – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessment of properties including approximately 750 buildings.

Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton – Preparation of History of Air Station.


Naval Air Station, Guam – Preparation of Base Closure Documentation for approximately 150 structures.

San Diego Naval Air Station, Coronado – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessment of selected air base facilities.

Naval Air Station, El Centro – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessment of air base properties, including approximately 100 buildings.

San Diego Naval Station, 32nd Street – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessment of properties including approximately 350 buildings.

Caltrans – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessments for approximately 200 properties in San Diego and Riverside counties.

Kentucky Department of Transportation (KDOT) – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessments of approximately 100 properties in Louisville, Kentucky.

Miramar Naval Air Station – Preparation of Historical and Architectural Assessment of properties including approximately 250 buildings.

Borrego Springs, San Diego County, California. Preparation of Cultural Resources Report for CA-SDI-20016 and Historic Assessment of former circa 1940s DiGiorgio Fruit Corporation property in Borrego Springs, California for County of San Diego.

Hell, Riverside County, California. Preparation of Cultural Resources Report and Historic Assessment of Hell, California for historic documentation of circa 1950s P-33-18794 archaeological site for County of Riverside.

Federal Aviation Administration, Quieter Home Program, San Diego County, California. Historical and Architectural Assessment of approximately 1,000 circa 1910–1960 historic homes in Point Loma and San Diego for sound retrofitting program conducted by the Federal Aviation Administration. State of California DPR 523 forms were prepared for each property for submittal to City of San Diego Planning Department and San Diego Historical Resources Board.

Cesar Chavez Boulevard, El Centro, San Diego County, - Preparation of Cultural Resources Survey and Historic Assessment of Cesar Chavez Boulevard, El Centro, San Diego County, for California Department of Transportation.

World Trade Center, San Diego County - Preparation of National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form for World Trade Center Building, San Diego, San Diego County, California.
Kathleen Crawford, M.A. - Architectural Historian


Coronado Historical Association, Coronado, San Diego County – Historical and Architectural Consultant conducting research for Historic Home Tour, “Wings of Gold, 100 Years of Naval Aviation” exhibit, and “Coronado We Remember” exhibit.

Coronado Historical Association, Coronado, San Diego County - Interim Registrar and Archivist.

La Jolla Historical Society, La Jolla, San Diego County - Archivist for historical collection.

Associations

- San Diego Historical Society
- Denver Historical Society

Publications

Appendix B:
Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Forms
State of California — The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
DISTRICT RECORD

*NRHP Status Code:

Page 1 of 29

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder): Froom Ranch Complex

D1. Historic Name: Froom Ranch

D2. Common Name: Froom Ranch

*D3. Detailed Description (Discuss overall coherence of the district, its setting, visual characteristics, and minor features. List all elements of district.):
The Froom Ranch complex was developed in the late 19th century by John Froom, a Canadian laborer who purchased the dairy farm in the 1890s. Froom, his wife, Harriet Perry Froom, with their seven children all lived on the Ranch. The ranch was developed as one of the early dairies in San Luis Obispo County. The ranch complex currently contains the Main Residence (c. 1915); the “Old” Barn (date unknown; moved to the site in the early 1900s); the Bunkhouse (c. 1915); the Diary Barn (c. 1913); the Creamery/House (date unknown); the Granary (c. 1913); the Shed (c. 1913); the Outhouse (c. 2000); the Storage Building (c. 2010); and the Water Tower (c. 2013). The buildings are clustered in two groupings: the lower level of the ranch property which contains the Main Residence, Bunkhouse, Shed, “Old” Barn, Outhouse and Storage Building; and the upper level which includes the Dairy Barn, the Creamery/House building, the Granary and the Water Tower. The main buildings date to the early development of the dairy complex and represent Craftsman and Vernacular styles which have retained their main character defining features. The buildings have maintained their historic integrity of location, association, materials, design, workmanship, feeling, and association.

*D4. Boundary Description (Describe limits of district and attach map showing boundary and district elements.):
The boundaries are the current boundaries of the property, Assessor’s Parcel Number 67-241-419, Lots 60, 67, 68, and 69, Township 31 South, Range 12 East, Sections 3 and 10, located at 12165 Los Osos Valley Road, San Luis Obispo, CA 93402.

*D5. Boundary Justification:
The boundaries are the current boundaries of the historic Froom Ranch complex which has not significantly changed since the 1900s.

*D6. Significance: Theme: Early 20 Century Agricultural Development

Area: San Luis Obispo County

Period of Significance: 1890-1977

Applicable Criteria: A, B, C

(Discuss district’s importance in terms of its historical context as defined by theme, period of significance, and geographic scope. Also address the integrity of the district as a whole.)
The Froom Ranch complex is a good example of the early 20th Century Agricultural development in the San Luis Obispo County area. The ranch was developed by John Froom, a native of Canada, who came to the area in the 1870s as a laborer and purchased the existing ranch in the 1890s and began dairy operations. Froom lived in the Creamery/House structure for many years prior to his marriage to Harriet Perry in 1902. The family continued to live in the House portion for several years and many of their seven children were born in the house. In 1913, Jim Aiken, a worker on the ranch, constructed the Dairy Barn, added to the Creamery building, built the Granary and the Horse Barn (no longer in existence) and the Shed for a total of $1800 for materials and labor. The Dairy Barn is a rare example, and the only one in the County, of a barn with a rounded front wall to accommodate the dairy cows. In 1915, Hans Peterson built the Main Residence on the lower level and the family moved into the Craftsman style structure. Peterson also built the Bunkhouse at the same time for use by family members as a residence. The “Old” Barn was moved to the site from a location southeast of the ranch at an unknown time, early in the ranch’s development. Bill Froom, the middle son, took over the ranching and dairy operations in 1927 when his father became ill and, in 1929, when his father died, Bill Froom inherited the ranch and continued to operate it as one of the dairies in the San Luis Obispo County area until 1977 when he retired. The property was sold to Alex Madonna in a tax lien sale in 1976, and his son, John Madonna uses it as an office and storage space for the Madonna Construction Company. The Outhouse, Storage Building and Water Tower (a Verizon cell tower location) were built by the Madonna Construction Company and have no historic associations.

*D7. References (Give full citations including the names and addresses of any informants, where possible.):
San Luis Obispo County Assessor’s Office; San Luis Obispo County Recorder’s Office; City of San Luis Obispo Planning Department; Brian Leveille, Senior Planner; San Luis Obispo County Public Library, Local History Room files, documents and films; History Center of San Luis Obispo, Bertrando, Betsy, “Historical Evaluation for Froom Ranch Building Complex APN 67-241-019 San Luis Obispo County, CA (P-40-04-991); Oral Interview with John Madonna, January 2015.

*D8. Evaluator: Kathleen A. Crawford

Affiliation and Address:
Crawford Historic Services, P.O. Box 634, La Mesa, CA 91944

Date: January 30, 2015

Required information
*Resource Name or #: Froom Ranch Complex

**P1. Other Identifier:** None

**P2. Location:**
- **Not for Publication**
- **Unrestricted**
- **a. County:** San Luis Obispo
- **b. USGS 7.5' Quad:** Mt. Diablo
  - **Date:** 1975
  - **T 31S; R 12E Sec; 10 B.M. M.D.**
- **c. Address:** 12165 Los Osos Valley Road
  - **Zip:** 93405
- **d. UTM:**
  - **Zone:** 10
  - **mE/mN (G.P.S.)**
- **e. Other Locational Data:**
  - **Elevation:** Assessor's Parcel No. 67-241-019

**P3a. Description:** (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

The Froom Ranch complex is located at 12165 Los Osos Valley Road, in the County of San Luis Obispo, California. The ranch complex was developed in the late 19th century by John Froom, his wife, Harriet Perry Froom, with their seven children. The ranch was developed as one of the early dairies in San Luis Obispo County. The ranch complex currently contains the Main Residence (c. 1915); the “Old” Barn (date unknown; moved to the site in the early 1900s); the Bunkhouse (c. 1915); the Diary Barn (c. 1913); the Creamery/House (date unknown); the Granary (c. 1913); the Shed (c. 1913); the Outhouse (c. 2000); the Storage Building (c. 2010); and the Water Tower (c. 2013). The buildings are clustered in two groupings: the lower level of the ranch property which contains the Main Residence, Bunkhouse, Shed, “Old” Barn, Outhouse and Storage Building; and the upper level which includes the Diary Barn, the Creamery/House building, the Granary and the Water Tower. The main buildings date to the early development of the dairy complex and represent Craftsman and Vernacular styles and have retained their main character defining features. The buildings have retained their original locations and associations on the site.

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes)
- HP 33: Farm /Ranch

**P4. Resources Present:**
- ☒Building
- ☒Structure
- ☐Object
- ☐Site
- ☐District
- ☐Element of District
- ☐Other (Isolates, etc.)

**P5a. Photo or Drawing**

[Photo of Froom Ranch Complex]

**P5b. Description of Photo:**
- **(View, date, accession #)**
  - West/January 6, 2015, #41

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:**
- Historic
- Prehistoric
- Both
- c. 1900-1915

**P7. Owner and Address:**
- John Madonna/Madonna Construction Co. 12165 Los Osos Valley Road, San Luis Obispo, CA

**P8. Recorded by:**
- Kathleen A. Crawford, MA

MBA/FCS 1350 Treat Blvd. Ste. 380, Walnut Creek CA 94597

**P9. Date Recorded:** Jan. 6, 2015

**P10. Survey Type:** (Describe)
- Intensive

**P11. Report Citation:** Phase I

**Attachments:**
- NONE
- Location Map
- Sketch Map

*Required information

CHC2-155
**Resource Name or #:** Froom Ranch Complex

**P1. Other Identifier:** Froom Ranch Main Residence

**P2. Location:**
- Not for Publication
- Unrestricted
- **a. County:** San Luis Obispo
- **b. USGS 7.5' Quad:** Mt. Diablo
- **Date:** 1975 T 31S; R 12E Sec; 10 B.M. M.D.
- **c. Address:** 12165 Los Osos Valley Road Zip: 93405
- **d. UTM:** Zone: 10 ; mE/ mN (G.P.S.)
- **e. Other Locational Data:** (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)
  - **Elevation:** Assessor’s Parcel No. 67-241-019

**P3a. Description:**
(Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

See Building, Structure, and Object Record for Building Description.

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes)
- HP 33: Farm /Ranch
- HP 2: Single-Family Residence

**P4. Resources Present:**
- Building
- Structure
- Object
- Site
- District
- Element of District
- Other (Isolates, etc.)

**P5a. Photo or Drawing:**
(Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

**P5b. Description of Photo:**
(View, date, accession #)
West//January 6, 2015/#22

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:**
- Historic
- Prehistoric
- Both
- C 1915

**P7. Owner and Address:**
- John Madonna/Madonna Construction Co. 12165 Los Osos Valley Road, San Luis Obispo, CA

**P8. Recorded by:**
- Kathleen A. Crawford, MA
  MBA/FCS 1350 Treat Blvd. Ste. 380, Walnut Creek Ca 94597

**P9. Date Recorded:**
- Jan. 6, 2015

**P10. Survey Type:**
- Intensive

**P11. Report Citation:**
- Phase I

**P1. Required information**
CHC2-157
The Main Residence was built in 1915 by Hans Peterson. The building was constructed as the Froom family was continuing to grow and needed better living conditions for the young children in the family. The family had lived in the house attached to the Creamery building on the upper slopes of the property to the west. The Main Residence was lived in by members of the Froom family until 1998 when Bill Froom moved in with his brother in San Luis Obispo. When the property was purchased by the Madonna Construction Company, arrangements were made to allow Mr. Froom to reside in the home until he chose to leave. The Main Residence is one-story, asymmetrical, irregular shaped, Craftsman style, single-family residence. The building has a redwood sill and concrete foundation, wood horizontal shiplap siding, a partial width front porch, and a hipped roof with shingles and a modest eave overhang. A brick chimney is present on the roof and extends downward into the residence, terminating about three feet from the floor. The building was heated by a wood stove and there was no interior fireplace.

Alterations:
According to John Madonna, the house has undergone a number of alterations. Both John Madonna and his father, Alex, have made many changes to restore the building. The original foundation was redwood sills. Portions of the north and south redwood sill foundations were completely rotted. The rotted portions were removed and replaced with concrete foundations. The house was then leveled as it had sunk significantly. At some point, the house had been flooded and the floors were all uneven and buckled. The floors were leveled, sanded and repaired. Several interior walls were removed to form larger office spaces. The kitchen sink and stove were removed and the area was converted to general office use.

The only heating in the house was provided by a wood stove and the stove produced significant amounts of soot. The walls had been painted over the years and the soot was sealed into the layers of paint. The walls were scraped, the soot and paint removed, and completely repainted. The house was rewired for all new electrical service, plumbing repairs were made, an HVAC system was installed, new ceilings were put in, a new roof was put on the house, and general tenant improvements were conducted.

The rear addition was altered by adding an extra section at the rear of the addition. This new section is used by the Madonna Company to store their electronic equipment.

B9a. Architect: Unknown
b. Builder: Hans Peterson

B10. Significance: Theme: Early 20 Century Agricultural Development
Area: San Luis Obispo County
Period of Significance: 1915–1977
Property Type: Dairy Ranch
Applicable Criteria: (Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)
The Froom Ranch complex is a good example of the early 20th Century Agricultural development in the San Luis Obispo County area. The ranch was developed by John Froom, a native of Canada, who came to the area in the 1870s as a laborer and purchased the existing ranch in the 1890s and began dairy operations. Froom lived in the Creamery/House structure for many years prior to his marriage to Harriet Perry in 1902. The family continued to live in the house portion for several years and many of their seven children were born in the house. In 1913, Jim Aiken, a worker on the ranch, constructed the Dairy Barn, added to the Creamery building, built the Granary and the Horse Barn (no longer in use).
existence) and the Shed for a total of $1800 for materials and labor. The Dairy Barn is a rare example, and the only one in the County, of a barn with a rounded front wall to accommodate the dairy cows. In 1915, Hans Peterson built the Main Residence on the lower level and the family moved into the Craftsman style structure. Peterson also built the Bunkhouse at the same time for use by family members as a residence. The “Old” Barn was moved to the site from a location southeast of the ranch at an unknown time, early in the ranch’s development.

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)

B12. References:
San Luis Obispo County Assessor’s Office; San Luis Obispo County Recorder’s Office; City of San Luis Obispo Planning Department; Brian Leveille, Senior Planner; San Luis Obispo County Public Library, Local History Room files, documents and films; History Center of San Luis Obispo, Bertrando, Betsy, “Historical Evaluation for Froom Ranch Building Complex APN 67-241-019 San Luis Obispo County, CA (P-40-04-991); Oral Interview with John Madonna, January 2015

B13. Remarks:

B14. Evaluator:
Kathleen A. Crawford, M.A. January 6, 2015
View Southwest: North Side of Main Residence

View Southwest: Rear Addition to Main Residence
View East: Overview of Main Residence

View North: South Façade of Main Residence
**State of California — The Resources Agency**

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**PRIMARY RECORD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Listings</th>
<th>Review Code</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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*Resource Name or #: Froom Ranch Complex*

**P1. Other Identifier:** Bunkhouse

**P2. Location:** ☐ Not for Publication ☑ Unrestricted ☐ Restricted

- **a. County:** San Luis Obispo

- **b. USGS 7.5' Quad:** Mt. Diablo  
  - **Date:** 1975  
  - **T 31S; R 12E Sec; 10 B.M. M.D.**

- **c. Address:** 12165 Los Osos Valley Road  
  - **Zip:** 93405

- **d. UTM:** Zone: 10; mE/mN (G.P.S.)

- **e. Other Locational Data:** (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)
  - **Elevation:** Assessor’s Parcel No. 67-241-019

  **P3a. Description:** (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

  See Building, Structure, and Object Record for Building Description.

  **P3b. Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes)  
  - **HP 33:** Farm /Ranch/h  
  - **HP 2:** Single-family Residence

  **P4. Resources Present:** ☑ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object ☐ Site ☐ District ☐ Element of District ☐ Other (Isolates, etc.)

  **P5a. Photo or Drawing** (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

  ![Photo of Bunkhouse at Froom Ranch Complex](image)

  **P5b. Description of Photo:** (View, date, accession #)
  - **West/January 6, 2015, #47**

  **P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:**
  - ☑ Historic
  - ☐ Prehistoric
  - ☐ Both
  - c. 1915

  **P7. Owner and Address:**
  - **John Madonna/Madonna Construction Co.**  
  - **12165 Los Osos Valley Road, San Luis Obispo, CA**

  **P8. Recorded by:** (Name, affiliation, and address)
  - **Kathleen A. Crawford,**  
  - **MA RPA**  
  - **MBA/FCS 1350 Treat Blvd. Ste. 380, Walnut Creek Ca 94597**

  **P9. Date Recorded:** Jan. 6, 2015

  **P10. Survey Type:** (Describe)
  - Intensive

  **P11. Report Citation:** Phase I

  **Attachments:**
  - ☐ NONE
  - Location Map ☐ Sketch Map ☐

  Continuation Sheet ♦ Building, Structure, and Object Record
  - ♦ Archaeological Record ☐ District Record ☐ Linear Feature Record ☐ Milling Station Record ☐ Rock Art Record
B1. Historic Name:
B2. Common Name: Bunkhouse
B3. Original Use: Bunkhouse

*B5. Architectural Style: Craftsman
*B6. Construction History: 1915

The building was constructed as a bunkhouse for the workers on the Froom property by Hans Peterson in 1915. However, according to John Madonna, the building is one small room which was used by Bill Froom’s brother. The brother lived in the small residence for many years. The small bunkhouse is a one-story, Craftsman style building used as a residential structure. The building has a concrete foundation, wood horizontal shiplap siding and a front gable roof with shingles. The building was constructed by Hans Peterson in 1915 when he built the main residence.

*B7. Moved? No □ Yes □ Unknown Date: Original Location:

*B8. Related Features: None

A set of concrete steps leads to the single wood entrance door on the east elevation. The concrete steps have the Froom “brand” pressed into the wet concrete. This detail is seen on many of the other buildings as well. A single wood entrance door provides access to the interior. A small metal slider style window is present. The south façade contains a wood framed double hung sash style window. The west façade also contains a wood framed double hung sash style window. The north façade is blank. A large metal sign is propped up against the wall. The building is in good condition with no major exterior alterations noted. Alterations:

According to John Madonna, the building has been altered by general tenant maintenance, including painting, a new roof, and a new floor. The building was used for storage of files and rats were a problem; a new floor was installed to solve the problem.

B9a. Architect: Unknown
b. Builder: Hans Peterson

*B10. Significance: Theme: Early 20 Century Agricultural Development Area: San Luis Obispo County
Period of Significance: 1915–1977 Property Type: Dairy Ranch Applicable Criteria:

(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

The Froom Ranch complex is a good example of the early 20th Century Agricultural development in the San Luis Obispo County area. The ranch was developed by John Froom, a native of Canada, who came to the area in the 1870s as a laborer and purchased the existing ranch in the 1890s and began dairy operations. Froom lived in the Creamery/House structure for many years prior to his marriage to Harriet Perry in 1902. The family continued to live in the house portion for several years and many of their seven children were born in the house. In 1913, Jim Aiken, a worker on the ranch, constructed the Dairy Barn, added to the Creamery building, built the Granary and the Horse Barn (no longer in existence) and the Shed for a total of $1800 for materials and labor. The Dairy Barn is a rare example, and the only one in the County, of a barn with a rounded front wall to accommodate the dairy cows. In 1915, Hans Peterson built the Main Residence on the lower level and the family moved into the Craftsman style structure. Peterson also built the Bunkhouse at the same time for use by family members as a residence. The “Old” Barn was moved to the site from a location southeast of the ranch at an unknown time, early in the ranch’s development.

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)

H12. References:
San Luis Obispo County Assessor’s Office; San Luis Obispo County Recorder’s Office; City of San Luis Obispo Planning Department; Brian Leveille, Senior Planner; San Luis Obispo County Public Library, Local History Room files, documents and films; History Center of San Luis Obispo, Bertrando, Betsy, “Historical Evaluation for Froom Ranch Building Complex APN 67-241-019 San Luis Obispo County, CA (P-40-04-991); Oral Interview with John Madonna, January 2015

B13. Remarks:

B14. Evaluator:
Kathleen A. Crawford, M.A. January 6, 2014
View North: West and South Facades of Bunkhouse

View South: North Façade of Bunkhouse
View of Froom Ranch Brand, Located on steps of Bunkhouse
Resource Name or #: Froom Ranch Complex

*P2. Location: ☐ Not for Publication ☑ Unrestricted a. County: San Luis Obispo
and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)
  b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Mt. Diablo Date: 1975 T 31S; R 12E Sec; 10 B.M. M.D.
  c. Address: 12165 Los Osos Valley Road Zip: 93405
  d. UTM: Zone: 10 ; mE/ mN (G.P.S.)
  e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate) Elevation:
     Assessor's Parcel No. 67-241-019

*P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

See Building, Structure, and Object Record for Building Description.

*P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) HP 33: Farm /Ranch

*P4. Resources Present: ☐ Building ☑ Structure ☐ Object ☐ Site ☐ District ☐ Element of District ☐ Other (Isolates, etc.)

*P5a. Photo or Drawing (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) West/January 6, 2015, #15

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources: ☑ Historic ☐ Prehistoric ☐ Both Unknown

*P7. Owner and Address: John Madonna/Madonna Construction Co. 12165 Los Osos Valley Road, San Luis Obispo, CA

*P8. Recorded by: (Name, affiliation, and address) Kathleen A. Crawford, MA RPA MBA/FCS 1350 Treat Blvd. Ste. 380, Walnut Creek Ca 94597

*P9. Date Recorded: Jan. 6, 2015

*P10. Survey Type: (Describe) Intensive

*P11. Report Citation: Phase I

*Attachments: ☐ NONE ☐ Location Map ☐ Sketch Map ☐ Archaeological Record ☐ District Record ☐ Linear Feature Record ☐ Milling Station Record ☐ Rock Art Record

Continuation Sheet ☐ Building, Structure, and Object Record ☐ Archaeological Record ☐ District Record ☐ Linear Feature Record ☐ Milling Station Record ☐ Rock Art Record

*Required information

CHC2-166
**B1. Historic Name:**

**B2. Common Name:** “Old” Barn

**B3. Original Use:** “Old” Barn

**B5. Architectural Style:** Vernacular

**B6. Construction History:** Over 25 years old

The barn was constructed at an unknown time on another property owned by the Froom family. The property was reportedly southeast of the current ranch complex. The building was moved by placing it on logs and rolling over the land and the creek (presumably with the aid of a team of horses) until it was located on its new site. The relocation took place at an unknown time early in the 20th century and the barn has been in its present location since that time. The barn is estimated to be over 125 years old. The “Old” Barn is located west of the main residence. The barn structure is a one-story, rectangular shaped, Vernacular style barn building. The barn has a concrete floor, vertical wood siding and a front gable roof with corrugated metal roofing.

**B7. Moved? **No **Yes **Unknown Date: **Original Location:** Another property owned by the Froom family, located southeast of the current ranch complex

**B8. Related Features:** None

The main doors are located on the east façade and include sets of sliding doors. A door for a hay loft is present on the upper portion of the building. The building does not contain any window openings. The north and south facades contain vertical wood siding. No windows are present. The west façade contains vertical wood siding. The rear wall was rotted and the boards were replaced with historic boards salvaged from nearby barns. The building is in good condition.

Alterations:

John Madonna made a wide range of changes to the barn structure. The barn was in poor condition when he received the property. The barn was leaning more than two feet to the side, the rear wall was rotted, and the barn was twisted. He poured a new concrete floor, the original floor had been dirt. The building had originally been set down on the dirt when it was moved to the site. Mr. Froom had used it to store his pickup truck. The rear wall was replaced due to dry rot and vertical boards from other local farm buildings were used to replace the rotted boards. Considerable expense was undertaken to stabilize the barn and restore it in stable condition.

**B9a. Architect:** Unknown  **b. Builder:** Hans Peterson

**B10. Significance: Theme:** Early 20 Century Agricultural Development  **Area:** San Luis Obispo County

**Period of Significance:** 1915–1977  **Property Type:** Dairy Ranch

**Applicable Criteria:**

(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

The Froom Ranch complex is a good example of the early 20th Century Agricultural development in the San Luis Obispo County area. The ranch was developed by John Froom, a native of Canada, who came to the area in the 1870s as a laborer and purchased the existing ranch in the 1890s and began dairy operations. Froom lived in the Creamery/House structure for many years prior to his marriage to Harriet Perry in 1902. The family continued to live in the house portion for several years and many of their seven children were born in the house. In 1913, Jim Aiken, a worker on the ranch, constructed the Dairy Barn, added to the Creamery building, built the Granary and the Horse Barn (no longer in existence) and the Shed for a total of $1800 for materials and labor. The Dairy Barn is a rare example, and the only one in the County, of a barn with a rounded front wall to accommodate the dairy cows. In 1915, Hans Peterson built the Main Residence on the lower level and the family moved into the Craftsman style structure. Peterson also built the Bunkhouse at the same time for use by family members as a residence. The “Old” Barn was moved to the site from a location southeast of the ranch at an unknown time, early in the ranch’s development.

**B11. Additional Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes)

**B12. References:**

San Luis Obispo County Assessor’s Office; San Luis Obispo County Recorder’s Office; City of San Luis Obispo Planning Department; Brian Leveille, Senior Planner; San Luis Obispo County Public Library, Local History Room files, documents and films; History Center of San Luis Obispo, Bertrando, Betsy, “Historical Evaluation for Froom Ranch Building Complex APN 67-241-019 San Luis Obispo County, CA (P-40-04-991); Oral Interview with John Madonna, January 2015

**B13. Remarks:**

**B14. Evaluator:**

Kathleen A. Crawford, M.A. January 6, 2015
View North: South Façade of “Old” Barn

View Southwest: East and North Facades of “Old” Barn
*Resource Name or #: Froom Ranch Complex

P1. Other Identifier: Shed

*P2. Location: ☐ Not for Publication  ☒ Unrestricted

- a. County: San Luis Obispo
- *b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Mt. Diablo  Date: 1975 T 31S; R 12E Sec; 10 B.M. M.D.
- c. Address: 12165 Los Osos Valley Road Zip: 93405
- d. UTM: Zone: 10; mE/ mN (G.P.S.)
- e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate) Elevation: Assessor's Parcel No. 67-241-019

*P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

See Building, Structure, and Object Record for Building Description.

*P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) HP 33: Farm/Ranch

*P4. Resources Present: ☐ Building  ☒ Structure  ☐ Object  ☐ Site  ☐ District  ☐ Element of District  ☐ Other (Isolates, etc.)

*P5a. Photo or Drawing: (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) Southeast/January 6, 2015, #40

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources: ☒ Historic
☐ Prehistoric  ☐ Both
 c. 1913

*P7. Owner and Address:
John Madonna/Madonna Construction Co. 12165 Los Osos Valley Road, San Luis Obispo, CA

*P8. Recorded by: (Name, affiliation, and address) Kathleen A. Crawford, MA
MBA/FCS 1350 Treat Blvd, Ste. 380, Walnut Creek Ca 94597

*P9. Date Recorded: Jan. 6, 2015

*P10. Survey Type: (Describe) Intensive

*P11. Report Citation: Phase I

*Attachments:
☐ NONE  ☐ Location Map  ☐ Sketch Map  ☐ Archaeological Record  ☐ District Record  ☐ Linear Feature Record  ☐ Milling Station Record  ☐ Rock Art Record
B1. Historic Name: Froom Ranch Shed

B2. Common Name: Shed

B3. Original Use: Shed

B4. Present Use: Storage

*B5. Architectural Style: Vernacular

*B6. Construction History: Unknown date of construction

The building is located north of the house and was built at an unknown time by an unknown person. At the time of the Bertrand investigation, the shed was full of tin cans. John Madonna stated that Bill Froom had lived through the Great Depression and cultivated habits of thrift. The building was full of cans of dog food which take several trips to remove them all. The building contains a seeder machine which Mr. Madonna has allowed to remain in the structure as it holds up the building. The Shed Building is a one-story, irregular shaped, asymmetrical, Vernacular style, storage building. The shed roof has a steep slant. The building has no true foundation, was constructed with vertical wood siding walls, and a steeply slanted shed roof. Entrance doors are on the north wall. An addition has a flat roof and a single entrance door. The building is in extremely poor condition and is barely standing.

*B7. Moved? No □ Yes □ Unknown Date: Original Location:

*B8. Related Features: None

Alterations:
No significant changes have been made to the building.

B9a. Architect: Unknown  
B9b. Builder: Hans Peterson

*B10. Significance: Theme: Early 20 Century Agricultural Development  
Area: San Luis Obispo County

Period of Significance: 1915–1977
Property Type: Dairy Ranch

Applicable Criteria:
(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

The Froom Ranch complex is a good example of the early 20th Century Agricultural development in the San Luis Obispo County area. The ranch was developed by John Froom, a native of Canada, who came to the area in the 1870s as a laborer and purchased the existing ranch in the 1890s and began dairy operations. Froom lived in the Creamery/House structure for many years prior to his marriage to Harriet Perry in 1902. The family continued to live in the house portion for several years and many of their seven children were born in the house. In 1913, Jim Aiken, a worker on the ranch, constructed the Dairy Barn, added to the Creamery building, built the Granary and the Horse Barn (no longer in existence) and the Shed for a total of $1800 for materials and labor. The Dairy Barn is a rare example, and the only one in the County, of a barn with a rounded front wall to accommodate the dairy cows. In 1915, Hans Peterson built the Main Residence on the lower level and the family moved into the Craftsman style structure. Peterson also built the Bunkhouse at the same time for use by family members as a residence. The “Old” Barn was moved to the site from a location southeast of the ranch at an unknown time, early in the ranch’s development.

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)

H12. References:
San Luis Obispo County Assessor’s Office; San Luis Obispo County Recorder’s Office; City of San Luis Obispo Planning Department; Brian Leveille, Senior Planner; San Luis Obispo County Public Library, Local History Room files, documents and films; History Center of San Luis Obispo, Bertrand, Betsy, “Historical Evaluation for Froom Ranch Building Complex APN 67-241-019 San Luis Obispo County, CA (P-40-04-991); Oral Interview with John Madonna, January 2015

B13. Remarks:

B14. Evaluator:
Kathleen A. Crawford, M.A. January 6, 2015
View North: West and South Facades of Shed

View West: South and East Facades of Shed
**Resource Name or #:** Froom Ranch Complex

**P1. Other Identifier:** Diary Barn

**P2. Location:**
- Not for Publication
- Unrestricted
- County: San Luis Obispo

**USGS 7.5' Quad:** Mt. Diablo
- Date: 1975
- Zone: 31S; R 12E
- SEc: 10
- B.M.: M.D.

**Address:** 12165 Los Osos Valley Road
- Zip: 93405

**e. Other Locational Data:**
- Assessor's Parcel No. 67-241-019

**P3a. Description:** (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

See Building, Structure, and Object Record for Building Description.

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes)
- HP 33: Farm /Ranch

**P4. Resources Present:**
- Building
- Structure
- Object
- Site
- District
- Element of District
- Other (Isolates, etc.)

**P5a. Photo or Drawing** (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

**P5b. Description of Photo:** (View, date, accession #)
- West/January 6, 2015, #32

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:**
- Historic
- Prehistoric
- Both
- c. 1913

**P7. Owner and Address:**
- John Madonna/Madonna Construction Co. 12165 Los Osos Valley Road, San Luis Obispo, CA

**P8. Recorded by:** Kathleen A. Crawford, MA
- MBA/FCS 1350 Treat Blvd. Ste. 380, Walnut Creek Ca 94597

**P9. Date Recorded:** Jan. 6, 2015

**P10. Survey Type:** Intensive

**P11. Report Citation:** Phase I
B1. Historic Name:  

B2. Common Name: Dairy Barn  

B3. Original Use: Dairy Barn  

B4. Present Use: Storage  

B5. Architectural Style: Vernacular  

B6. Construction History: 1913  

The dairy barn was built in 1913 by Jim Aiken who lived in a tent by the creek on the property and built the dairy barn, the granary and the horse barn in 1913 for $1800.00 which included labor and materials. Every day he came up from his tent by the creek and worked on the buildings. The dairy barn was designed to hold ten cows at either end and ten at each side. The barn contained a four-inch carrier track designed to bring hay into the barn. Research indicates the barn is the only round barn in San Luis Obispo County. A variety of early dairy farm equipment is still located within the barn structure. The barn was used to milk the cows, start the butter and cheese production, and was used until the dairy operations ceased in 1977. The Dairy Barn is a 60’ x 80’, one-story, asymmetrical, irregular shaped, Vernacular style barn. The barn has a wood pier and concrete block foundation, vertical wood siding walls, and a gabled roof.

B7. Moved? ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown Date:  

B8. Related Features: None  

The east façade contains a door at the south end of the façade that opens to a slanting concrete ramp. The ramp area includes a wide concrete apron located between the Dairy Barn and the Creamery/House structures. The concrete apron had a specific function in that the hard surface allowed the cows to remove mud from their feet prior to entering the barn for milking. The east wall contains a small addition on the north end of the façade. The addition contains a variety of windows which appear to be remnants from other structures. The windows are wood framed in various shapes and sizes. Each of the three walls contains a single door opening. A concrete trough is present on the east wall near the addition. The north façade contains two door openings. The east door opening is a single sliding door. The other door is the main door into the space and includes a wide opening with a sliding door. The west end of the façade slopes steeply down to the ground area. A large metal hook is present at the peak of the gable roof. The west façade contains an open entrance on the south end of the façade. A concrete entrance area leads into the interior space. The shed roof slopes steeply down to the lower level of the wall. The south façade contains a unique feature. The façade is curved and a portion of the curved section has no foundation and hangs out over the slope. The wall has vertical siding and a sloping curved roof. The wall was specifically constructed in this manner to accommodate the movement of the cows within the interior space. Due to their size and breadth, it was easier to move the cows through the space if it was rounded. The building is in fair condition. Corrals are present on the south side of the slope near the barn. Alterations: The barn has been altered by a variety of renovations by both Alex and John Madonna over the years to stabilize the building. New support beams have replaced unstable sections, portions have been propped up and repaired, beams were placed in portions of the roof system to keep the roof in place, vertical wall boards have been replaced and overall general maintenance has taken place to keep the structure standing over the years.

B9a. Architect: Unknown  

b. Builder: Hans Peterson

B10. Significance: Theme: Early 20 Century Agricultural Development  

Area: San Luis Obispo County  

Period of Significance: 1915–1977  

Property Type: Dairy Ranch  

Applicable Criteria:  

(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

The Froom Ranch complex is a good example of the early 20th Century Agricultural development in the San Luis Obispo County area. The ranch was developed by John Froom, a native of Canada, who came to the area in the 1870s as a laborer and purchased the existing ranch in the 1890s and began dairy operations. Froom lived in the Creamery/House structure for many years prior to his marriage to Harriet Perry in 1902. The family continued to live in the house portion for several years and many of their seven children were born in the house. In 1913, Jim Aiken, a worker on the ranch, constructed the Dairy Barn, added to the Creamery building, built the Granary and the Horse Barn (no longer in existence) and the Shed for a total of $1800 for materials and labor. The Dairy Barn is a rare example, and the only one in the County, of a barn with a rounded front wall to accommodate the dairy cows. In 1915, Hans Peterson built the Main Residence on the lower level and the family moved into the Craftsman style structure. Peterson also built the Bunkhouse at the same time for use by family members as a residence. The “Old” Barn was moved to the site from a location southeast of the ranch at an unknown time, early in the ranch’s development.

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)  

B12. References:  

San Luis Obispo County Assessor’s Office; San Luis Obispo County Recorder’s Office; City of San Luis Obispo Planning Department; Brian Leveille, Senior Planner; San Luis Obispo County Public Library, Local History Room files, documents and films; History Center of San Luis Obispo, Bertrand, Betsy, “Historical Evaluation for Froom Ranch Building Complex APN 67-241-019 San Luis Obispo County, CA” (P-40-04-991); Oral Interview with John Madonna, January 2015  

B13. Remarks:  

B14. Evaluator:  

Kathleen A. Crawford, M.A. January 6, 2015
View North: South Façade of Dairy Barn

View Northwest: East Façade of Dairy Bar
View South: East Façade of Dairy Barn

View West: East Façade of Dairy Barn
Resource Name or #: Froom Ranch Complex

**P1. Other Identifier:** Creamery/House

**P2. Location:**
- **Not for Publication**
- **Unrestricted**
- **a. County:** San Luis Obispo
- **b. USGS 7.5' Quad:** Mt. Diablo
- **Date:** 1975 T 31S; R 12E Sec; 10 B.M. M.D.
- **c. Address:** 12165 Los Osos Valley Road Zip: 93405
- **d. UTM:** Zone: 10; mE/mN (G.P.S.)
- **e. Other Locational Data:** (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate) Elevation: Assessor’s Parcel No. 67-241-019

**P3a. Description:** (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

See Building, Structure, and Object Record for Building Description.

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes) HP 33: Farm/Ranch/HP 2: Single-Family Residence

**P4. Resources Present:**
- Building
- Structure
- Object
- Site
- District
- Element of District
- Other (Isolates, etc.)

**P5a. Photo or Drawing** (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

**P5b. Description of Photo:** (View, date, accession #)
West/January 6, 2015, #58

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:**
- Historic
- Prehistoric
- Both
- c. 1900-1915

**P7. Owner and Address:**
John Madonna/Madonna Construction Co. 12165 Los Osos Valley Road, San Luis Obispo, CA

**P8. Recorded by:** (Name, affiliation, and address) Kathleen A. Crawford, MA MBA/FCS 1350 Treat Blvd. Ste. 380, Walnut Creek Ca 94597

**P9. Date Recorded:** Jan. 6, 2015

**P10. Survey Type:** (Describe) Intensive

**P11. Report Citation:** Phase I

**Attachments:**
- NONE
- Location Map
- Sketch Map
- Archaeological Record
- District Record
- Linear Feature Record
- Milling Station Record
- Rock Art Record

Continuation Sheet

Building, Structure, and Object Record
Archaeological Record
District Record
Linear Feature Record
Milling Station Record
Rock Art Record

*Required information
CHC2-177
*Resource Name or #* Froom Ranch Creamery/House

**B1. Historic Name:**

**B2. Common Name:** Creamery/House

**B3. Original Use:** Milk Processing and Residential

**B4. Present Use:** Not in use

**B5. Architectural Style:** Vernacular

**B6. Construction History:**
The Creamery/House are two connected structures; the west portion of the building was used as the Creamery and the east portion was the residence. According to Bill Froom, his father lived in the Creamery for a period of time when he first began to operate the dairy. The residence was constructed at an unknown time, possibly after John Froom’s marriage to Harriet and the need for more space. The young family lived in the house portion of the building until 1915 when Hans Peterson built the Main Residence on the lower level. Bill Froom was born in the house and presumably any of the children born before 1915 were also born in the house on the upper level. After the family moved into the “new” residence built by Hans Peterson in 1915, the space was possibly used as additional living space for the workers on the ranch. The Creamery/House is a one-story, irregular shaped, asymmetrical, Vernacular style building that was built in several stages at unknown times. The building is divided into three sections, each with gabled roofs.

**B7. Moved?** ☑No ☐Yes ☐Unknown

**B8. Related Features:** None

The south façade contains the two buildings – the Creamery and the House. Each of the sections contains a single door opening and a window is present in each of these three sections that comprise the two buildings. The south façade contains a combination of vertical and horizontal wood siding. The building has a wood pier foundation with rock footings and infill of the open areas.

The overall structure is composed of two buildings which are separated by approximately one foot of space separating the east wall of the Creamery from the west wall of the House. An addition was constructed on the south wall on the house portion but deteriorated to the point where it was removed. A single wood entrance opening faces the Dairy Barn on the west wall. The interior contains two small rooms. A cellar area is present under the building and the adjoining structure. The roof on this portion of the structure slopes down to a low level and is covered with shingles. The north façade contains vertical and horizontal siding. The entrance to the cellar area is located at the base of the north wall under the Creamery portion of the building. A secondary entrance is located further down the wall. A small, narrow door is present in the area where the two buildings are separated. The door is located on the north wall and there is no corresponding door on the south wall. An open porch was added to the east end of the north wall of the house structure at an unknown time. The east façade serves as the end wall of the residential portion of the structure. A rectangular shaped window opening is present.

**B9a. Architect:** Unknown

**b. Builder:** Hans Peterson

**B10. Significance:**

**Topic:** Early 20 Century Agricultural Development

**Area:** San Luis Obispo County

**Period of Significance:** 1915–1977

**Property Type:** Dairy Ranch

**Applicable Criteria:** A and C

The Froom Ranch complex is a good example of the early 20th Century Agricultural development in the San Luis Obispo County area. The ranch was developed by John Froom, a native of Canada, who came to the area in the 1870s as a laborer and purchased the existing ranch in the 1890s and began dairy operations. Froom lived in the Creamery/House structure for many years prior to his marriage to Harriet Perry in 1902. The family continued to live in the house portion for several years and many of their seven children were born in the house. In 1913, Jim Aiken, a worker on the ranch, constructed the Dairy Barn, added to the Creamery building, built the Granary and the Horse Barn (no longer in existence) and the Shed for a total of $1800 for materials and labor. The Dairy Barn is a rare example, and the only one in the County, of a barn with a rounded front wall to accommodate the dairy cows. In 1915, Hans Peterson built the Main Residence on the lower level and the family moved into the Craftsman style structure. Peterson also built the Bunkhouse at the same time for use by family members as a residence. The “Old” Barn was moved to the site from a location southeast of the ranch at an unknown time, early in the ranch’s development.

**B11. Additional Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes)

**B12. References:**
San Luis Obispo County Assessor’s Office; San Luis Obispo County Recorder’s Office; City of San Luis Obispo Planning Department; Brian Leveille, Senior Planner; San Luis Obispo County Public Library, Local History Room files, documents and films; History Center of San Luis Obispo, Bertrando, Betsy, “Historical Evaluation for Froom Ranch Building Complex” APN 67-241-019 San Luis Obispo County, CA (P-40-04-991); Oral Interview with John Madonna, January 2015

**B13. Remarks:**

**B14. Evaluator:**
Kathleen A. Crawford, M.A. January 6, 2015
View Northwest: East and South Façade of Creamery/house
**Resource Name or #:** Froom Ranch Complex

**P1. Other Identifier:** Granary

**P2. Location:**
- **Not for Publication**
- **Unrestricted**
- **a. County:** San Luis Obispo
- **b. USGS 7.5’ Quad:** Mt. Diablo
- **Date:** 1975
- **T 31S; R 12E Sec; 10 B.M. M.D.**
- **c. Address:** 12165 Los Osos Valley Road
- **Zip:** 93405
- **d. UTM:** Zone: 10; mE/mN (G.P.S.)
- **e. Other Locational Data:** (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)
  - **Elevation:** Assessor’s Parcel No. 67-241-019

**P3a. Description:** (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

See Building, Structure, and Object Record for Building Description

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes)
- **HP 33:** Farm/Ranch

**P4. Resources Present:**
- Building
- Structure
- Object
- Site
- District
- Element of District
- Other (Isolates, etc.)

**P5a. Photo or Drawing:** (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

**P5b. Description of Photo:** (View, date, accession #)
- West/January 6, 2015, #46

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:**
- **Historic**
- **Prehistoric**
- **Both**
- c. 1913

**P7. Owner and Address:**
- John Madonna/Madonna Construction Co. 12165 Los Osos Valley Road, San Luis Obispo, CA

**P8. Recorded by:**
- Kathleen A. Crawford, MA
- MBA/FCS 1350 Treat Blvd. Ste. 380, Walnut Creek Ca 94597

**P9. Date Recorded:** Jan. 6, 2015

**P10. Survey Type:** (Describe)
- Intensive

**P11. Report Citation:** Phase I

**Attachments:**
- NONE
- Location Map
- Sketch Map

Continuation Sheet:
- Building, Structure, and Object Record
- Archaeological Record
- District Record
- Linear Feature Record
- Milling Station Record
- Rock Art Record

*Required information*
B1. Historic Name: Granary
B2. Common Name: Granary
B3. Original Use: Granary
B4. Present Use: Storage
*B5. Architectural Style: Vernacular
*B6. Construction History: 1913
The Granary was built in 1913 by Jim Aiken. The Granary was constructed in a way that eliminated the rat problem. The building was secure and many of the local farmers stored their grain in the building to keep it safe from rats.

*B7. Moved? ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown Date:
*B8. Related Features: None
The Granary is located on the hill in close proximity to the Dairy Barn and the Creamery. The Granary is a small, one-story, double walled, rectangular shaped, asymmetrical, Vernacular style utilitarian building. The building has a wood pier foundation, vertical tongue and groove wood siding walls and a gabled roof. One window is present on the south façade. A single door is present on the east façade. The interior contains storage areas. Tongue and groove siding was used as this prevented the grain from being eaten by animals. No grain was present during the site visit and the floor was covered in horse harnesses and equipment. The building is in poor condition.

B9a. Architect: Unknown
b. Builder: Jim Aiken
*B10. Significance: Theme: Early 20 Century Agricultural Development
Area: San Luis Obispo County
Period of Significance: 1913–1977
Property Type: Dairy Ranch
Applicable Criteria: (Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)
The Froom Ranch complex is a good example of the early 20th Century Agricultural development in the San Luis Obispo County area. The ranch was developed by John Froom, a native of Canada, who came to the area in the 1870s as a laborer and purchased the existing ranch in the 1890s and began dairy operations. Froom lived in the Creamery/House structure for many years prior to his marriage to Harriet Perry in 1902. The family continued to live in the house portion for several years and many of their seven children were born in the house. In 1913, Jim Aiken, a worker on the ranch, constructed the Dairy Barn, added to the Creamery building, built the Granary and the Horse Barn (no longer in existence) and the Shed for a total of $1800 for materials and labor. The Dairy Barn is a rare example, and the only one in the County, of a barn with a rounded front wall to accommodate the dairy cows. In 1915, Hans Peterson built the Main Residence on the lower level and the family moved into the Craftsman style structure. Peterson also built the Bunkhouse at the same time for use by family members as a residence. The “Old” Barn was moved to the site from a location southeast of the ranch at an unknown time, early in the ranch’s development.

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)

H12. References:
San Luis Obispo County Assessor’s Office; San Luis Obispo County Recorder’s Office; City of San Luis Obispo Planning Department; Brian Leveille, Senior Planner; San Luis Obispo County Public Library, Local History Room files, documents and films; History Center of San Luis Obispo, Bertrando, Betsy, “Historical Evaluation for Froom Ranch Building Complex APN 67-241-019 San Luis Obispo County, CA [P-40-04-991]; Oral Interview with John Madonna, January 2015

B13. Remarks:

B14. Evaluator:
Kathleen A. Crawford, M.A. January 6, 2015
View Northeast: West and South Facades of the Granary

View Southeast: North and West Facades of the Granary
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INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY

John and Susan Madonna wish to study the feasibility of preserving and/or renovating several existing structures of historic significance at the Froom Ranch property in San Luis Obispo.

The structures included in this analysis are the Main Residence, the Dairy Barn, the Old Barn, and the Creamery House. All structures consist of wood-framed walls and roofs, wood siding, and either a wood or concrete foundation. Construction of these buildings took place between the late 1800’s and early 1900’s.

As part of the preservation, it is necessary to assess both the gravity and lateral load resisting systems of the buildings in order to ensure life-safety of the occupants. For existing structures of historic significance, the structural analysis is to be per the 2016 California Historic Building Code (CHBC). In order to balance structural safety with historic preservation, this code allows for a 25% reduction in current building code design wind & seismic load levels. In addition, it also provides strength capacities for structural systems that would typically not be allowed for new structures. Where design gravity loads are not being increased, the CHBC also allows that the vertical load resisting system may be assumed adequate by having withstood the test of time, where no distress is evident, and a complete load path is present.

Guidelines for determining the feasibility of historic preservation is given in the City of San Luis Obispo Historic Preservation Ordinance, December 7, 2010. Feasibility is defined by this document as the ability of a building or other structure to “be repaired or rehabilitated so as to be safe and usable without significant loss of historic fabric,” and that the structure has the “physical capacity…to withstand the repair and/or rehabilitation process without the danger of further damage.”

Both the structural integrity and the feasibility of rehabilitation have been addressed in this report for the structures noted above. The study considers multiple building-use scenarios, including continued commercial use as well as the conversion to public space. For continued commercial use, the building code does not require any structural upgrades to be done. However, we have included in our recommendation the items that pose a significant risk to the structure, or to the life-safety of the occupants. Where the conversion to public space is considered, we have included all structural deficiencies, as well as potential increases to design live loads, and long-term performance improvements.

Our scope of work for this project involved the following tasks:
2. Review of the Seismic Analysis Map provided by Geosolutions. The map shows the local fault zone, in which it is recommended that no structure with an occupancy of 2,000 cumulative man-hours per year may be within this zone.
3. Visually survey each building to verify the original construction, past alteration, and the current conditions.
4. Perform a structural analysis of each building for CHBC-level gravity, seismic and wind loads.
5. Prepare a report that includes an outline of the major structural deficiencies, as well as a general description of the proposed structural retrofit work.

**MAIN RESIDENCE**

The Main Residence [Figure 1] was constructed in 1915, and has been occupied continuously for use as both a residence and an office building. The approximately 1,600 SF one-story wood-framed structure appears to be in good condition, and has undergone several renovations and repairs throughout its history. The majority of the structural framing is original, however concrete foundations have been added at certain locations around the perimeter where excessive settlement has occurred. The lateral load-resisting system consists of wood siding over straight-sheathed exterior wood stud shear walls.

**Roof Framing**

The roof framing consists of composite shingles over the original wood shakes over 1x6 skip sheathing supported by 2x4 roof joists at 30” spacing. The roof joists are braced mid-span with kickers down to interior stud walls below [Figure 2]. Although the existing roof framing appears to be in good condition, there is no recognized diaphragm system needed to resist lateral loads.

*Required Strengthening:*

*Continued Private Commercial Use – If the structure will continue to be used for private commercial purposes, the building code does not require any upgrades to the roof framing system. It is recommended, however that the next time the roof is replaced, the original wood shakes be removed, and a layer of plywood added over the existing 1x skip sheathing. The layer of plywood, if detailed and nailed properly, will act as a structural diaphragm. Additional wood blocking and metal framing clips will also be required to tie the roof diaphragm to the exterior walls below. It should also be noted that if a new roofing material is selected that is*
heavier than the existing roofing material, strengthen of the roof rafters will be required.

For Use as Public Space – If the structure is to be used for public occupancy, the existing roofing shall be removed and the plywood, blocking and framing clips added as described above.

**Exterior Walls**

The exterior walls are constructed of horizontal 2"x4" wood studs at 24" spacing. The exterior is sheathed with 1x shiplap siding over 1x straight sheathing, which provides lateral stiffness for the structure in resisting wind and seismic loads. The wall framing and siding appear to be in good condition.

**Required Strengthening:**

*Continued Private Commercial Use – If the structure will continue to be used for private commercial purposes, the building code does not require any upgrades to the existing exterior walls. Although the walls are overstressed for CHBC-level design loads, one-story wood framed structures typically perform well in earthquakes, and no strengthening is recommended.*

*For Use as Public Space – If the structure is to be used for public occupancy, it is recommended that plywood shear walls be added. Plywood, when detailed and nailed properly provides significantly greater lateral strength and stiffness for wood shear walls than the existing 1x straight sheathing. For existing structures, the interior drywall in specific locations can be removed, plywood installed directly over the existing studs, and then the drywall reinstalled. Holdowns anchoring the shear wall boundaries to the foundation are also typically required.*

**First Floor**

The first floor is constructed of wood flooring over 1x6 diagonal sheathing over 2"x5-1/2" wood floor joists spaced at 24". The wood floor joists span across unbraced wood cripple walls below spaced at approximately 7'-6" [Figure 3]. The 2x redwood sill of the cripple wall bears directly on grade. Releveling of the first floor has been performed several times throughout the life of the structure.

**Required Strengthening:**

*Continued Private Commercial Use – If the structure will continue to be used for private commercial purposes, the building code does not require any upgrades to the existing floor structure. The existing floor joists are adequate to resist code-level office live loads. It should be noted, however, that if future unevenness in
the floor surface is encountered, it could be an indication of excessive settlement in the foundation. See the foundation section below for potential strengthening recommendation.

For Use as Public Space – If the structure is to be used for public occupancy, strengthening of the floor joists may be required. The existing floor joists do not have the capacity to resist code-level design live loads when considering areas of assemblies. If space is to be made within the structure for meeting or conference areas, the floor joists below that area are required to be doubled up.

Foundation

The foundation consists of interior and exterior 2x wood stud cripple walls bearing on an existing wood sill placed directly on grade [Figure 3]. Where past excessive settlement has occurred, an undocumented concrete foundation was poured below the sill to provide a greater bearing surface and better long-term durability. The exterior cripple walls are lightly braced with occasional 1x diagonal boards, while the interior cripple walls are completely unbraced.

Required Strengthening:

Continued Private Commercial Use – If the structure will continue to be used for private commercial purposes, as a minimum both the exterior and interior cripple wall systems should be strengthened. This can be done with either a system of properly detailed diagonal boards or a pattern of plywood sheathing. Where concrete foundations have been added in previous repairs, it should be verified that the wood sills are properly anchored to the concrete. Because the existing structure bears directly on top of the soil and proper concrete foundation embedded into the soil are not present, sliding of the structure during a large earthquake could occur. Although life-safety does not appear to be a significant risk assuming the cripple wall bracing is installed, non-structural damage to interior furnishings and equipment is likely. In addition, attention should be given if future unevenness in the floor surface is encountered. This could be an indication of excessive settlement in the foundation. For better long-term structural performance, see “For Use as Public Space” below.

For Use as Public Space – If the structure is to be used for public occupancy, a proper concrete foundation should be installed. To install the concrete foundation, the structure is jacked up, continuous trenches are dug below the exterior and interior cripple walls, and concrete footings are poured. The structure is then lowered and bolted to the concrete. In addition to the footings, all cripple walls require bracing as described above.
DAIRY BARN

The Dairy Barn [Figure 4] is an approximately 4,200 SF wood-framed farming facility built in 1913 to house livestock and hay. Weather and neglect has severely deteriorated many of the barn's key structural elements over the course of its history. In addition, a significant portion of the barn is located within the rupture zone setback of a potentially active trace fault. These items are discussed below and shall be addressed in the renovation along with the strengthening of the lateral load-resisting system.

Local Seismic Hazard Mitigation

Because the Dairy Barn is situated within the rupture zone setback of a potentially active trace fault, there is a high risk of significant damage to the structure due to ground rupture. If the barn is to be used in any way other than being fenced off and left in a state of arrested decay, significant alterations to the building footprint are required.

Required Remediation:

If left in its current location, it is recommended that the round-nosed portion of the barn be removed, in addition to the next three adjacent bays of framing, essentially cutting the structure in half. Also requiring demolition due to its proximity to the fault line is the northern masonry addition to the barn. Because the round-nosed portion of the building is unique and has historical significance, a portion of the demolished materials may be salvaged to rebuild the round-nosed portion at the eastern end of the structure. It is estimated that approximately 75% of the roof framing and 50% of the floor framing will be good for re-use. Nearly all the exterior siding is in such a state of decay that it will have no structural value. This remediation is required to ensure the safety of the occupants during a large seismic event. The rebuilt round-nosed portion will require a modern concrete foundation system to prevent the type of settling and deterioration that is currently present.

Relocation Option:

Another option for the Dairy Barn is to demolish and rebuild the structure at another location. In order to preserve the historic aspect of the barn, the framing system should remain the same as the existing framing system, but with consideration of the strengthening requirements outlined in the sections below. It is also possible to re-use a portion of the lumber as noted above. Please refer to the schematic structural drawings provided for reference at the end of this document.
**Roof Framing**

The existing roof framing [Figure 5] consists of wood shingles over 1x6 skip sheathing supported by 2"x6" roof joists at 30" spacing. A collar tie system consisting of tension rods at 10'-0" spacing thru the double top plate at the two interior post lines is present to resist the horizontal thrust. The majority of the roof framing has the capacity to resist code-level dead and live loads. The existing skip sheathing provides minimal lateral stiffness, and will not act as a proper roof diaphragm.

*Required Strengthening:*

**Occupancy less than 2,000 cumulative man-hours per year (tours, exhibits, etc.)**
- Because the existing wood shingles are in a serious state of deterioration, much of the roof framing is exposed to weather. It is recommended that the existing roofing be removed and all framing be inspected for damage. It is estimated that approximately 10% of the roof framing will need replacing. It is possible that lumber salvaged from the seismic remediation described above may be reused for this purpose. Additionally, a layer of plywood will be required over the skip sheathing in order to create a roof diaphragm. The entire roof shall be re-roofed with a light weight standing seam or corrugated metal roof with better long-term performance.

**Occupancy greater than 2,000 cumulative man-hours per year (public use, meeting space, etc.)** – Same as above.

**Exterior Walls**

The exterior walls [Figure 6] are typically constructed with 1x12 vertical siding spanning from the double top plate to the wood sill, with an intermediate horizontal 2"x4" girt mid span. The double top plate and girt span horizontally to 4"x4" wood posts at 10'-0" spacing around the perimeter.

*Required Strengthening:*

**Occupancy less than 2,000 cumulative man-hours per year (tours, exhibits, etc.)**
- The exterior vertical siding is required to be in good condition to allow for adequate nailing. Proper nailing is essential for shear wall performance. Because of years of neglect, it is estimated that up to 75% of the wood siding will need to be removed and replaced for the wood shear wall system. It is also estimated that approximately 10% of the wall framing will require replacement due to weather intrusion at the damaged siding. The entire exterior will require re-painting to help preserve the condition of the wood.
Occupancy greater than 2,000 man hours per year (public use, meeting space, etc.) – Same as above.

**Wall Bracing**

At the main western entrance to the Dairy Barn, not enough wall length existing to provide adequate lateral stiffness [Figure 7]. At this location, as well as at the two interior lines of posts [Figure 8], diagonal wood wall bracing will be required. All connections will be designed to be bolted and hidden. The bottom ends of the bracing will be required to be anchored to the existing foundation.

*Required Strengthening:*

Occupancy less than 2,000 cumulative man-hours per year (tours, exhibits, etc.) – Install new 4x4 wall braces at the western wall and at the two interior lines of posts. Strengthen all brace connections and splices with steel plates and bolts. Anchor braced connections to new concrete pad foundation.

Occupancy greater than 2,000 cumulative man-hours per year (public use, meeting space, etc.) – Same as above.

**Foundations**

The majority of the perimeter foundation consists of a 24" high concrete stem or retaining wall [Figure 6] with an undetermined footing depth. The concrete foundation appears to be in good condition for the age of the structure. The majority of the foundation damage has occurred at the eastern downhill portion of the structure at the round-nosed area of the barn. The foundation system at the interior post line appears to be a redwood sill bearing directly on the soil, or else the wood posts are embedded directly into the soil [Figure 9]. The posts appear to have settled over time approximately 2".

*Required Strengthening:*

Occupancy less than 2,000 cumulative man-hours per year (tours, exhibits, etc.) – Provide a modern concrete foundation system to support the re-built round-nosed portion of the structure. This is included in the Seismic Remediation section above. Additionally, concrete pad footings will be required below the posts. These pad footings have been included in the Wall Bracing section above.

Occupancy greater than 2,000 cumulative man-hours per year (public use, meeting space, etc.) – Same as above.
OLD BARN

The old barn [Figure 10] is an approximately 1,300 SF wood structure with a corrugated metal roof, vertical wood siding, and a concrete slab-on-grade foundation. It is estimated that the barn is 125 year old, and has been moved from its original site. The barn appears to be in very good shape for its age due to the fact that it remains in use. However, its constant use has led to a number of undocumented alterations that have inadvertently compromised the historic fabric of the Old Barn significantly.

Roof Framing

The existing roof framing [Figure 11] consists of corrugated metal roofing over existing wood shingles, over 1x6 skip sheathing, supported by 2”x4” roof joists at 32” spacing. A collar tie system consisting of 2x4 struts near the ridge is present to resist the horizontal thrust. This appears to have been added at a later date, most likely to combat a sagging ridge. The majority of the roof framing has the capacity to resist code-level dead and live loads. The existing skip sheathing provides minimal lateral stiffness, and will not act as a proper roof diaphragm.

Required Strengthening:

Continued Private Commercial Use – If the structure will continue to be used for private commercial purposes, the building code does not require any upgrades to the roof framing system. It is recommended, however that the next time the roof is replaced, the original wood shakes be removed, and a layer of plywood added over the existing 1x skip sheathing. The layer of plywood, if detailed and nailed properly, will act as a structural diaphragm. Additional wood blocking and metal framing clips will also be required to tie the roof diaphragm to the exterior walls below. It should also be noted that if a new roofing material is selected that is heavier than the existing roofing material, strengthen of the roof rafters may be required.

For Use as Public Space – If the structure is to be used for public occupancy, the existing roofing shall be removed and the plywood, blocking and framing clips added as described above.

Exterior Walls
At some point in the history of the barn, the exterior walls were reframed with a more modern system of 2x4 vertical studs spaced at 16” o.c. [Figure 12]. This system likely replaced a post-and-beam system with horizontal wall girts, similar to the Dairy Barn described above. Blocking between the vertical studs is used to support the 1x12 vertical siding.

**Required Strengthening:**

**Continued Private Commercial Use** – If the structure will continue to be used for private commercial purposes, the building code does not require any upgrades to the existing exterior walls. However, because of the three large door openings at the north elevation of the structure, a wood bracing system is recommended along this line.

**For Use as Public Space** – Same as above. Additionally, the exterior vertical siding is required to be in good condition to allow for adequate nailing. Proper nailing is essential for shear wall performance. It is estimated that up to 50% of the wood siding will need to be removed and replaced for the wood shear wall system. It is also estimated that approximately 5% of the wall framing will require replacement due to weather intrusion at the damaged siding. The entire exterior will require re-painting to help preserve the condition of the wood.

**Wall Bracing**

At each of the two interior lines of posts, a shear wall has been added [Figure 13]. It is unclear as to when and why the shear walls were added, however they do provide a significant amount of stiffness to the structure.

**Required Strengthening:**

**Continued Private Commercial Use** – If the structure will continue to be used for private commercial purposes, the building code does not require any upgrades to the existing exterior walls. However, if a plywood roof diaphragm is added at a later date, proper blocking and shear transfer detailing will be required.

**For Use as Public Space** – Same as above.

**Foundations**

The Old Barn bears on an undocumented concrete slab-on-grade foundation. The slab-on-grade appears to be in good shape, and no differential building settlement is noticeable.

**Required Strengthening:**
Continued Private Commercial Use – In order to resist the design lateral loads at the new bracing elements required at the north elevation, it is likely that several pad footings underpinning the existing slab-on-grade will be required.

For Use as Public Space – Same as above.

CREAMERY HOUSE

The Creamery House [Figure 14] is an existing wood-framed structure in a state of disrepair. Years of abandonment have made it unfeasible for renovation [Figures 15 through 18]. Among the issues are the following:

- All exterior siding requires replacement
- There are no wood studs in the majority of the walls. The siding, which has no bearing capacity, is currently supporting the majority of the roof loads.
- The roof framing is undersized and severely damaged.
- The floor framing is undersized and severely damaged.
- The wood post-and-beam foundation system is supported on rocks or soil and has failed.

Required Strengthening:

The Creamery House is an unsafe building in a state of disrepair, and the materials are unsalvageable for structure purposes. It is recommended that the structure be properly documented and demolished.
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Figure 1 – Main House

Figure 2 – Main House roof joists w/ mid-span bracing
Figure 3 – Unbraced wood cripple wall with redwood sill

Figure 4 – Dairy (Round-Nosed) Barn
Figure 5 – Dairy Barn roof framing

Figure 6 – Dairy Barn exterior wall framing
Figure 7 – Lack of wood bracing at main western entrance to the Dairy Barn
Figure 8 – Bracing at interior line of wood posts
Figure 9 – Interior Dairy Barn posts bearing on soil
Figure 10 – Old Barn

Figure 11 – Old Barn roof framing
Figure 12 – Old Barn exterior wall framing

Figure 13 – Full-height plywood shear wall (left & right of photo)
Figure 14 – Creamery House

Figure 15 – Deterioration of Creamery House
Figure 16 – Deterioration of Creamery House

Figure 17 – Creamery House foundation
Figure 18 – Deterioration of Creamery House
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BACKGROUND/PROPOSAL

The proposed project includes the dedication of 3.6 acres to the City of San Luis Obispo as the Froom Ranch Trailhead Public Park. The main portion of the Park consisting of 2.9 acres would incorporate the most significant historic structures on the property. The remainder of the Park area (0.7 acres) is an open space and drainage channel that will act as a physical and visual buffer between the main park area and the shopping center to the north.

A Historic Resource Assessment documented seven existing structures as historically significant for their association with the dairy industry and Froom family and as contributors to a potential historic district referred to as the Froom Ranch Complex: Main Residence, Creamery/House, Round-Nose Dairy Barn, Shed, Bunkhouse, Old Barn, and Granary.

Of these seven existing structures, three buildings, the Main Residence, Creamery/House, and Round-Nose Dairy Barn, were deemed to be primary contributors to the potential historic district as they exhibited more unique architectural features and greater historic significance from their association with the Froom family and dairy industry of San Luis Obispo County.

The Shed, Bunkhouse, Old Barn, and Granary and non-significant additions were identified as secondary contributors in terms of their architectural integrity and ability to convey association with the dairy industry and Froom family. These non-significant structures and additions would be thoroughly documented consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (SIO Standards) prior to demolition.

Due to the presence of a trace of the Los Osos earthquake fault which runs beneath the Dairy Barn, the proposed project proposes to reconstruct the architecturally significant Dairy Barn at a new location slightly downhill and to the east, which is outside of the required setback from the fault. In addition, the two other architecturally significant buildings, the Main Residence and Creamery, would also be relocated further to the east to maintain their same relative horizontal spacing. To maintain the visual hierarchy of these three buildings, grade changes would be created between the structures to mimic their existing vertical relationship.

OBJECTIVES

PRESCRIBE THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

1. Historic Preservation - Retain the three most significant historic structures which are the Main Residence, Creamery/House, and Round-Nose Dairy Barn, into the City Trailhead Park for adaptive reuse.
3. Retain Physical Relationship Between Buildings - Maintain the same horizontal spacing between buildings with their relocation.
4. Preserve Character-Defining Features of Buildings - Reconstruct all character-defining features using historically accurate materials, including salvaged and reused materials where feasible.

MAINTAIN EXISTING HISTORIC VIEWSHED

5. Recreate the Vertical Relationship between Buildings - While the Froom Ranch complex will be re-graded, the existing vertical relationship between the three primary contributing buildings will be mimicked with the Main Residence at the lowest elevation, the Creamery/House at the middle elevation, and the Round-Nose Dairy Barn at the highest elevation.
6. Provide Accessibility - Grading will maintain the general slopes up from east to west across the park site, mimicking existing grades, but also allowing for complying accessibility to and between buildings.
7. Retain the Off-Site View Corridors - Open views will be maintained from the roundabout into the park area of the three historic buildings beyond.
8. Preserve the Open Atmosphere - The landscaping for the park will primarily consist of low-growing and drought-tolerant native grasses to mimic the historic setting of the ranch. Drought-tolerant trees and shrubs will be strategically placed in informal groupings behind the historic structures.
9. Incorporate the Palm Tree - The Main Residence will include one prominently located palm tree near the front of the house to mimic the historic setting.
10. Select Historically Appropriate Site Details - Lighting and fencing should be historically accurate to the Froom Ranch setting.

EDUCATE PARK VISITORS

11. Create Plazas to Complement Historic Buildings - A small series of plazas are proposed on the back sides of the buildings to create a sense of entry and gathering spaces, but not detract from the natural setting.
12. Educate Park Visitors - Interpretive and directional signs are proposed throughout the Trailhead Park to educate and direct park visitors. Signage near plazas would contain information on building history and function.
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