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Additional Historic Photo 11: Main house, east elevation, view northwest (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
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Additional Historic Photo 23-24: Main house, central courtyard, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 25: Main house, central courtyard, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 26: Main house, central courtyard, view north (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 27: Main house, central courtyard, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 28: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 29: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 30: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 31: Entry gate from East Valley Road, view northeast (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 32: Drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 33: Drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 34: Drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 35: Drive to Main house through orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 36: Drive to Main house, view north toward Main Office (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 37: Detail of stone curb and gutter along drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 38: Detail of stone wall along drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 39: Main house, entry court, view west (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 40: Main house, east elevation (left), view southwest (Huntington Library,
Additional Historic Photo 41: Main house, south elevation, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 42: Main house, south elevation, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 43: Main house, south elevation, note orchard, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 44: Main house, south elevation, note orchard, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 45: Main house, south elevation, note orchard, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 46: Main house, south elevation, balcony off living room, view east (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 47: Main house, east parterre, view northeast toward orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 48: Main house, east parterre, view northeast toward orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 49: Main house, east parterre, view northeast toward orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 50: Main house, north garden, view southeast (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 51: Main house, north garden, view northwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 52: Main house, north garden, view northwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 53: Main house, north garden detail (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 54: Main house, west elevation of north wing, view south (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 55: Main house, terrace above entry court view east (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 56: Main house, north wing, terrace above entry court view southwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 57: Main house, pebble paving (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 58: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 59: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 60: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 61: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 62: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 63: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 64: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 65: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 66: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 67: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 68-69: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

*All maps and photos from Sotheby’s International Realty, 2014, unless otherwise indicated.*
March 29, 2018

Mr. Howard Wittausch, Chair  
Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission  
County of Santa Barbara  
123 E. Anapamu Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Re: Revised Landmark Nomination: Rancho San Carlos Estate

Dear Chair Wittausch and Members of the Commission:

Attached please find a revised nomination application for the Rancho San Carlos Estate at 2500 East Valley Road for designation as a County of Santa Barbara Historic Landmark. This revised application incorporates information provided by Post-Hazeltine’s Peer Review of the original application, responses to questions and suggestions posed at the April 9th hearing, and includes additional research requested by the owner and this Commission.

The 227-acre Rancho San Carlos Estate is a self-sufficient “working estate” built over a three-year period between 1928-1931 for Ann and Pete Jackson. The Estate was designed in the grand tradition containing a Main House, Round Barn, Office, Shop, Gas Station and six (6) cottages attributed to Reginald Johnson, a nationally known architect. According to information provided by the Jackson Family, three nationally-known landscape architects were involved in designing the Estate landscaping. Lockwood De Forest, Jr. was responsible for the main entrance planting plan and cottage landscaping. Florence Yoch, a nationally known landscape designer personally selected by Mrs. Jackson, has been credited with the interior courtyard landscaping and formal gardens around the Main House. Ralph Stevens, another nationally known landscape designer, also contributed to the landscaping. The Estate was a working farm, as well as a residential compound, with 100 acres of historic orchards approaching their centennial year and pastures supporting up to 100 horses at different times during its period of significance.

The Rancho San Carlos Estate is the largest remaining estate in the Montecito area and one of few remaining intact examples from the period of great estate building prior to World War II. The Estate has been evaluated for historic significance by four different sets of architectural historians since 1995, including a 2018 study conducted on behalf of the Jackson Family. The reports are unanimous in concluding the Estate is eligible for designation as a
Santa Barbara County Historic Landmark under multiple criteria. A 2016 Report by Dr. Ronald Nye concluded the Estate was an “exceptional example of an equestrian and citrus ranch complex dating to the period 1920s-1940s and an increasingly rare surviving example of its type.” (Phase I-2 Historic Resources Survey, p.11.)

The Rancho San Carlos Estate also retains an unusually high degree of historical and architectural integrity. The property has not been subdivided and, except for a single employee cottage destroyed by fire in 1969, and rebuilt in 1972, no habitable structures have been added to the Estate since approximately 1931. The orchards, pastures and landscaping largely retain their original configuration, with only minor changes. Even the interiors of the Main House retain their decorations and furnishing from prior to 1945. Rancho San Carlos is a unique example of an important period in the history of Santa Barbara, as identified in the Montecito Community Plan, both because of its extraordinary architectural pedigree and its survival as a unified “working estate” occupied for almost a century by a single family.

Four different independent professional historic reviews have found that the Rancho San Carlos is eligible for Listing as a Historic Landmark under multiple criteria:

**DESIGNATION SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eligible Under Criterion A</th>
<th>Eligible Under Criterion D</th>
<th>Eligible Under Criterion E</th>
<th>Eligible As Unified Estate</th>
<th>Retains Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post/Hazeltine Associates (2018)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes - All R. Johnson designs; main estate drive; EVR frontage; other unspecified elements, including Yoch and Stevens landscapes.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattel Architecture (2017)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Nye, Ph.D. (2016)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Barbara (1995)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SANTA BARBARA COUNTY HISTORIC LANDMARK CRITERIA**

**Criterion A.** *It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the County’s cultural, social, economic, political, archaeological, aesthetic, engineering, architectural or national history.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post/Hazeltine Associates (2018)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>“The property has a direct association with the theme of great estates, which is a historic theme identified by the County for the Montecito area between 1918 and 1945 (County of Santa Barbara Resource Management Department, Cultural Resource Guidelines, Historic Resources Element 1986, revised 1993). The connection with this theme is substantive and spans the period between the Jacksons purchase of the property [in] 1927 and 1945.” p.14.</td>
<td>Review of Historic Landmark Nomination of Rancho San Carlos Estate (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattel Architecture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>As one of the last surviving and largest, intact estates from the beginning of the twentieth century, Rancho San Carlos</td>
<td>Historic Landmark Nomination Package</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2017) reflects the development of Montecito as the final expression of the Gilded Age under this criterion. p.29.

Ronald Nye, Ph.D. (2016) Yes “The ranch has a direct association with a pattern of events recognized as the era of great estate building in Montecito and Southern California during the years 1890-1945.” pp.9-13.

Santa Barbara County (1995) Yes “Conversations with the Montecito History Committee indicate that the entire San Carlos and Featherhill Ranches are considered to have great historic interest given the individuals who have lived on the ranch in the past, the nature of operations onsite, and the historic structures.” p.13.

Phase I-2 Historic Resources Survey, 2500 East Valley Road, certified May 26, 2016 (Exhibit 5 to Nomination)

Criterion D.  It is representative of the work of a notable builder, designer, or architect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chattel Architecture (2017) Yes “The Main house and office, and possibly other buildings on the estate, were designed by master architect Reginald Johnson. ... The landscape design is attributed to three nationally known landscape architects, Ralph Stevens, Florence Yoch and Lockwood De Forest, Jr. Each of these architects is responsible for a discrete portion of the overall designed landscape.”</td>
<td>Historic Landmark Nomination Package (2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Nye, Ph.D. (2016) Yes “Reginald D. Johnson (1882-1952), the designer of the Rancho San Carlos estate house and additional structures on the ranch, is recognized as one of the most distinguished architects to have practiced in Santa Barbara and Southern California. Lockwood De Forest, Jr. (1896-1949), a celebrated landscape architect, designed the Rancho San Carlos grounds and gardens.” p. 11.</td>
<td>Phase I-2 Historic Resources Survey, 2500 East Valley Road, certified May 26, 2016 (Exhibit 5 to Nomination)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion E. It contributes to the significance of a historic area, being a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic, prehistoric, archaeological, or scenic properties, or thematically related grouping of properties, which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan or physical development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

i The conclusions of the Nye Report were not challenged by the owners of the property or members of the Jackson Family during the formal certification process.

ii With respect to County Criterion C, Post/Hazeltine also found “[t]he house, stables and other elements of the estate designed by Reginald Johnson, an architect of national significance, along with the main estate drive, the East Valley Road street frontage and with some of the other elements of the property, meet this criterion.”

iii The remainder of this sentence argues that in commissioning Rancho San Carlos the Jacksons were not motivated by aesthetic concerns and the Estate therefore did not reflect a “single aesthetic vision.” However, Criterion E requires only that the property be “unified aesthetically by plan or physical development,” which clearly applies to the Rancho San Carlos Estate.
and development.” p. 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Critical Criterion</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Critical Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chattel Architecture (2017)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>“Rancho San Carlos is a geographically definable grouping of buildings, structures and landscape features that are unified by physical development. … The buildings and landscape features of Rancho San Carlos relate to each other both visually and functionally. The property has been operated as a unified entity since 1927, is remarkably unchanged since that time, and its historic residential agricultural, and equestrian functions are clearly conveyed by its physical character.” p. 30.</td>
<td>Historic Landmark Nomination Package (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Nye, Ph.D. (2016)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>“[T]he ranch has been operated as a unified entity since 1927 and has retained the historical arrangement of its natural features and its functioning activities that was begun at that time. This includes its historical orchard growing, horse raising, ranch maintenance, and residential living functions, which based on this initial review, appear to be largely unchanged.” p. 13.</td>
<td>Phase I-2 Historic Resources Survey, 2500 East Valley Road, certified May 26, 2016 (Exhibit 5 to Nomination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Barbara (1995)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Palmer Jackson/95-GP-003; 95-RZ-003 Initial Study (1995)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Criterion:  

The property retains physical integrity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post/Hazeltine Associates (2018)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>“Post/Hazeltine concurs that most of the nominated property's buildings appear to retain a good to high level of integrity for the period of significance (1927-1945).” p. 9. “However, the estate as a whole does appear to maintain sufficient integrity to convey its overall appearance during the period.” p. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattel Architecture (2017)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>“The subject property appears to have remained remarkably intact from 1927 to 1931, the dates between which the Jackson purchased the majority of the property, designed the layout of the grounds, and constructed most of the buildings and the Main house, through today.” p. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Nye, Ph.D. (2016)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>“The ranch has retained its integrity of location and setting because it remains in its original place, although its neighborhood has been impacted somewhat by nearby semi-rural residential development. The ranch estate house, round barn, and other structures designed by Reginald D. Johnson appear to reflect their original plans with few or no substantial alterations. The operating portions of the ranch, in addition, including its orchards, landscaping, horse facilities and overall spatial organization, appear to have changed little since the 1930s. It therefore has retained a high level of design integrity. The Johnson-designed structures appear to have retained most if not all of their original building materials as well as their features exhibiting high levels of workmanship. Likewise, the ranch’s orchards, landscaping, and natural features have retained their original historic horticultural and visual characteristics. The ranch has retained a high level of integrity for its materials and workmanship qualities.” p. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Barbara (1995)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The enclosed revised Nomination Form includes all of the information required under Section V.2. of the Historic Advisory Commission By-Laws. It includes the boundaries of the property, a discussion of associated historic cultural features, description of historic and modern features with their current historical and architectural integrity levels, assessor parcel numbers, legal description, and an extensive discussion of the historical importance of the property and
how it meets the criteria of County Code Chapter 18A. Additional information supporting the Nomination is contained in the recent Phase 1-2 Historic Resources Survey.

The Rancho San Carlos Estate continues to be for sale as a residential estate. Marketing materials recognize the historic significance of the Estate, including the Main House, equestrian facilities, outbuildings and orchards. However, the marketing materials also advertise it as containing 30 legal parcels each with a certificate of compliance. The realtor’s website even includes a map showing the parcel boundaries.

The East Valley Preservation Association recognizes that change will come to the property over time and under new ownership. However, to ensure that any future subdivision or development respects the historic character of the property, the attached Nomination is supported by proposed conditions to protect the historic character of the Estate. As recommended by the County Landmark Ordinance, these proposed conditions include:

1. Demolition or removal of historic elements of the Estate will require HLAC consent, including imposition of reasonable conditions (County Code, Sec. 18A-5(a));
2. Alteration of historic elements, other than normal maintenance and repair, will require HLAC review and imposition of reasonable condition before plan approval (County Code, Sec. 18A-5(b));
3. New construction within the Estate will require HLAC review and imposition of reasonable conditions to protect historic character (County Code, Sec. 18A-5(c)); and
4. If required by the Board of Supervisors, the proposed specific plan will require a comprehensive redevelopment plan for the entire Estate before approval of any applications for subdivision or new construction (County Code, Sec. 18A-5(d)).

The East Valley Preservation Association welcomes this opportunity to honor one of the historic jewels of Montecito and Santa Barbara County. We appreciate the new information provided by the Jackson Family through the Post-Hazeltine review. Our community is very fortunate to have an historical, architectural, agricultural and visual resource of this magnitude and importance in our community, and we respectfully request that the Commission join us in recognizing the significance of this unique property.

Sincerely,

Mary Rose, for
East Valley Preservation Association

Enclosures

cc: Dianne Black, Interim Director, Planning & Development Department
    David Villalobos, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Department
EXHIBIT B
July 11, 2017

Mr. Howard Wittausch, Chair
Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission
County of Santa Barbara
123 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101-2058

Re: Nomination of Rancho San Carlos Estate as Historic Landmark
County Code Chapter 18A

Dear Chairman Wittausch:

The East Valley Preservation Association is pleased to nominate the Rancho San Carlos Estate at 2500 East Valley Road for designation as a County of Santa Barbara Historic Landmark. From its construction, starting in 1928, and continuing through today, the Rancho San Carlos Estate has been recognized as a premier historic and architectural gem of local, regional and national significance. The combination of masterful architectural design, nationally-known polo and equestrian facilities, historic citrus orchards and an extraordinary natural setting on 237 acres makes Rancho San Carlos a unique community asset.

The Rancho San Carlos Estate has been recognized for its historical significance on multiple occasions. In 1992, the County identified the Estate as a potential historic site in the Montecito Planning Area. (Montecito Community Plan (MCP) Update 92-EIR-03, Figure 36, Appendix D.) At the same time, the County identified its location on East Valley Road as the centerpiece of a scenic view corridor offering unmatched mid-range and distant views. (MCP Update, Figure 37.) In 1995, the County recognized the historic character of the Estate, as well as its “great historic interest given the individuals who have lived on the ranch in the past, the nature of operations onsite, and the historic structures.” (95-GP-003; 95-RZ-003 Initial Study, p. 13.)

More recently, the entire Rancho San Carlos Estate has been certified as having “exceptional” historical significance under local Santa Barbara County criteria due to its: “historical integrity; association with the great estate building pattern of events; California Monterey Revival Style structures and their architect, Reginald D. Johnson; exemplification of a great estate era ranch complex; representative structural, horticultural, and natural materials and fabric; embodiment of the broad historic
theme of great estate building; and ability to convey a bygone historical era.” (Phase 1-2 Historic Resources Survey” for Fire Station No. 3 Final EIR, Appendix N, Montecito Fire Protection District, certified June 27, 2016.) The Historic Resources Survey also found that the Rancho San Carlos Estate meets Criteria A and C for listing on both the California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places, due to its contribution to the broad patterns of history and its embodiment of ranch development styles through the work of a master architect. In addition, the Estate was determined to qualify as an historic district under National Park Service criteria. (Historic Resources Survey, pp. 12-14.)

The Rancho San Carlos Estate is exceptionally deserving of local Historic Landmark Designation as a “place, site, building, structure and district.” The enclosed Nomination Form details the Estate’s full satisfaction of at least six criteria for designation under Section 18A-3 of the County Code.

(a) As a reflection of the great period of estate development and architectural expression in Montecito, Rancho San Carlos exemplifies special elements of the county’s cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering and architectural history under Criterion A;

(b) As the primary residence, horse and dog breeding facilities and polo practice fields for Ann and Peter Jackson, Rancho San Carlos is identified with persons significant in local, state and national history under Criterion B;

(c) As a reflection of the lifestyle, tastes, interests and choices of the socially and financially prominent in early-to-mid twentieth century Santa Barbara County, Rancho San Carlos embodies the distinctive characteristics of the Monterey and Spanish Colonial Revival architectural styles under Criterion C;

(d) As the work of master architect Reginald Johnson and master landscape architect Lockwood de Forest, Jr., Rancho San Carlos is representative of the work of two notable designers and architects under Criterion D;

(e) As a geographically-definable and functionally-related group of buildings and landscape features, Rancho San Carlos consists of a thematically related grouping of properties that contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan and physical development under Criterion E;

(f) As a unique combination of citrus orchards, naturalistic landscaping, mature natural habitats, stylish architecture and mountain backdrops, Rancho San Carlos is not only a familiar visual feature of Santa Barbara County, it offers unparalleled views along East Valley Road, a scenic corridor identified in the Montecito Community Plan, under Criterion F;

(g) As an architect-designed mansion and associated agricultural-equestrian estate surviving almost unchanged for more than 85 years, Rancho San Carlos embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials and craftsmanship that represent significant structural and architectural achievements under Criterion G;

(h) As one of the only surviving large residential-equestrian-agricultural estates from early-to-mid twentieth century and one of the best examples of Reginald Johnson’s work, Rancho San Carlos is one of the few remaining intact examples possessing the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural and historical type under Criterion I.

The enclosed Nomination Form includes all of the information required under Section V.2. of the Historic Advisory Commission By-Laws. It includes the boundaries of the property, a discussion of associated
historic cultural features, a description of historic and modern features with their current historical and architectural integrity levels, assessor parcel numbers, legal description, and an extensive discussion of the historical importance of the property and how it meets the criteria of County Code Chapter 18A. Additional information supporting the Nomination is contained in the recent Phase 1-2 Historic Resources Survey.

The Rancho San Carlos Estate is currently for listed for sale as a residential estate. Marketing materials recognize the historic significance of the Estate, including the Main House, equestrian facilities, outbuildings and orchards. However, the marketing materials also advertise it as containing 30 legal parcels each with a certificate of compliance. To ensure that any future subdivision or development respects the historic character of the property, the attached Nomination is supported by proposed conditions to protect the historic character of the Estate.

The East Valley Preservation Association welcomes this opportunity to honor one of the historic jewels of Montecito and Santa Barbara County. We are very fortunate to have an historical, architectural, agricultural and visual resource of this magnitude and importance in our community, and we respectfully request that the Commission join us in recognizing the significance of this unique property.

Sincerely,

Mary Rose
East Valley Preservation Association

Enclosures:

1. Nomination Summary
2. Nomination Form
3. Assessor’s Map and Legal Description
4. Proposed Special Designation Conditions
6. Rancho San Carlos Marketing Materials, Sotheby’s International
7. Montecito Community Plan Update 92-EIR-03, pp. 5-192-199 and Figure 36
8. Montecito Community Plan Update, Appendix D
9. Montecito Community Plan Update 92-EIR-03, Figure 37
11. Owner Notification Letter

cc: Glenn Russell, Ph.D., Director, Planning & Development Department (without enclosures)
Dianne Black, Assistant Director, Planning & Development Department (without enclosures)
**Santa Barbara County Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission**

**NOMINATION FORM FOR DESIGNATION OF:**

- [x] HISTORIC LANDMARK  
  OR  
- [ ] PLACE OF HISTORIC MERIT

*(Please read the instructions before preparing form, and use continuation pages as necessary.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Address and Assessor's Parcel Number(s) of site:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2500 East Valley Road  
  APN Nos:  155-030-045; 155-070-001; 155-070-002; 155-070-003; 155-070-007; and 155-070-008 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Current owner’s name, address, and telephone number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Petan Company  
  2500 East Valley Road, Montecito, CA  93108  
  805-969-2258 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Name of property:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rancho San Carlos Estate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Property’s historical name and name of original owner:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| "Rancho San Carlos Estate" and "The Jackson Place"  
  Ann and Peter Jackson (Mr. and Mrs. Charles Hervey Jackson, Jr.) |

| 5. Type of resource (check one): [ ] building; [ ] other structure; [ ] site or feature; [ ] cultural landscape; [ ] object; [x] other  
  Site or district including multiple structures within designed and planted cultural landscape. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Date of construction or age:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920-1972 - period of significance: 1928-1945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Architect and architectural style:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Architect: Reginald Johnson  
  Style: Monterey Revival  
  Landscape Architect: Lockwood de Forest, Jr., Ralph T. Stevens, Florence Yoch |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Physical description of the nominated property:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See attached.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Physical alterations to the nominated property and its current historical and architectural integrity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See attached.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Description of current setting, including but not limited to associated historic cultural features such as vegetation, walls, roads, as applicable:

See attached.

11. Provide a brief history of the nominated property and discuss its historical importance (include references and use continuation pages if needed):

See attached.

12. Discuss why the nominated property meets one or more of the eligibility criteria established by the County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 18A, Section 18A-3. (Consult the County Landmark Information Sheet and use continuation pages if needed):

See attached.

13. Summarize the case for the designation of this property as a [x] Landmark or [ ] Place of Historic Merit:

See attached.

14. [x] Published map with the property location marked.

See Item 16, Maps 1-4

15. [x] Map or survey of the property boundaries (Assessor’s Parcel Map is acceptable). Include the boundaries of those portions or elements that are proposed to be designated.

See Item 16, Map 3

16. Number and description of photographs enclosed. Where feasible, provide views of those features that make the property worthy, as well as views of the current neighborhood setting.

See attached listing.

17. Name, address, telephone number, and email address of person or entity submitting this nomination:

   East Valley Preservation Association c/o Mary Rose & Associates
   P.O. Box 90610, Santa Barbara, CA 93190
   805-965-3952 (Nomination prepared by Chattel, Inc.)

18. [x] I believe that the statements made herein are true and complete.

   (Authorized signature of individual or entity representative submitting this nomination)

   Mary Rose

19. Date of nomination:

   June 11, 2017
8. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE NOMINATED PROPERTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building/Feature</th>
<th>Date of Construction*</th>
<th>Contributing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Main House</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Office</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Octagonal Barn</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Stables</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Arena</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Garage</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cottages:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage A</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage B</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage C</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cottages:</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage E</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage for Cottage E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage F</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage G/H</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage for Cottage G/H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage I</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage J</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage K</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Cottage L</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Shop</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn 1</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn 2</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennels</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Landscape features, including orchards, internal roads, stone walls, and formal gardens surrounding main house</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Building Dates from Santa Barbara County Permit/Case Files for 95-RZ-003

The expansive Rancho San Carlos Estate is located at 2500 East Valley Road (also known as State Highway 192) and 900 Romero Canyon Road, in Montecito, an unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County, California. The property consists of buildings and grounds, including formal and informal gardens, orchards, pasture land and natural habitats, divided generally into quadrants, with the southeast quadrant devoted to equestrian uses, the northeast quadrant containing natural open space and some higher-elevation orchards, the southwest quadrant reserved for citrus orchards and the Main house located in the northwest quadrant away from the Estate entrances. In addition to the tightly-grouped equestrian buildings in the southeast quadrant, other clusters of buildings are arranged in nodes throughout the site. (Maps 1-2)
The Main house is very private, located at the end of a long drive through the orchards, just north of the center of the property. (Contemporary Photo 3 and Additional Contemporary Photo 6). The Main house is surrounded on three sides by orchards. It is quite some distance from East Valley Road and not visible from it, with dog kennels and a large garage immediately to the north. In addition to a servant’s wing in the Main house, staff housing (known as “cottages”) is located north and west of the Main house. Additional groupings of cottages lie to the south: in the equestrian area, near the main gate, and at the western edge of the property. A ranch office is sited slightly south of the Main house. Other buildings on the property include a gas station and shop, positioned just north of East Valley Road between the main and service gates. (Map 1)

With the exception of the formal garden associated with the Main house, ornamental plantings surrounding the various buildings are relatively informal, and take full advantage of the numerous oaks and other trees on the property. In several places, stones and boulders are used to create small retaining walls. Curbs, where present, appear to be granite. The road system was in place by 1928, and is well maintained.

1. Main house (Date of Construction 1931, Maps 5-6, Contemporary photos 4-11, Additional Contemporary Photos 3-9)¹

   **Exterior**

Set on a plateau near the center of the property that affords views of both the Pacific Ocean and the mountains, the Reginald Johnson-designed Main house comprises approximately 29,483 square feet and over thirty rooms, arranged in an irregular, rambling, roughly rectangular plan around a central, enclosed courtyard. Additional courts, open on one or two sides, plus terraces and gardens, are accessed from the radiating wings of the central core of the building, demonstrating a sensitive approach to the topography of the site that maximizes views and cross-breezes. One and two stories in height, with a partial basement, the house is an elegant and subdued example of the Monterey Revival style, combining elements derived from both the Spanish Colonial and Georgian revivals. A complex front-and side-gabled roof, low-pitched and covered with flat terracotta tiles laid in a shingled pattern, caps the masonry structure. Ridgelines are marked by barrel tiles. Whitewashed, with a hint of the red brick peeking through the paint, the building is trimmed with wood and wrought iron detailing. Corners are subtly emphasized by the use of larger, sandstone masonry units that suggest quoining in their arrangement. Roof treatment includes a molded eave with dentil-like brackets in the overhang. Numerous red brick chimneys with corbeled caps rise above the roof. Windows are recessed, and are flat-headed, wood or steel-framed, multi-light, double casements in type, many adorned with wooden shutters held in place by wrought iron brackets. Lintels are suggested by courses of soldier bricks atop the recesses. Exterior lighting includes wrought iron and glass fixtures, both

¹ The following description is based on referenced maps and contemporary photographs available to the public.
lanterns suspended on chains and attached sconces.

The primary elevation faces west and is accessed from the west via a large, rectangular, brick-paved entry court ringed by a stone wall. Beyond the wall, the court is open to the south, where gardens and orchards slope away from the house. On the north, the stone wall supports a berm, which is topped by an open court and a one-story wing set atop a natural terrace at the same height as the second story of the central wing of the house and housing the children’s rooms. Forming the eastern edge of the entry court, the primary elevation is one-story, side-gabled, and nearly symmetrical. A centered and recessed, three-bay porch is defined by paired posts and a wrought iron railing. The posts are detailed with recessed panels and molded caps and bases. Opening onto the central bay, the main entry is elaborately framed by fluted pilasters with embellished caps and a denticulate cornice. Stone quoins outline the opening, which is topped by a five-light transom. Rectangular and X-patterned paneling distinguishes the front door. Paired casement windows overlook the side bays of the porch. Larger, paired casement windows articulate one bay north of the porch and two bays south of the porch. A third bay on the south is located in the recessed, front-gabled, south wing. The façade of the two-story, front-gabled north wing is also slightly set back from the primary elevation and features an elongated, stone-framed, double-casement window that illuminates the main interior staircase.

The one-story south elevation is L-shaped, consisting of a long, side-gabled wing and a projecting, front-gabled wing at the east end (Contemporary Photo 5). An elevated terrace, enclosed by a wrought iron railing, fills the open space of the “L.” Three pairs of French doors open from the living room onto the terrace, allowing for ocean views and breezes. Another terrace, accessed by an exterior staircase, is located east of the projecting leg of the “L.”

The east elevation overlooks a formal garden, which is encircled by a low stone wall and divided geometrically into parterres. This elevation is varied in design, with one-story sections on the south and across the center and a two-story service wing on the north, which projects eastward much of the depth of the garden (Contemporary Photos 5-6). An elevated terrace lines the south side of the service wing paralleling the garden. Roof configurations include front and side gables plus a small, hipped roof section. The architectural focal point of the east elevation is the front-gabled dining room, which features a pair of French doors opening onto an iron-railed balcony. Other fenestration includes the double casement windows flanked by shutters that are evident elsewhere on the residence.

The north elevation is highly irregular, embracing the motor court at the east end and stepping towards the north in increments from east to west (Contemporary Photos 5-6). Paved in cobblestones, the L-shaped motor court is bounded by the two-story service wing on the south, storage rooms and a five-car garage on the north, and the two-story north wing on the west. Because of the sloped site, the motor court is depressed below ground level on the north. The slope allows the second story of the north wing to open onto a large lawn area at grade level.
This wing is characterized by a side-gabled roof, several paired casement windows framed by shutters, and a small porch providing access from the master suite hallway. Extending northward at the west end of the north wing, the one-story guest wing and children’s wing are similarly fenestrated and topped by gabled and hipped roofs.

Interior

Interior spaces are generously proportioned, with multiple access points to the exterior courtyards, terraces, and gardens available from each wing. Nearly all corridors are single-loaded, facilitating access to the exterior and cross-ventilation.² The central courtyard is the core of the floor plan. Spaces within each wing are functionally related, with public rooms including main gallery (corridor), ladies’ and gentlemen’s lounges, living room, library, and dining room, arranged west and south of the central courtyard. Service spaces occupy the east wing and the lower level of the north wing. The north wing extends east beyond the central courtyard (as previously described with the respect to the east elevation), with employee living quarters beyond the kitchens. The master suite, including bedroom, dressing (sitting) room, and his and her bathrooms, comprises the second story of the north wing and overlooks the central courtyard to the south and the lawn on the north. Perpendicular to the north wing, the guest wing incorporates two bedroom suites. Further to the west, the L-shaped children’s wing accommodates three bedrooms and a playroom. The basement contains a pub and badminton court. The main staircase is located in the northwest corner of the central core, with a secondary staircase connecting the service wing with the master suite.

The central courtyard is square in shape and characterized by hedge-rimmed planters, scattered palm trees, and flagstone-paved pathways. An octagonal water basin marks the center. Loggias edge the courtyard on the west and east. On the north, an exterior staircase leads up past the stone³-veneered lower story and brick upper level to a tower which rises over the northeast corner of the space and which contains a small studio (office) room beneath the cupola. An attached second story balcony spans most of the south face of the north wing, a signature of the Monterey Revival style. Paired posts support the roof overhang that shades the balcony. The balcony is enclosed by an iron railing and supported beneath by brackets. Several pairs of shutter-framed, casement windows and French doors open onto the balcony.

Oak paneling and architectural features imported from England distinguish the public spaces.⁴ The stone-paved gallery is classical in detailing, with engaged, fluted, wood piers rising to a carved triglyph-and-metope frieze topped by an intricate crown molding. Entered via an

² Prior to World War II and widespread use of air conditioning, it was common to site and design homes to take full advantage of cross-ventilation.
⁴ As described below, Architecture editor Henry H. Saylor noted in his column dated July 3, 1931 that Reginald Johnson went to England to seek out old paneling. (Alison Clark “Reginald D. Johnson,” Johnson, Kaufmann, Coate: Partners in the California Style (Scripps College Capra Press, 1992), 18.)
octagonal foyer and set a few steps lower than the gallery, the grandly scaled living room is entirely paneled, with a denticulated cornice marking the transition to the plastered ceiling. Broken pediments top doorways. Elaborate fireplaces are centered on the north and east walls of the room. Beyond the living room, the library is also generously proportioned and paneled, lined with bookcases, and contains another fireplace. Three large, tiled murals depicting historical and equestrian themes grace the barrel-vaulted hallway that parallels the living room and library, leading to the dining room. The large dining room features murals, paneling, and another fireplace. A small card room creates a transition from the grand public rooms to the service wing.

The upper level is accessed via the main staircase located at the northwest corner of the central core. Wrought iron railings edge the stairs and landing. All the family and guest bedrooms on the upper level are generously sized and have individually designed ensuite bathrooms. Nearly all the bedrooms have fireplaces. The master suite is entered via double doors set into an arched opening; most other doorways are flat-headed. Doors are paneled. Floors throughout the house are hardwood. Additional interior detailing includes extensive but subdued use of moldings, wainscoting, and baseboards. Several spaces feature original wallpaper. Lighting fixtures, including sconces and chandeliers, also appear to be original.

In the basement, the pub features an imported wood bar within an arched recess, stone and quarry tile floors, and a beamed ceiling. Constructed during Prohibition, the pub is accessed by a door concealed in the paneling of a small hallway outside the living room.

The northeast service wing contains the large main kitchen and an equally sizable preparation room, all with period cupboards and appliances and stainless steel countertops. Kitchen appliances have not been updated over time. Facilities for employees include several bedrooms, shared bathrooms, an employee dining room and lounge, and a self-contained employee apartment complete with fireplace. Laundry facilities are located in the lower level of the north wing.

The Main house is remarkably intact, with no apparent alterations to design, materials, or floor plan. Original finishes, fixtures, and furnishings are in situ.

2. Office (Date of construction: 1928; square feet: 1,590; Contemporary Photo 39)

The office is located down-slope and south of the Main house. Also reflecting the Monterey Revival style, the office has the appearance of a one-story, single-family residence. It is constructed of whitewashed red brick and topped by a low-pitched, side-gabled roof covered in barrel-shaped terracotta tiles. Windows are deeply recessed beneath wooden lintels and are primarily steel-framed, eight-over-eight double-hung sash on the north-facing façade. The entry is offset to the east in the asymmetrically composed design. A brick chimney, flush with the
façade, rises above the roofline near the center of this elevation. Shaded by mature trees, with a paved parking area on the north, the office appears to be unaltered on the exterior.

3. Octagonal Barn (Date of construction: 1928; square feet: 3,215; Contemporary Photos 42-44)

One of the most remarkable buildings on the property, the Octagonal Barn is Spanish Colonial Revival in style, with stucco exterior walls and a tile roof. Brackets punctuate the eave lines. Not only is the Octagonal Barn notable for its architectural design by Reginald Johnson, it is also exceptionally functional. The barn consists of an outer shell containing horse stalls and an inner rotunda whose roof rises above that of the outer ring. The inner roof sits upon a drum that is banded by clerestory windows, three to each wall plane. A cupola surmounts the rotunda roof and is itself crowned by a weather vane in the shape of a polo player atop a horse. Facing west, the primary entry is via a front-gabled projection containing a large archway. Double wood doors attached by iron strap hinges and screen doors are set below a semicircular, wood spandrel. A second entry is on axis with the main entrance and faces the stable yard on the east. The outer walls are fenestrated with broad, tripartite windows which are composed of central, six-light hoppers flanked by two-light fixed windows and which are set high on the wall planes to accommodate horse stalls on the interior. Taller, multi-light windows face the stable yard. The clerestory windows are six-lights, with the center window of each group an operational hopper in type. Stalls and tack rooms are arranged around the periphery and are accessed by paneled and grilled sliding doors, opening onto the rotunda. The stalls feature walls of stained vertical wood paneling and wood floors. Hay storage is located above the stalls. Interior rotunda walls are painted vertical wood planks and the floor is covered with decomposed granite or a similar material. The roof superstructure is exposed, creating a lattice of radiating ribs that meet under an oculus below the cupola.

4. Wood/Stucco Barn (Stables) (Date of construction: 1928; square feet: 4,244; Contemporary photo 45, Additional Contemporary Photos 13-14)

East of the Octagonal Barn, the stable yard is enclosed by additional stalls housed in a one-story, gabled, squared “U”-shaped stable building with 11 stalls. Similarly designed in the Spanish Colonial Revival style by Reginald Johnson, these stables feature bracketed tile roofs, stucco walls, and symmetrical stable yard facades articulated by arched openings. The north wing is five bays wide, with a central, round-headed, screened doorway flanked by pairs of round-headed screened windows. On the east, a front gable caps the projecting central bay, which contains an archway leading to an open passageway. Blind arches with large, paneled wood doors are located to either side of the archway. It has been suggested that the Stables functioned as a foaling barn.

Both the Round Barn and the Stables appear to be substantially unaltered.
5. **Arena** (Date of construction: 1930; square feet: 11,250; Contemporary photo 50)

   Linked to the Round Barn by a broad pathway lined by chain link-fenced paddocks (installed circa 1971), the Covered Arena is a large, rectangular structure with partially open sides. The barrel-vaulted wood roof is supported by exposed bowstring trusses. A series of stout wooden posts on concrete bases regularly spaced around the exterior perimeter of the arena carry the roof. The lower third of the sides of the arena are enclosed by a horizontal wood fence. The floor of the arena is covered in dirt or sand. The Covered Arena appears to be in original condition.

6. **Garage** (Date of construction: 1928; square feet: 1,420; No photo available)

   Located north of the Main house in a copse, the Garage is a detached, one-story building accommodating multiple vehicles.

7. **Cottages A, B and C** (Date of construction: 1920-1928; square feet: 976-1715; Non-contributing)

   These three cottages are located on a separate access drive from East Valley Road along the western boundary of the property. Although they were in existence and occupied during the period of significance, they pre-dated the Jacksons’ tenure and do not appear to have been constructed as part of the estate. They may have originally been constructed as part of the adjacent Featherhill Ranch, and they are not integrated into the design of the estate as envisioned by the Jacksons and their designers Reginald Johnson, Lockwood de Forest, Jr, and Ralph Stevens. Given their location adjacent to the Orchards and historical use as worker housing, these cottages were functionally integrated into the operation of the estate, even though they were not part of the Jacksons’ building program.

8. **Cottages E, F, G, H, I and J** (Date of construction: 1928; square feet: 1,289-2,628, Additional Contemporary Photos 10-11)

   These cottages, with associated garages, were among the earliest structures built after the Jacksons purchased the estate, concurrent with construction of the equestrian facilities. They were constructed to house estate workers. Except for Cottage J, they are clustered near East Valley Road, with access provided from a separate service gate east of the main entrance. Four of the cottages are located immediately adjacent to the equestrian facilities, and they may have housed the horse trainer and stable hands employed by the family. Aerial photographs of the property suggest that these cottages and garages are designed in the Spanish Colonial Revival

---

5 Turner Schley, letter to Mr. Bob Scott, Zoning Administrator, Santa Barbara County Planning Department, February 3, 1971.
6 Census data from 1930 shows eight additional dwellings on the site, including a horse trainer Frank J. Holtzbauer.
style, with tiled, gabled roofs and stucco exterior walls.

9. **Cottage L (Date of Construction: 1920; square feet: 1,680; Additional Contemporary Photo 12)**

This L-shaped cottage sits slightly above the service road near the west gate from Romero Canyon Road. Although it pre-dated the Jacksons’ tenure, it appears to have functioned as a secondary gatehouse after the Jacksons occupied the site.7

10. **Shop and Gas Station (Date of Construction: 1928; square feet: 6,520; Contemporary photo 31)**

The Shop and Gas Station are located just north of East Valley Road, between the main and service gates to the property. These functional buildings were among the first constructed as support structures for the estate. They were an integral part of the Jacksons’ vision of Rancho San Carlos as a self-sufficient agricultural operation and country estate. This vision for the estate is illustrated in the murals on the interior of the main house.

11. **Landscape, Gardens and Orchards (Date of construction: circa 1927-1933)**

Designed in a Regionalist style by Lockwood de Forest, Jr. and Ralph Stevens, the landscape design emphasizes “capturing views of the regional landscape through the elimination of the middle ground.” The property was laid out to enhance and create mountain, sea, and property vistas and to retain areas of native oaks and vegetation.8 The agricultural and equestrian uses of the property are integrated into the topography rather than imposed upon it, and the whole tied together by the network of stone- and tree-lined internal roads. Orchards blend into the landscape without intervening fencing or separation, interspersed with areas of native vegetation. Paddocks follow the natural contours of the land. Ornamental landscaping is purposefully restricted to the areas immediately adjacent to the residences, office, and octagonal barn. The formal gardens at the Main house are defined geometrically, by box hedges in the central and entrance courts and by parterres in the east garden. Ornamental trees are strategically placed to frame views and to accent the buildings, courtyards, and terraces. Lawns are limited to the terraces around the main house and cottages. The plant palette combines native, tropical, and Mediterranean trees and shrubs. As evidenced by historic photographs, the property as a whole, which despite its impressive size still reads as a single, unified entity, retains an outstanding level of integrity.
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7 This cottage may have been affected by the landslides of January 2018.
9. PHYSICAL ALTERATIONS TO THE NOMINATED PROPERTY AND CURRENT HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY

With a period of significance ending in 1945, the subject property appears to have remained remarkably intact from 1927 to 1931, the dates between which the Jacksons purchased the majority of the property, designed the layout of the grounds, and constructed most of the buildings and the Main house, through today. Rancho San Carlos is a stunning survivor from the era of grand estate-building in Montecito that ended in 1945 with the conclusion of World War II, when estates began to be subdivided. It is the last remaining example of an intact property combining high-style architecture with an agricultural lifestyle, including the last extensive groves of citrus that were common to eastern Montecito dating back to 1880s.\(^9\)

As detailed in the following “historical sketch,” the Jacksons purchased a portion of the adjacent Feather Hill Ranch for additional orchards early in their tenure. Cottages A, B and C, are segregated from other buildings and appear to have been part of a building campaign for Feather Hill Ranch. As described above, while there have been some minor alterations to individual buildings, including recent neglect of the gardens and orchard visible from East Valley Road or aerials, there do not appear to have been alterations to the location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, or setting of most buildings on the property. As a result, the subject property retains a strong sense of time and place and is the last remaining great estate, consisting of a grand Main house and intact working orchards and agricultural lands in the Montecito area, and one of the few such estates remaining in Southern California.

10. DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT SETTING, INCLUDING ASSOCIATED HISTORIC CULTURAL FEATURES

The Rancho San Carlos Estate is 237 acres, nestled in the foothills of a small coastal mountain range, just south of the Santa Ynez Mountain range of the Los Padres National Forest. From East Valley Road, views of the western half of the property are dominated by tidy rows of citrus trees sloping gently to the north in the distance, historic stone walls, and a grand gated entry. The eastern half of the property is largely shielded from close view by oak trees along East Valley Road, but natural areas of vegetation on elevated slopes are plainly visible from Ortega Ridge Road. Although the classic Reginald Johnson-designed Main house exceeds 29,000 square feet, the general impression of the property is rural, agricultural, and human-scaled. Not only do the buildings and structures on the site have historic and architectural significance, but so does the cultural landscape consisting of large-scale orchards, natural areas, planted domestic gardens and equestrian facilities designed on a grand scale. (Contemporary Photos 1-3.)

The topography of the site dictates the locations of agricultural, equestrian, and residential uses within the property. The eastern third of the property, which contains a steep, narrow canyon running north-south to the National Forest, is largely an uncultivated landscape of trees, riparian vegetation and coastal sage scrub. The ravine of the canyon narrows as it extends to the south, with an unnamed tributary to Picay Creek creating a natural separation between the planted orchards to the west and a large equestrian facility in the southeast quadrant. The equestrian area of the property features flat and gradually sloped open fields dotted with steel-and wood-railed paddocks. A cluster of barns and a covered arena occupy a small hollow near the southeast corner of the property. To the north of the arena, adjacent to the eastern edge of the property, a low hill is encircled by a large, oval-shaped practice track. The track, which was used to train polo ponies, was constructed as early as 1930 and is prominently visible in aerial photographs. (Historic Photo 2)

The western half of the property features relatively gradual topography and has been largely dedicated to orchards for almost a century, as seen in historic aerial photographs (see Historic Photos 1-5) as well as a painted mural within the Main House. The agricultural fields are irrigated from three reservoirs located at the northwest corner of the site, fed by Romero Creek, a naturally occurring water resource located outside the property boundaries to the north. The orchards are concentrated in two areas, a narrow strip of land just east of the canyon ridgeline and south of the three water reservoirs, and a larger grouping of fields that extend north and east of the boundaries to the center of the property. Almost half the property, or approximately 100
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10 One notable feature of the Santa Ynez Mountains is that they are one of the only east-west mountain ranges in the United States.
11 It is possible the track was slightly regraded after 1967 (see Map 2 and Historic Photo 5). However, based on historic and contemporary aerial photographs, this change appears to be relatively minor.
acres, is occupied by orchards, consisting of 60 acres of lemons, 30 acres of avocados, and five acres each of limes and oranges, with an additional grove of olive trees. The orchards were among the earliest features of the property, some pre-dating the Jacksons’ ownership, visible on historic aerial photographs.

The southern boundary of the property is delineated by State Highway 192, which was originally part of State Route 150. The road was signed in 1934 and renumbered in 1964. The Montecito Community Plan adopted in 1992 (updated 1995), recognizes the scenic and historic nature of this roadway, and calls for designating East Valley Road as a State Scenic Highway as part of its implementation plan.12

The property is surrounded by stone fencing along the north edge of East Valley Road. There are two vehicular entrances on East Valley Road, a highly visible main entrance with decorative wrought iron gates and a handful of oddly-positioned palm trees located just east of the intersection with Ortega Ranch Road (see Contemporary Photo 2, Additional Historic Drawing 1, and Additional Historic Photo 31). A second gated service area is located slightly to the west, largely hidden by vegetation. A third entrance gives access from Romero Canyon Road, but appears to have been constructed at a different time and is not well integrated into the internal circulation pattern of the property.1314

Circulation patterns follow roughly the north-south orientation of the site, linking various buildings and improvements. Paved roads extend from each of the entrance gates through the property, forming a loop, with a branch to a secondary gate to Romero Canyon Road on the west. Roughly paralleling East Valley Road, another roadway links the two north-south arteries and the equestrian facilities. Additional unpaved roads service the orchards. Cut sandstone gates mark the entrances to the property as well as the entrance to the Main house (see Contemporary Photo 3, Additional Contemporary Photo 6, and Additional Historic Photos 37-38). Sandstone is a significant local material of some of the larger estates that was used to evoke a sense of permanence.15

Noted landscape architect Lockwood de Forest, Jr. is credited with designing a portion of the Rancho San Carlos grounds and gardens,16 along with Ralph Stevens17 and Florence Yoch.18
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12 Montecito Community Plan, p.23; Action VIS-M-1.3.1 p. 124. See also Figure 37, Visual Resources from the "Final Environmental Impact Report, Phase II of the Montecito Community Plan Update," prepared by the County of Santa Barbara and Envicom Corporation, June 1992.
13 The western portion of the property, which was part of the adjacent Feather Hill Ranch, was purchased in the mid-1930s from Christian R. Holmes.
14 This third entrance may have been damaged in the debris flow of January 2018.
15 The Jacksons hired local stonemason “luminaries” Joe Buzzella and the Arnoldi brothers to build both walls and buildings. Existing stone walls appear to date from an early period. (Santa Barbara Conservancy, Images of America: Stone Architecture in Santa Barbara (San Francisco: Arcadia Publishing, 2009), 103.)
16 Jackson, Charles H., Jr. house (“Rancho San Carlos”), Montecito. In the Lockwood de Forest, Jr. landscape drawings, Architecture & Design Collection, Art, Design & Architecture Museum, University of California, Santa
With the exception of the formal garden associated with the Main house, ornamental plantings surrounding the various buildings are relatively informal, and take full advantage of the numerous oaks and other trees on the property. In several places, stones and boulders are used to create small retaining walls. Curbs, where present, appear to be granite. The internal road system was in place by 1928, and is well maintained.
11.  BRIEF HISTORY OF THE NOMINATED PROPERTY

Montecito Estates

Development of Montecito paralleled growth of Santa Barbara, located adjacent to the east. As a residential community adjacent to Santa Barbara, settlement began in Montecito in the late 1800s. Santa Barbara’s real estate boom of the late 1800s was the result of construction of Stearns Wharf in 1872 and arrival of the Southern Pacific Railroad from Los Angeles in 1887. Dependable transportation allowed for a “reliable and convenient transportation link to Los Angeles” which established Santa Barbara “as the premier destination for wealthy families from the East Coast, Midwest, and Europe, especially in the winter.”

To meet demand, the Upham Hotel opened in 1871 and the Arlington Hotel opened in 1875. The Arlington Hotel was rebuilt in 1902 as a resort hotel, catering to a wealthier clientele. The Potter Hotel, another resort hostelry, also opened in 1902. Some wealthy tourists decided to purchase land and construct winter homes for themselves while maintaining their eastern homes as their permanent addresses. In Montecito, these homes took the form of grand estates for “gentleman farmers” on large tracts of land.

Montecito was originally a part of the Santa Barbara Pueblo lands with tourism and agriculture as early industries. Montecito Hot Springs Hotel (1873, destroyed by fire in 1920) was built near the largest natural hot springs and catered to tourists taking in the curative waters. Montecito also attracted horticulturists who had heard about the legendary “Big Grapevine” or “La Parra Grande,” which was said to be 14-inches in diameter and was put on display at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition in 1876. Because of the fertile soil cultivated by the early horticulturalists, tourists thought they had found a “rustic ‘Eden’” in Montecito. As David
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Romantic accounts of la Parra Grande recount the story of Senorita Marcelina Feliz, who was given a riding switch from her lover, Don Carlos de Dominguez in the late 1790s. While Marcelina moved with her parents from Los Angeles to Santa Barbara, Don Carlos went off to seek his fortune in the silver mines of Mexico. On arriving in Santa Barbara, Marcelina planted what was essentially a twig and the grape vine flourished. Two years later, Marcelina Feliz’s father decided to marry her off to a rich old man, but right before the wedding was set to take place, Don Carlos returned, having become a rich man. Marcelina and Don Carlos were married immediately. While this could have been the happy ending to the story, Don Carlos’ fortune became depleted in later years. The couple turned to the grape vine, which had continued to grow, averaging 12,000 pounds a year of Mission grapes under an arbor that spanned 10,000 square feet, drawing tourists to see the wonder. It is not known how much of this story is truth or myth created by local boosters interested in promoting agriculture in Santa Barbara. What is known is that by the 1860s, Santa Barbara County ranked third in California wine production. (Victor William Geraci, Salud!: The Rise of Santa Barbara’s Wine Industry, (Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press, 2004), 38).
Myrick noted in *Montecito & Santa Barbara: From Farms to Estates*, “Even today [1987], part of the ambience of Montecito stems from considerable acreage dedicated to agricultural use as pasture or avocado and citrus orchards.”

Large estates of wealthy Montecito residents were a final expression of the Gilded Age. On the East Coast, the Gilded Age got its name from the liberal application of gold leaf throughout mansions on Manhattan’s 5th Avenue and “cottages” of Newport, Rhode Island. While some historians date the “Gilded Age” as the period of the 1870s to 1900, others extend it to the onset of World War I in 1917. This was a period of rapid economic growth and increasing industrialization. Documented in novels by writers such as Mark Twain and Edith Wharton, this period was characterized by a large divide of income disparity. Montecito estates were financed by inherited fortunes amassed by “industrialists” and “capitalists” of the Gilded Age. Specifically, although built after World War I, Rancho San Carlos was envisioned, purchased, and created by the heir of Anthony N. Brady, an Albany, New York “capitalist” who exemplified the Gilded Age. Locales similar to Montecito that served as playgrounds for the super-rich during this period included Pasadena, California as well as Sarasota and Palm Beach, Florida.

For many heirs of large fortunes, maintenance on large estates became too costly during the Depression, and increasingly so after World War II. Rancho San Carlos is unique in that the estate has remained in the same family for the past 90 years and has not been subdivided into smaller lots, distinguishing it from most of the other large estates in Montecito, as well as regionally throughout Santa Barbara County.

In 1920, John Reginald Southworth wrote: “In this colony live many people of national and international repute …; social leaders known in all the capitals of the world; retired millionaires and famous professional leaders who have all searched the world over for a perfect spot to dwell in and have chosen Montecito as the realization of their dreams.” Some of the more recognizable East Coast and Midwestern family estates included those of the McCormick family, who inherited from Chicago native Cyrus Hall McCormick, inventor of the farm reaper; the Clark family, who inherited from William Andrews Clark, Sr., owner of mines in Montana; and the Fleischmann family, whose fortune derived from a highly successful yeast business. The estates encompassed many acres of land and included a large, typically architect-designed Main house and often formal gardens, orchards, and guest cottages. John Reginald Southworth described Montecito as “home of many wealthy eastern people, whose attractive, and in many instances, magnificent residences are found in all parts of the valley. These homes are often surrounded by a treasure of flowers and shrubs, making the whole neighborhood a delightful
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23 Myrick, 10.
24 Florida high society was photographed by one of their own, Ellen Glendinning Frazer Ordway, who took her camera to luncheons and parties beginning in the 1920s. Many of her photographs are available on the website “New York Social Diary.” (see http://www.newyorksocialdiary.com/social-history/2011/philadelphia-in-palm-beach-part-i/).
One of the earliest estates, “Mira Vista,” was constructed beginning in 1893. It “was the unchallenged show place in Montecito and was included in any tour for visiting dignitaries.”

The house and gardens “marked the beginning of the transition from an agricultural area to a rural residential community with great estates.”

By the 1920s, Montecito had become synonymous with millionaire socialites whose “whole lives revolved around polo, parties, tennis and country clubs.” Murals in the barrel-vaulted hallway in the Main house of Rancho San Carlos depict some of these themes. The three primary panels of the hand-painted tile murals identify the polo fields of the United States, the location of Rancho San Carlos proximate to Santa Barbara, and the land holdings of the estate. Smaller panels painted in a faux bas relief below each of the three main panels depict other leisure activities, including dog breeding and lounging on a beach.

Given the climate, there was a predilection for outdoor entertaining and many estates had elaborate, designed landscapes expressly for this purpose. At Rancho San Carlos, while terraces line the south and east elevations of the Main house, overlooking the orchards to the south and a formal, designed landscape to the east, the focus of activities was likely the equestrian facilities. Although Montecito continues to be synonymous with millionaire socialites, the large estates began to be sold and subdivided after World War II. Rancho San Carlos is one of the last intact Montecito estates representing the lifestyle of the very rich at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Rancho San Carlos and the Jacksons

In 1937, Rancho San Carlos was one of the largest estates in Montecito. In terms of size, Rancho San Carlos was rivaled only by the Ortega Ranch and Las Fuentes Rancho in Montecito, neither of which could boast an architecturally remarkable house in combination with planned landscapes, historic orchards, and equestrian facilities. Today, Rancho San Carlos continues to be one of the largest, intact estates in Montecito, incorporating both a lavish Main house, working orchards, and equestrian facilities. Rancho San Carlos is comparable today to only a few other, although much smaller, intact estates in Montecito and Santa Barbara, including Bellosguardo, the Santa Barbara estate of Huguette Clark, daughter of mining baron William Andrew Clark; Lotusland, which is best known for its lavishly designed landscapes of Madame Ganna Walska; and Casa del Herrero, the estate of George Fox Steedman, a St. Louis native whose family amassed wealth in a foundry and machine shop. Like Rancho San Carlos, the Main
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28 Myrick, 235.
30 20 Myrick, back end paper.
houses at both Bellosguardo and Lotusland were designed by prominent architect Reginald Johnson. Also like Rancho San Carlos, both Casa del Herrero and Lotusland feature landscape design contributions by Lockwood de Forest, Jr. and Ralph Stevens. However, all three estates pale in comparison to the size of Rancho San Carlos and lack its integrated agricultural and equestrian facilities.

In 1927, newlyweds Charles Harvey and Marcia Ann Gavit Jackson purchased San Carlos Rancho from Mary and William Yule. The Yules had received the property from Mary’s parents, Charles B. and Mary Raymond twelve years earlier, who had purchased the property from the estate of Mrs. Alice McCurdy Hart. The earliest available aerial photograph from 1928 shows a few buildings on the estate shortly after the Jacksons took title to the property. Specifically, the aerial photograph clearly shows an octagonal barn at its current location near East Valley Road; there were also orchards and reservoirs. Several other buildings appear to be extant north and west of the octagonal barn, as well as close to the entrance gate at 2500 East Valley Road. Given the building campaign that took place in 1928, it is likely cottages evident in the aerial photograph are the same as the existing ones as they are located in the same place. The 1928 aerial photograph also reveals that when the Jacksons purchased Rancho San Carlos, it was already a working ranch with extensive orchards and buildings that had been constructed by previous owners.

In addition to the Main house designed by prominent architect Reginald Johnson and gardens designed by equally prominent landscape architects Lockwood de Forest, Jr. Ralph Stevens, and Florence Yoch, the estate consists of 21 other buildings, as well as working citrus and avocado orchards and reservoirs. Real estate promotional materials cite Reginald Johnson as architect of many of the cottages and equestrian facilities. It is not known where the Jacksons lived between 1927, when they purchased the property, and 1931, when the Main house was completed, although the 1930 U.S. Census notes they were living on the property. A Main house where the Yules lived is not visible in the 1928 aerial photograph. Nevertheless, it is probable that the Jacksons also resided there prior to the Johnson-designed Main house being completed in 1931. Likely in the mid-1930s, the Jacksons purchased a portion of the adjacent Feather Hill Ranch from Christian R. Holmes, who was related to the Fleischmann family, bringing the total acreage of Rancho San Carlos to approximately 237 acres. Several cottages were extant at Feather Hill Ranch that were incorporated into Rancho San Carlos and continued to be used.

31 Myrick, 402.
32 It is not known where, or even if, drawings and correspondence relating to construction of most of Rancho San Carlos are located. There are two main repositories of Reginald Johnson’s papers: the Reginald Johnson papers, Architecture and Design Collection, Art, Design and Architecture Museum, University California Santa Barbara, and the Reginald D. Johnson Collection, Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, Architecture Collections. With the exception of the two blueprints of the stable for C. H. Jackson, dated 1927, located in the UCSB collections, these archives do not include this property.
33 Barnaby Conrad and Marc Muench, Santa Barbara, (Graphic Arts Books, 2004), 52. Christian Holmes purchased Feather Hill Ranch in 1920 and collected exotic birds and wild animals. In 1932, a tiger got loose from his cage and killed his young son.
through the period of significance.

Charles Harvey “Pete” Jackson, Jr. (1898-1978) and Marcia Ann Gavit (1906-1990), both originally from Albany, NY but living in Santa Barbara when they met, announced their engagement in 1926 and married later that year on September 7 at All Saints Church in Santa Barbara. According to the engagement announcement, Mrs. Jackson and Marcia Ann Gavit’s step-mother, Marie Gavit, were close friends. At the time of his engagement, Pete Jackson was the head of the bond department of the Bank of Italy in Santa Barbara. He had been educated at Eastern preparatory schools and attended the University of California to study agriculture. By 1930, Pete Jackson had retired from Bank of Italy and was listed in the U.S. census that year as the owner of a ranch, following the line of work he had pursued in college. Headlines of the wedding announcements also noted that Pete Jackson was the grandnephew of President Chester A. Arthur.

Marcia Ann Gavit, later known as Ann Jackson, was the subject of much controversy in her youth. Born in 1906, Marcia Ann Gavit was the only child of Erastus Palmer and Flora Myers Brady Gavit. When she was only five years old, her mother was killed in a tragic train accident in Westport, Connecticut. An article appearing in The Pittsburg Press in July 1914 entitled “The Richest Little Rich Girl” reported on Marcia Ann Gavit’s income of $3,500 a day, making her the wealthiest girl in the United States with an estate of approximately $14,000,000 inherited from her grandfather Anthony N. Brady after his death in 1913. Her father, according to the will, would receive half of the $3,500 a day allowance not spent on Marcia Ann when she reached maturity. Anthony Brady made his fortune in numerous business interests, serving as a major stockholder in over fifty corporations, including transportation systems in several East Coast cities, utilities, and tobacco. By 1900, he was one of the 100 wealthiest men in the United States. Inheriting one sixth of the Brady estate, her fortune was controlled by her uncles, Nicholas F. and James C. Brady, as trustees. “The expenses of bringing up the child are paid

34 Myrick, 275.
35 “Albany’s Richest Girl to be a Bride,” Watertown Daily Times, June 16, 1926.
36 “Wealthy Albany Girl to Marry California Man,” New Castle News, June 30, 1926. Established in 1904 by Amadeo Peter Giannini (1870-1949) in the North Beach neighborhood of San Francisco, Bank of Italy became the largest commercial bank in the world by serving members of the community such as the working class, immigrant populations, and small businesses that had not previously had access to financial institutions. Bank of Italy became known as where “the little fellow was welcomed and respected, given the same service as the big fellow, and granted financial aid on easy terms.” In 1909, Bank of Italy opened a branch in San Jose, its first outside of San Francisco, by purchasing a small, struggling bank. This pattern of opening bank branches repeated in other cities. By the end of 1918, Bank of Italy had 24 branches throughout California and total resources of more than $93 million. In the 1920s, Giannini formed holding companies, the largest of which was Transamerica Company and the name of the umbrella organization changed to Bank of America in 1930. (Ralph J. Christian, Historic Landmarks Project, “Bank of Italy Building,” National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form, June 1977.)
37 Myrick, 275.
38 Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Santa Barbara County, Enumeration District 42-2, Sheet 19A.
from the income, and one-half the reminder goes to the father.”  How the estate would be taxed became the subject of a lawsuit that was heard by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1925.

Marcia Ann Gavit’s father, E. Palmer Gavit, remarried Marie Turner Cooke of Colorado Springs, who was divorced from Edward Marsden Cooke. In 1914, E. Palmer Gavit and his new wife planned to move to Denver. However, Marcia Ann’s grandmother, Mrs. Anthony Brady, did not want her to move and filed a temporary injunction restraining E. Palmer Gavit from removing his daughter from New York state, putting a very personal matter into the public eye. Once the family feud was resolved, E. Palmer and Marie Gavit purchased Cuesta Linda in Montecito in 1916, approximately five miles from Rancho San Carlos. Beginning in 1919, Reginald Johnson designed the Mediterranean Revival style Main house at Cuesta Linda, which was completed in 1920. In 1925, the Gavits hired prominent Santa Barbara architect, George Washington Smith, to construct a perimeter wall, pavilion, stable, swimming pool, bathhouse, and several other buildings. The Gavits hosted many visitors, including Presidential candidate Herbert Hoover in 1928. The 37-acre property was later purchased by Madame Walska and renamed Lotusland.

While living in Albany, Marcia Ann Gavit had been educated by private tutors, but attended school in Montecito and graduated from the private Santa Barbara Girls School in June 1926. In 1928, Pete Jackson, Jr. joined ten other trustees to found the prestigious Valley Club, along with Dwight Murphy, Kirk B. Johnson, Francis Price, James B. Canby, and Harold Chase of Santa Barbara. Other trustees included C.B. Raymond (a prior owner of Rancho San Carlos), Max C. Fleischmann, and Jackson’s father-in-law, E. Palmer Gavit. Memberships in the exclusive club were limited to 225, with an individual initiation fee of $2,000. By the middle of August 1928, 80% of the membership goal was reached, and in 1928, the Valley Club acquired the land on both sides of Sheffield Road. In August of 1929, a year later, Max Fleischmann was elected President of the club and E. Palmer Gavit was elected one of the vice-presidents. The club officially opened on December 29, 1929, two months after the disastrous 1929 stock market crash.

By the 1930 U.S. Census, the Jacksons were living at Rancho San Carlos with their daughter, Flora, and infant son Palmer G., who was born earlier that year, along with 14 servants. As the
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43 Supreme Court of the United States, Irwin, Former Collector of Internal Revenue, v. Gavit, Argued April 15, 1925, Decided April 27, 1925.
50 “Daily Round of Society,” The Morning Press (Santa Barbara, CA), September 5, 1926.
51 Myrick, 226.
52 Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Santa Barbara County, Enumeration District 42-2, Sheet 19A.
Main house was not completed until 1931, it is unclear where the Jackson family was residing on the property. An aerial photograph from 1938 clearly shows the Main house, main office, and arena. By the 1940 census, the Jacksons had another son, Peter. The census records show Pete Jackson had retired as a banker and was now the owner of a ranch and Ann Jackson was listed as a “housewife.” In addition to the Jackson family, five maids lived in the Main house, while others living on the property included a manager, a trainer for the polo horses, a butler and an additional maid, chauffeur, housekeeper, horseman, foreman, and a gardener.53 Perhaps due to her young experiences or to security concerns, the Jacksons shunned publicity and led a relatively private life. There are very few newspaper articles describing their social activities. One of their few guests noted in the society pages of the Los Angeles Times was the novelist Charles Agnew Chamberlain, who visited the Jacksons shortly after his return from China in 1937.54 The Jacksons had a security system in the basement, reportedly manned 24 hours a day, possibly in response to the kidnapping of the Lindbergh baby in 1932. In addition to Rancho San Carlos, the Jacksons also owned Silver Creek Ranch in Elko County, Nevada, where they would visit for winter skiing,55 and the Alisal Guest Ranch near Solvang, CA.56 Based on their other properties; it appears the Jacksons traveled frequently.

The Alisal Ranch was purchased by Pete Jackson in 1943, and he quickly transformed the working cattle ranch into a resort. On July 16, 1946, the Alisal Guest Ranch opened for the summer season with a maximum capacity of 30 guests. Today, the Jackson family still owns the private guest ranch, which includes a private 18-hole golf club and private tennis club. During the 1970s and 1980s, the Jackson family developed a unique residential component of the property, which includes 63 homes on 75-year land leases that provide quarterly or yearly payments while allowing the Jacksons to retain ownership of the intact ranch land.57

In 1958, Pete Jackson turned to real estate development, purchasing the 46-acre Bonnymede estate near the present day Santa Barbara Biltmore for $1.2 million with two friends from San Mateo. The main house was demolished and the western portion was given over to two condominium developments. Bonnymede was opened in 1965-66 and was followed by Montecito Shores nine years later.58

Like many large estates with palatial homes in Montecito, as well as other enclaves of the wealthy during the Gilded Age, the lifestyle was made possible by a staff of servants. The Main house at Rancho San Carlos has clear distinctions between public and private space, with the

---

53 Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940, Santa Barbara County, Enumeration District 42-1, Sheet 5B.
58 Myrick, 416.
north and much of the east wings devoted to private space inhabited by servants, and the south and west wings the purview of the Jackson family. Servants had separate corridors and stairways so that they could more discretely go about their work. Seven bedrooms are provided for staff within the Main house, with eleven other cottages on the property that were rented out to staff.

There is a complicated relationship with domestic service in the United States as it is often linked with the history of African slaves and European indentured servants. It is no surprise, then, that many domestic servants in wealthy households were immigrants from England, where there had been a long tradition of service and where the profession did not have the same connotations. For the affluent employers, the number of servants was often a status symbol, and European employees were more desirable as they were more accepting of the lifestyle and better trained. Interestingly, the demand for domestic service peaked in the late nineteenth century at the same time the industrial revolution was creating a rising middle class, thereby diminishing the pool of potential servants.\footnote{Scholarly research into domestic servants includes The Domesticated Americans by Russell Lynes (1957); The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Servant by Pamela Horn (1975); Americans and Their Servants: Domestic Service in the United States from 1800 to 1920 by Daniel E. Sutherland (1981). The Preservation Society of Newport County has done quite a bit of research into domestic servants at the summer "cottages" in Newport, Rhode Island, including "Servant Life at the Breakers; A Room with a View" by Holly Collins in 2001 (see http://www.newportmansions.org/documents/servant_life_at_the_breakers.pdf), and an oral history project, "Keeping House." The National Park Service also created a lesson plan around servant life at the National Register-listed estate Brucemore in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, owned by the National Trust for Historic Preservation (see http://www.nps.gov/nr/twhp/wwwlps/lessons/105brucemore/105brucemore.htm).}

Servants at Rancho San Carlos followed the national trend of hiring European servants. In 1930, there were fourteen additional staff living at Rancho San Carlos, some with their families who were not in service. In-house servants included a Swedish cook, a German nurse, a French lady’s maid, and an Italian butler. Those working outside the house and renting a cottage on the grounds tended to be American-born, with the exception of the Dutch dairyman. Rents for the eight cottages ranged from $20 (for the dairyman) to $100 (for the horse trainer).\footnote{Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Santa Barbara County, Enumeration District 42-2, Sheet 19A.} In 1940, there was only five in-house staff, four of whom were European-born. Eleven additional staff lived outside the Main house in six cottages, where monthly rent ranged from $15 to $40.\footnote{Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940, Santa Barbara County, Enumeration District 42-1, Sheet 5B.} Of those living outside the Main house, only the English butler was not American-born.

Pete and Ann Jackson shared a love of horses and polo, which may have induced them to purchase Rancho San Carlos to pursue their passion. In addition to the large tract of land, incomparable views, and available water, the still-extant octagonal barn and training track were some of the first improvements the couple undertook, even before construction of the Main house. As early as 1930, the Jacksons hired a horse trainer, Frank J. Holtzbauer,\footnote{Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Santa Barbara County, Enumeration District 42-2, Sheet 19A.} who rented a
cottage on the property. Along with the octagonal barn, there are additional stables immediately to the east that lead to an arena for exercising the horses. It is reported that up to 30 horses at a time were bred at the property.\footnote{Candace Taylor, “A Large Montecito Estate Lists For $125 Million,” Wall Street Journal, September 4, 2014, <http://www.wsj.com/articles/a-large-montecito-estate-lists-for-125-million-1409857374>.

63 “Polo Tourney opens Today,” Los Angeles Times, September 4, 1932, D2.
64 “Jackson Elected to Head Santa Barbara Polo Club,” Los Angeles Times, June 24, 1933, A10.
69 “A Century of Polo in Santa Barbara,” Polo Players' Edition, October 2011, 63. Little information could be found on Ann Jackson’s ownership of the Santa Barbara Polo Club; the Santa Barbara Polo Club’s website does not mention it, although several other articles do. It is not known how long she owned it or when she sold it. However, as she purchased the club in 1941, she held the property during a wartime suspension of polo, that started in 1942, when the club was used to station and train soldiers, and extended until 1946. Ann Jackson may have owned the Santa Barbara Polo Club until the early 1960s. (Santa Barbara Polo Club, “About Us; Club History,” <http://www.sbpolo.com/Default.aspx?p=dynamicmodule&pageid=394312&ssid=316538&vnf=1>.


Perpetuation of this image is reinforced by a famous stone tablet next to a polo ground in Gilgit, Pakistan that reads: “Let other people play at other
things. The king of games is still the game of kings.” In the United States, polo has generally been the domain of the wealthy, leisured class. The sport of polo arrived in England via India in the mid-1800s and was billed as “Hockey on Horseback.” James Gordon Bennett brought the sport to America in 1876. Founded in New York City in 1890, the Polo Association standardized rules, set pony size limits, and established material of balls. Polo was played at the Olympics between 1900 and 1936. By the 1910s, the epicenter of polo in the United States was at Long Island’s Meadowbrook Polo Club. California joined the Polo Association in 1909 under the California Polo Pony and Racing Association. The sport was also adopted by some Hollywood luminaries, including Spencer Tracy, Walt Disney, and Will Rogers, the latter building a polo field on his Pacific Palisades estate. The 1930s are considered the “Golden Age” of polo, when it reached its height of popularity. Possibly due to the military’s reliance on horses until World War II, the game was played by those in the armed forces “in order to obtain poise in the saddle.” Polo playing in the United States declined after World War II.

The Main house also displayed ribbons and trophies for the show dogs that Ann Jackson bred in the kennels north of the Main house, specifically Kerry Blue Terriers and English Springer Spaniels. The Jackson facility was regarded as a “major” kennel and known as Blue Leader Kennels; dogs raised at the property were entered into shows throughout the country. Among their best known dogs was an English Springer Spaniel named Ch. Norman of Hamsey, who won many awards in the 1930s and 1940s, including first in its breed and best sports dog in the prestigious Westminster Kennel Club show in 1932. They also housed the first Kerry Blue Terrier to win Best in Show in an American all-breed show, Leinster Leader. Ann Jackson also served as president of the Santa Barbara Kennel Club in the mid-1930s and in the 1950s, the Jacksons sponsored a trophy in their name at the Santa Barbara Kennel Club for the first terrier group.

Pete and Ann Jackson purchased Rancho San Carlos shortly after their marriage as a young couple, constructed their dream house, and pursued their passions there together until their deaths in 1978 and 1990, respectively. After Pete’s death, Ann Jackson established the Ann Jackson Family Foundation, which offers grants to non-profits in Santa Barbara County and has become one of the most important foundations for local philanthropy.

Reginald Johnson
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78 “Channel City Prepares for All-Breed Dog Show,” Los Angeles Times, July 19, 1953, C5.
79 The Ann Jackson Family Foundation was the subject of a United States Court of Appeals case, involving how a loan to the foundation should be taxed.
Reginald Johnson’s work at Rancho San Carlos dates from at least to 1928, when he drew plans for the office at the estate. Although the Jackson house was never published, perhaps in response to the clients’ concerns for privacy and security, the Jackson office did appear in print (“Office for Mr. C. H. Jackson, Jr., on the Rancho San Carlos near Montecito” in California Arts and Architecture 37, May 1930). Given the dates and style of many of the cottages, it is likely they were designed by Johnson as part of the same building campaign as the major structures including the Main house.

Reginald Johnson (1882-1952) was a master architect, respected and admired by his peers and clients, whose buildings and designs have withstood the test of time. Elected a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects (F.A.I.A.) in 1926, Johnson was the recipient of several architectural awards in his life; his work was extensively published in both the professional and popular press; and several young architects who later achieved prominence in the field apprenticed in his office. From his base in Pasadena, California, Johnson practiced architecture for four decades, mostly in the Los Angeles/Pasadena and Santa Barbara/Montecito areas. While the first half of his career was notable for its commissions from the more established and well-to-do segments of society, the last two decades saw Johnson shift his focus to affordable and mass housing projects. Rancho San Carlos represents the pinnacle of the first and highly influential period of Johnson’s architectural career.

Born in 1882 in Westchester, New York, Johnson came from a privileged background. When he was a child, his father was appointed Episcopal Bishop of the Southern California Diocese and the family moved to Pasadena. Johnson returned to the east coast for his education, attending the Morristown School in New Jersey, obtaining an A. B. from Williams College in 1907, and graduating from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology with a B. S. in architecture in 1910. In 1907-1908 he apprenticed in the Pasadena office of respected architects Myron Hunt and Elmer Grey. Following graduation from M.I.T., he gained additional experience in the Los Angeles office of architect Robert Farquhar. Johnson began his own architectural practice in 1912, and, buoyed by his family contacts, was a success from the outset. Over the next decade, Johnson’s many commissions were primarily large homes for the wealthy in and around Pasadena. His first major work in the Santa Barbara area, where he also found favor, was “Mira Flores,” a residence for J. Percival Jefferson in Montecito (1915). Johnson’s homes reflected the eclectic taste of the period, but always with his particular blend of architectural restraint and sensitivity towards the relationship of building to site. By 1920, Johnson was one of the leading architects of the region. That year, Mira Flores was awarded an A.I.A. Gold Medal as one of the outstanding residential designs in the nation, the first time a

---

80 A veritable “Who’s who” of architecture in Southern California passed through his office, including Roland Coate, Robert Alexander, Fitch Haskell, Lawrence Test, David Ogilvie, Paul Williams, Palmer Sabin, Edgar Maybury, and George Vernon Russell, among many others.
Southern California project had received that honor.  

The 1920s were a highly productive period for Johnson. From 1922 until the end of 1924, Johnson operated within a loosely structured partnership with Gordon Kaufmann and Roland Coate, two equally skilled architects. Johnson, in combination with Kaufmann and Coate, and subsequently, as an independent practitioner, designed dozens of homes, as well as churches, hospitals, schools, commercial buildings, and clubhouses during this period.

The 1925 Santa Barbara earthquake nearly leveled the commercial district in Santa Barbara along State Street. Prior to the earthquake, Santa Barbara’s downtown commercial core featured mostly Victorian-era brick-faced buildings. In the years immediately prior to the earthquake, the City had hired Bertram Goodhue to plan a new commercial streetscape of “Hispanic” design. As noted below, Bertram Goodhue had gained fame for his work at the 1915 Pan Pacific Exposition in San Diego, which popularized Spanish Colonial Revival style. Leveling of the commercial district allowed for the downtown commercial core to rebuild based on the Goodhue plan, and the City of Santa Barbara established its first Architectural Review Board to enforce the uniform architectural and stylistic program of “Spanish type” buildings.

Coinciding with these events, a commission for which Johnson received national attention as well as an award from the Architectural League of New York (1928) was the Santa Barbara Biltmore Hotel (hotel, 1926, and cottages, 1927). Completed within two years of the earthquake, the hotel complex showcased many of Johnson’s signatures including a floor plan organized around a courtyard and a fluid, yet tasteful, interpretation of the Spanish Colonial Revival style, or “Spanish” style, as required by the newly established Architectural Review Board. By this time, Johnson’s practice was nearly as busy with projects in Santa Barbara County as with ones in Los Angeles County. Many of his Santa Barbara projects were designed in a “Mediterranean” style, which loosely borrowed from Spanish Colonial Revival and Italian Revival styles, among other styles. Johnson was one of several architects who worked with Harold S. Chase on the development of Hope Ranch, winning another A.I.A. award for “Las Terrasas” in 1927. Johnson’s last major commission in the county was the Santa Barbara Post Office (1936).

The 1890s – 1930s was a period in which historic eclecticism was the dominant mode of architectural expression. A discussion of what historic eclecticism was most suited to California architecture in general and domestic architecture specifically was the subject of lively discussions, to which Reginald Johnson contributed through his architectural designs.

Alison Clark, “Reginald D. Johnson,” Johnson, Kaufmann, Coate: Partners in the California Style (Scripps College Capra Press, 1992). This book also notes that Johnson won two local A.I.A. awards that year, one for the Paxton House in Pasadena (1919) and the other for Annandale Country Club.
82 Herb Andree, Noel Young & Patricia Halloran, Santa Barbara Architecture; From Spanish Colonial to Modern, (Santa Barbara: Capra Press, 1995), 9
Education of high style architects in the late nineteenth century shifted from training as apprentices to attendance at the École de Beaux Arts in Paris. This academic training resulted in more faithful representations of historical styles. Use of historic eclectic styles reached broad attention and widespread use after the Chicago Columbian Exposition of 1893. With the emphasis on faithful replication, specific historic styles were used to convey particular meanings.

Herbert Croly, editor of *Architectural Record*, devoted a lengthy article in the December 1913 issue to discussion of an appropriate Californian style for domestic architecture. He argued that Mission style, which had been popular at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, was not appropriate because it was “ecclesiastical rather than domestic.” However, what was “valuable” of Mission style architecture was that it “stamp[ed] the Spanish tradition upon Californian architecture; and the Spanish tradition is only…a picturesque version of what may in general be described as the Latin or Italian tradition.”

The academic, high-style expression of Spanish Colonial Revival style was popularized by the Panama-California Exposition of 1915 in San Diego. By commemorating the opening of the Panama Canal a year earlier, the exposition served to boost San Diego as the closest American port to the canal. The Exposition, with Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue as chief architect, was a “statement of local industry clothed in a Southern California architecture” and had as much influence on subsequent use of Spanish Colonial Revival style as the Chicago Columbian Exposition did for historic revival styles in general and Classical Revival style in particular.

Use of the Spanish Colonial Revival style at the Panama-California Exposition represented Spanish historical antecedents more faithfully than the Mission Revival style and “emphasize[d] the richness of Spanish precedents found throughout Latin America.”

Johnson did not adhere to strict academic styles and designed in a variety of genres, sometimes combining more than one style in one composition, as seen at Rancho San Carlos. While many of his designs employed variations of Spanish Colonial Revival style, such as the Biltmore Hotel, by the mid-1920s, Johnson had become interested in Monterey Revival style. His 1925 design for the Bixby House in South Pasadena in the Monterey Revival style was widely
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84 David Gebhard, “The Spanish Colonial Revival in Southern California (1895-1930),” *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, vol. 26, no. 2 (May 1967), 136. This article is considered the seminal work on Spanish Colonial Revival style.
85 Like many architects working at that time, Bertram Goodhue (1869-1924) worked in a myriad of historic revival styles. Prior to working on the Panama-California Exposition, much of his work was executed in the Gothic Revival style as a partner of Ralph Adams Cram in New York City from 1891 until 1914. Bertram Goodhue’s work on the Episcopal Cathedral, Le Santissima Trinidad, in Havana, Cuba in 1905 and a later trip to Mexico influenced him to such a degree that he wrote a detailed study of Spanish Colonial architecture in Mexico, the principles of which he adapted to his work at the Panama-California Exposition.
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published and helped to popularize the style. Monterey Revival style is a loose interpretation of “Anglo-influenced Spanish Colonial houses built in the mid-nineteenth century in Monterey in Northern California.” In other words, it combines Spanish Colonial Revival style with the ever-popular, more Eastern Colonial Revival style. It is generally characterized by two-story buildings with low-pitched gable roofs and overhangs, and second-story balconies. Unlike the Colonial Revival style, it does not necessarily have a symmetrical composition. And unlike Spanish Colonial Revival style, the style often mixes exterior cladding materials.

What really distinguished Reginald Johnson was his effort to push the boundaries of defining a “California” architectural style. He accomplished this by emphasizing indoor-outdoor living in his plans through extensive use of patios and French doors. His designs were responsive to the site, creating a picturesque massing as seen from the approach, as well as defining views seen from the interior. Many of Johnson’s compositions break up strict symmetry to allow for maximum light and air penetration, as well as to create a sense of enclosure to outdoor living spaces. Johnson worked with a variety of local, Santa Barbara landscape architects for his commissions in that county, including Paul G. Thiene at Mira Flores, Peter Riedel and Ralph T. Stevens at Cuesta Linda, as well as Lockwood de Forest, Jr. Because he was not always constrained by strict symmetry, Reginald Johnson’s domestic architecture appeared relatively informal compared with other large homes from the same period. It can be argued that his emphasis on indoor-outdoor living and pushing out wings to maximize light and air, was an antecedent to mid-century Ranch style houses.

In the first phase of his career, Johnson worked prolifically in the Santa Barbara and Montecito area. He designed over twenty homes beginning in 1916, including “Hillside House” for G.C. Kendall (1917), “Riven Rock” for Stanley McCormick (1918, demolished), and “El Elisio” for Edward Lowe (1922), and Cuesta Linda (later Lotusland) for Ann Jackson’s father E. Palmer Gavit (1920) in addition to Mira Flores, Las Terrasas, the Biltmore Hotel, and the Santa Barbara Post Office. These buildings all illustrate Johnson’s unmistakable, informal, “California” style, which combined a variety of precedents to embrace indoor-outdoor living.

Beginning in the early 1930s, Johnson’s architectural focus began shifting from homes for the elite to housing for the less privileged and to the issue of mass housing, both publicly and privately financed. From mid-decade until he retired in 1947, Johnson devoted himself to this cause, becoming a consultant to the Los Angeles Housing Authority and serving on the boards of several citizens’ organizations. He became increasingly “modern” in his architectural style, as well, stating in 1934: “The rambling house of rugged individualism and the house with its many tricks of architectural detail will, for economic reasons alone, be discarded. What has been very aptly called the monotony of variety will then be a thing of the past.” Johnson was chief architect for Harbor Hills and coordinating architect for Rancho San Pedro, two public

89 McAlister and McAlister, 431.
90 Clark, 26.
housing projects in Los Angeles. His crowning achievement, however, was the privately
developed Baldwin Hills Village (1940), for which Johnson was the managing architect,
collaborating with the firm of Wilson, Merrill and Alexander and planning consultant Clarence
Stein. This 627-unit housing estate set on 88 acres earned national acclaim from eminent critic
Lewis Mumford among others.

Johnson passed away in 1952, and although retired at the time, was praised by his colleagues
for his position at the forefront of his profession during both phases of his career.

Because Johnson worked extensively throughout Santa Barbara and Montecito, it is likely the
Jacksons were well aware of his designs, but they may have become personally acquainted
through Johnson’s work at Cuesta Linda, which he worked on for Ann Jackson’s father and step
mother beginning in 1919, when she was a schoolgirl of 13. Regarding the Jackson house,
Architecture editor Henry H. Saylor noted in his column dated July 3, 1931 that “Reginald
Johnson dropped in on his way from the Pacific Coast before sailing tonight for England. He is
going over mainly to seek out some fine old paneling to use in a large country house [the Jackson
House] in Montecito.”

The Jackson House on Rancho San Carlos has been characterized as among Johnson’s “finest”
designs. It incorporates most of the features that distinguished Johnson’s mature work during
the first phase of his career. The floor plan is asymmetrical and organized to maximize lighting
and ventilation. It incorporates an enclosed patio while wings stretch out to embrace courts,
terraces, and gardens and providing interior spaces with optimum light and ventilation. It is
functionally organized, with a discrete service wing. The sloping site has been enhanced by a
retaining wall, so that the upper story appears to be built naturally atop the hillside. The styling
is Johnson’s own interpretation of early California rather than a historically authentic replica,
harmoniously blending Spanish and Colonial elements typical of the Monterey Revival with
Regency railings and Georgian interiors. While the “California” plan, emphasizing indoor-
outdoor living was not unique to Johnson’s design of Rancho San Carlos, it reached an
expression in this design not fully realized in his earlier residential architecture.

Landscape Design

The landscape design at Rancho San Carlos has been attributed to three of the most notable
landscape designers of the period working in southern California: Lockwood de Forest, Jr.,
Ralph Stevens, and Florence Yoch. De Forest and Stevens appear to be responsible for the main
entrance off East Valley Road, enhancing the experience of the circulation system, integrating
the orchards and pastures into view sheds, and the informal gardens surrounding the cottages,
while Florence Yoch focused her work around the main house at the entrance, patio, courtyard,
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and formal east garden.\textsuperscript{93} Rancho San Carlos exemplifies what Ronald L. Nye, Ph.D. describes as “regionalist landscape design,” which considers formal designed gardens with the topography while incorporating native California plants.\textsuperscript{94} The seeds of Regionalist landscape design are found as early as the 1860s when Fredrick Law Olmstead identified the lack of abundant water in California and found it unsuitable for pastoral and picturesque English landscapes. Both large, formal Mediterranean Revival gardens as well as the less formal “regionalist response to California’s unique landscape and climate”\textsuperscript{95} are particularly well represented in Santa Barbara and Montecito, including the landscape at Val Verde designed by de Forest (1926-1949).

Nye characterizes Regionalist landscapes by “the integration of three elements: formal components, such as those found in the traditional gardens of the Mediterranean Basin and favored by estate builders at the time; newly-available exotic and tropical plant materials; and the natural palette of plants and trees unique to California.”\textsuperscript{96} All three elements of regionalism can be found on the Rancho San Carlos property: from the formal gardens on the terraces and near the Main House, to the exotic palms that line the main driveway in a conscious transition to the natural landscape of oaks and native plants, and the relatively informal gardens adjacent to the various buildings around the property.

In keeping with the agricultural heritage and ambiance of Montecito, existing orchards were retained, and expanded with the purchase of a portion of the adjacent Featherhill Ranch. The orchards are evident in historic aerial photos as early as 1928 and are represented in a painted mural within the Main house. The presence of the orchards created an image of Rancho San Carlos as a “gentleman’s farm,” an ideal described by Andrew Jackson Downing Jr.’s \textit{A Treatise in the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening} (first published in 1841 and revised twenty times between 1847 and 1900). According to Downing, “the orchard was regarded as a highly aesthetic, ornamental landscape feature or space that decorated the landscape with beautiful blossoms, fine fruit, and shady walks or rides within allées of green boughs. A well tended orchard of choice fruit varieties was a hallmark of the owner’s sophistication.”\textsuperscript{97} The orchards are an integral component of the landscape at Rancho San Carlos, providing an agricultural ambiance along the drive to the main house, as well as views to the orchards from the main house.

Lockwood de Forest, Jr.

Landscape architect Lockwood de Forest III, known as Lockwood de Forest, Jr. (1896-1949), is credited with shaping some of the landscaping of Rancho San Carlos. As noted previously, de Forest was known to both architect Reginald Johnson and the family of Ann Jackson through collaborations on other projects. According to historian Ronald L. Nye, Ph.D., Lockwood de Forest, Jr. was “one of a small group of California designers known as ‘Regionalists’ who are recognized primarily for their work on behalf of wealthy estate owners during the 1920s.”

Lockwood de Forest Jr. was born in New York City, and as the son of Lockwood de Forest II, a landscape painter, designer, and one-time partner of Louis C. Tiffany, was exposed to architecture, landscape, and aesthetics from an early age. His landscape training consisted of courses taken at Williams College, Harvard University, and the University of California at Berkeley, and brief employment in the offices of two landscape architects, most notably that of acclaimed Santa Barbara practitioner Ralph Stevens. He established his own practice in Santa Barbara in 1922.

A knowledgeable horticulturalist, de Forest was the editor with his wife, fellow landscape architect Elizabeth Kellam, of the magazine The Santa Barbara Gardener between 1925 and 1942. He was especially interested in South African plants and, as advisor to the Santa Barbara Botanic Garden, native plants. His gardens exhibit both a disciplined architectural quality and a respect for the regional landscape. In the words of landscape historian David Streatfield, de Forest “rejected stylistic eclecticism; his designs are notable for simple detailing and bold, almost theatrical effects achieved entirely with plants. He was one of the first landscape architects in California to question the ubiquitous and excessively generous use of lawn irrigation.” Other distinguishing characteristics of his gardens were the careful integration of distant views into his design and the use of stonework.

De Forest’s oeuvre was primarily residential. Perhaps his most published and acclaimed work was at Val Verde (1926-1949), the Montecito estate of Wright Ludington that boasted a 1915 house designed by Bertram Goodhue. There, de Forest’s flair for the dramatic was in full view, with water features, columns, statuary and plant forms that transformed the grounds into an abstract and atmospheric classical villa. Other de Forest projects, in addition to his aforementioned work at Casa del Herrero and Lotusland, include the William Dickenson estate, Hope Ranch (1929-1932), and the Meeker estate, Constantia (1930). Following the Depression and World War II, de Forest’s projects were smaller scale gardens and the architectural design of
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several modestly sized homes, one of which was featured in *Sunset* magazine in 1948. His embrace of modernist ideas, such as minimalism, axial geometry, and integration with the surrounding landscape, has been said to foreshadow the work of renowned post-war landscape architect Thomas Church.\(^{101}\) Lockwood de Forest, Jr. died unexpectedly in 1949.

*Ralph Stevens*

Ralph Stevens’ involvement with shaping the landscape at Rancho San Carlos was suggested by Mrs. Palmer Jackson, Ann Jackson’s daughter-in-law. Because Stevens’ papers are not collected in a single archive and most drawings are believed to be lost, Stevens’ contributions to the Rancho San Carlos landscape cannot be clearly identified. However, it is possible Stevens and Lockwood de Forest, Jr. collaborated at Rancho San Carlos. In addition to de Forest working for Stevens in 1921 and 1922, the two collaborated on a number of important projects in Montecito, including Casa del Herrero and Lotusland. Furthermore, it is likely Ann Jackson was well acquainted with Ralph Stevens, as her father purchased Stevens’ childhood home, Tanglewood, in 1916, constructing a new main house on the property and renaming it Cuesta Linda. Interestingly, Stevens and de Forest also worked on the landscape at Cuesta Linda, which later became Lotusland.\(^{102}\)

Ralph Stevens (1882-1958) was born in Montecito and grew up at his family’s aforementioned property, Tanglewood. Stevens’ father, R. Kinton Stevens, was a “pioneering” nurseryman, specializing in exotic, subtropical vegetation.\(^{103}\) After his father’s death in 1896, Stevens’ mother stayed on at Tanglewood until 1913, renting out the main house to winter visitors.\(^{104}\) Stevens received his formal education from Michigan State College (now Michigan State University), graduating with a BS in 1905. After working for a short time for a landscape designer in Chicago, as well as a nursery in California and a landscape architect for the Southern California Acclimatizing Association, Stevens became an assistant professor in the newly established Landscape Gardening department of the University of California Berkeley between 1913 and 1917. Stevens returned to Santa Barbara in 1917 and opened a landscape architecture practice. In the 1920s, he taught landscape architecture at the Santa Barbara School of the Arts. It was during this time that Lockwood de Forest Jr. worked for him.

Stevens worked in a variety of styles throughout his career. His projects “synthesized International and Californian design ideals, integrating formal ideas gleaned from the Mediterranean, Islamic, Spanish Colonial Revival and Hawaiian traditions with a more laid-back..."
California style.”

An early commission, Casa de Herrero in Montecito (1922-1925, listed in the National Register of Historic Places in part for its landscape design), “superbly demonstrate the new American synthesis of Anglo and Islamic design concepts.” Stevens worked on several projects with Reginald Johnson in Montecito, including the Santa Barbara Biltmore Hotel (1926-1927), the Chase House called Las Terrasas, (1925), and the Jefferson House called Mira Flores (1915).

One of his most important work, Stevens “gave form to” Ganna Walska’s ideas at Lotusland (1944-1957), which had been adapted from his childhood home Tanglewood. In the post-war period, Stevens created the Succulent Garden for the Tremaine house in Montecito, which was designed by Modernist architect Richard Neutra. The garden was included in Elizabeth Kassler’s 1964 book *Modern Gardens and Landscape*, establishing the garden as “a landmark of mid-century modernism.”

**Florence Yoch**

Landscape architect Florence Yoch (1890-1972) designed the landscapes immediately adjacent to the main house at Rancho San Carlos. Her formal designs were based on European precedents including the Renaissance Farnese Palace in Rome and the carmens of the Spanish town of El Albaicin. Florence Theresa Yoch (1890-1972) grew up both in Laguna Beach and Santa Ana. Her interest in landscape design possibly stemmed from her visits to Arden, the Orange County estate of Helena Modjeska where Theodore Payne served as gardener from 1893-1896. Although Arden was Payne’s first job in southern California, he went on to become a pioneer in cultivating California native plants. Yoch began her formal education at University of California Berkeley in 1910, transferred to College of Agriculture at Cornell University in 1912, and completed a BS in Landscape Gardening at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1915.

In 1917, she founded her own landscape design firm. Lucile Council (1898-1964) joined the firm in 1921. In 1925, they formed the partnership of Yoch and Council and worked together until Council’s death in 1964. Yoch served as primary landscape and garden feature designer while Council was the firm’s office manager and planting specialist. Their practice centered in
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Pasadena, San Marino, Beverly Hills, and Montecito, as well as other areas of Santa Barbara County, Monterey, and Carmel. Yoch’s first designed landscape in Montecito was in 1922 at Il Brolino. It is possible Ann Jackson became aware of Yoch through this project as “the six acres of gardens delighted countless visitors who come to Montecito on the regular Garden Tours.”

The firm worked mostly on private residences, including movie moguls’ estates and movie sets, but also worked on other projects as diverse as the Wilshire Country Club (1920), Vroman’s Bookstore in Pasadena (1921), The Eubell Club of Los Angeles (1927), California Institute of Technology: The Athenaeum (1930), and Robinson’s Department Store in Beverly Hills (1955). Movie sets included Romeo and Juliet (1936), The Garden of Allah (1936), Gone with the Wind (1939), How Green Was My Valley (1941), and The Good Earth (1937).

Yoch “designs were noted for the juxtaposition of informal, wild plantings and formal geometry, as well as the theatrical and unexpected.” Extensive travel, including annual trips to Europe, as well as to Mexico and North Africa, provided inspiration for her landscapes, including the one at Rancho San Carlos. One of her signature designs consisted of trees leaning over walkways and garden paths, departing from rigid structures. She also often used native plants. “Adapting European formal garden designs to the California landscape, Yoch created gardens rich in architectural detail and in varieties of plants, yet intimate and casual in style.” Gardens were often designed as outdoor rooms. Yoch also designed features such as pebble pavements, benches, and ornate drains, all of which she included at Rancho San Carlos (see Additional Historic Photos 21-22).

Rancho San Carlos is an excellent example of one of Yoch’s “patrician gardens.” James Yoch, Florence Yoch’s cousin and biographer, describes “one of the main goals of Florence Yoch’s earliest gardens was to bring admired pieces of Europe home to America for wealthy clients who wanted to recollect scenes from their travels.” Given the size of Rancho San Carlos, Yoch worked to create more intimate spaces close to the main house by clearly delineating plant spaces with more than 1,500 tiles in various forms (leaf, double arch, shell, and single arch). Rancho San Carlos was one of the few landscapes that Yoch agreed to the client’s wishes to import mature trees and shrubs to create an instant effect rather than allow plants and landscapes to grow and mature. Cost for the central courtyard was $8,799. The central courtyard is highly visible as a central design element around which the public rooms are organized; Yoch’s design defines the mix of formal and casual architecture that characterized the House. The central courtyard features three different species of palms to “suggest harmony” while “walks lead
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sensibly but not always straightforwardly to the doors, the open gallery, and stairs along the patio.”\textsuperscript{120} The east garden cost $34,652 and included a parterre consisting entirely of geometrically clipped beds of lawn as well as a more traditional parterre of hedges enclosing plant beds. Although not detailed in a price list, her work also appears to include landscaping along the north elevation, which included one of her most well-known pebble pavements of two dogs (see Additional Historic Photo 21 and 57). James Yoch, Florence Yoch’s cousin and biographer, wrote of her involvement at Rancho San Carlos, “All major Florence Yoch gardens have been much-modified or perished…except for your [Mrs. Palmer Jackson] ranch. If but one was fated to survive intact into the 21\textsuperscript{st} century, I’m glad it’s yours, among the best she created.”\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{120} Yoch, 42.
\textsuperscript{121} James Yoch to Mrs. Palmer (Joan) Jackson, personal correspondence, June 5, 2013, Huntington Library.
12. WHY THE NOMINATED PROPERTY MEETS THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR A COUNTY LANDMARK

Rancho San Carlos is significant under multiple Santa Barbara County Landmark criteria:

A) *It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the County's cultural, social, economic, political, archaeological, aesthetic, engineering, architectural or natural history*

As one of the last surviving and largest, intact estates from the first half of the twentieth century, Rancho San Carlos reflects the development of Montecito as the final expression of Gilded Age wealth and style under this criterion. Montecito has been defined by large estates of wealthy residents and Rancho San Carlos epitomizes this pattern of development. Rancho San Carlos is a remarkably intact grouping of buildings, including prominent a main house, cottages, barns, and other support buildings within both a designed and agricultural landscape. While once more prevalent in Santa Barbara County, the orchards at Rancho San Carlos, dating from before World War II, are increasingly rare.

B) *It is identified with persons or events significant in local, state or national history*

Rancho San Carlos may also be considered significant under criterion B for its association with Pete and Ann Jackson, pillars of the community in Montecito, noted philanthropists, and very influential in the world of polo. Pete Jackson became a developer in Montecito. Ann Jackson was a major women’s polo player, traveling throughout California and the United States for games. In addition, Pete Jackson was a founding trustee of the Santa Barbara Polo Club and Ann Jackson owned the Polo Club for approximately 20 years. This passion for polo is closely tied to Rancho San Carlos, where they bred and trained polo ponies. Pete and Ann Jackson, as represented by their association with Rancho San Carlos, are a link to Montecito’s historic development.

C) *It embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship*

The Main house, office, octagonal barn, and most outbuildings of Rancho San Carlos embody the distinctive characteristics of their architectural styles and are significant under criterion C. The Main house is an elegant and sophisticated example of the Monterey Revival style that incorporates Georgian and Regency detailing in a rambling plan that appears to be a precursor to the post World War II Ranch style. The office, with its adobe-inspired heavy wooden lintels and deeply recessed windows and doors, represents a more rustic but equally adept interpretation of the Monterey Revival style. The octagonal barn, and other outbuildings are excellent showcases of the character-defining features of the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Both of these styles are emblematic of Santa Barbara County during the 1920s and 1930s. Additionally, as a building
type, the octagonal barn is a very rare example of this type, which originated in Europe and was not widely constructed in the United States. Round and polygonal barns are one of several barn types identified in the National Park Service publication Preservation Brief 20: The Preservation of Historic Barns (Michael J. Auer, (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, 1989), 3). Popular especially in the Midwest at the end of the eighteenth century through the 1920s, round and polygonal barns were thought to be a more efficient use of space and more structurally stable than rectangular barns. Round and polygonal barns were extremely rare in California, with only two other known historic examples extant in Santa Rosa and San Luis Obispo.122 It appears that aesthetics were the primary consideration for the distinctive octagonal plan of the barn at Rancho San Carlos. The buildings have had very few alterations over the years and retain a very high degree of integrity.

D) **It is representative of the work of a notable builder, designer, or architect**

Rancho San Carlos is eligible under this criterion for several associations. The Main house, round barn, wood/stucco barn and office, and likely other buildings on the estate, were designed by master architect Reginald Johnson. Johnson was highly acclaimed both during his lifetime and after his death and is widely recognized to have been one of the most influential architects of the 1920s and 1930s in Southern California. Although Johnson was based in Pasadena, his work in Santa Barbara County was widely respected, and Rancho San Carlos is accounted to be an excellent example of his architectural accomplishments. The landscape design is attributed to Lockwood de Forest, Jr., Ralph Stevens, and Florence Yoch, all acclaimed as landscape architects with deep ties to Santa Barbara County. Both de Forest and Stevens’ work at Rancho San Carlos is highly characteristic of the Regionalist approach to landscape design, while Yoch’s design is considered one of her best and most intact. De Forest and Stevens received regional recognition during their lifetimes and de Forest's work was illustrated in national publications, including *House Beautiful* and *Country Life in America*. A major exhibit is planned showcasing the work of Florence Yoch at the Huntington Library, opening in the fall of 2018.

E) **It contributes to the significance of a historic area, being a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic, prehistoric, archaeological, or scenic properties, or thematically related grouping of properties, which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan or physical development**

Under criterion E, Rancho San Carlos is a geographically definable grouping of buildings, structures, and landscape features that are unified by physical development. Rancho San Carlos clearly meets the National Register of Historic Places definition of a historic district: “a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united

---

historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development” having a “sense of time and place.” The buildings and landscape features of Rancho San Carlos relate to each other both visually and functionally. Contributing resources to this historic district include the Main house, its gardens, courts, terraces, and lawns; the main office; the octagonal barn, stables, arena, paddocks, and practice track; staff cottages and garages; shop, gas station, and other utilitarian buildings and structures such as barns and dog kennels; orchards; ornamental trees and plantings; internal circulation system; other hardscape features such as stone fences and iron gates; bridges, retaining walls, and low stone walls defining roadways; irrigation system features; natural topography; and vistas, both from the property to external landmarks such as the mountains and the ocean, and within the property, of the orchards and fields. The property has been operated as unified entity since 1927, with additional orchards added in the mid-1930s, is remarkably unchanged since that time, and its historic residential, agricultural, and equestrian functions are clearly conveyed by its physical character.

F) It has a location with unique physical characteristics or is a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the County of Santa Barbara

Most of the extensive street frontage of Rancho San Carlos along East Valley Road is hidden by a dense row of trees and vegetation that allow only occasional glimpses into the interior of the property. However, the stone fence along part of the frontage and massive wrought iron gate at the main entry announce the presence of a large estate, and the unbroken frontage, devoid of buildings or other interruptions combined with the occasional views of the citrus groves on the property make its character as a large agricultural estate highly apparent. This lack of development is in itself a unique physical characteristic and a view that represents an established and familiar visual feature of this neighborhood of Montecito. Additionally, expansive views of the property are available from various points on Ortega Ridge Road and from public trails.

G) It embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation

The Main house and office are outstanding examples of architectural design, skillfully using brick and stone, accented by iron and wood work at the former, and brick and wood at the latter. The interiors of the Main house, some of which were imported from England, are especially notable for their period design and materials; the living room, dining room, and library are particularly noteworthy in this regard. Craftsmanship is evident throughout the house, in fireplaces, lighting fixtures, and the hand-painted tile murals along the first floor hallway walls. Additionally, the octagonal barn is highly noteworthy for its skillful display of

123 Nye, 13.
an octagonal floor plan culminating in a cupola.

H) It reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth, particularly transportation modes or distinctive examples of park or community planning

Rancho San Carlos reflects the historical pattern of development of Montecito as a community of large estates, many of which incorporated, in addition to homes and gardens, agricultural and equestrian facilities. This pattern of development was particularly associated with the years between 1890 and the onset of World War II. With a period of significance of 1927-1945, Rancho San Carlos is a very rare, intact example from the period.

I) It is one of the few remaining examples in the County, region, state, or nation possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural or historical type or specimen

Very few other large estates from the first half of the twentieth century have survived subdivision and redevelopment, making Rancho San Carlos one of the few remaining examples to be significant as an example of this property type in the County, region, state and nation. In addition, the fruit orchards, once common in the area are increasingly rare. Even more unique is the presence of an orchard with accompanying features that dates from before World War II.
13. SUMMARY OF CASE FOR DESIGNATION AS COUNTY LANDMARK

The Rancho San Carlos Estate merits designation as a landmark of the County of Santa Barbara for its outstanding evocation of several historical themes important to the history of Montecito and the County. As one of the last, largest and most intact agricultural and equestrian estates in the County, Rancho San Carlos is a remarkable vestige of that earlier time when Montecito first gained international prominence as a home of the wealthy and powerful. The Estate exemplifies this aspect of the County’s cultural and social history and has been maintained by the same family with few modifications for over 90 years. While there have been some minor modifications, such as to the arena and loss of some landscape features, the property as a whole retains a high degree of integrity. A comparison of historic and contemporary photos reveals that Rancho San Carlos appears very much like it did during the period of significance – 1927-1945. The property also showcases the accomplishments of prominent designers who impacted the physical character of the County in general and Montecito in particular during its most formative years, architect Reginald Johnson and landscape architects Lockwood de Forest, Jr., Ralph Stevens, and Florence Yoch. With its elegant and restrained design in Monterey Revival style, the Main house is an exceptional example of the style as it was interpreted by Johnson. The office and the rare octagonal barn, both also designed by Johnson, are aesthetically pleasing as well as contributors to a functional suite of outbuildings and equestrian facilities that together comprise a working horse ranch and citrus orchard. The landscape, which exemplifies the Regionalist approach to landscape design, combines ornamental plantings with a respect for natural topography and the needs of a horse ranch and an orchard that dates from before World War II, are now rare historical features in Santa Barbara County. The sweeping view of orchards against a mountain backdrop is a prominent vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of the Montecito community, as well as a link to the area’s agricultural heritage that is significantly diminished. It is one of the few remaining examples of this type of pre-war design “in the grand manner” in the County, region, state and nation.
16. NUMBER AND DESCRIPTION OF PHOTOS * ENCLOSED:

Map 1: Topographic map showing boundaries of Rancho San Carlos and extant buildings
Map 2: Current aerial photograph showing property outline in yellow
Map 3: Rancho San Carlos – Structures Location (Sotheby’s)
Map 4: Map showing locations of buildings and prominent features on aerial
Map 5: Assessor parcel maps showing property outline in yellow (Santa Barbara County Assessor)
Map 6: Historic map showing Montecito estates (Myrick, backpiece)
Map 7: Composite Map of Certificate of Compliance (www.suzanneperkins.com)
Map 8-17: Rancho San Carlos Certificate of Compliance Maps
Map 18: Main house, first floor plan
Map 19: Main house, second floor plan

Contemporary Photo 1: Panoramic view of orchards and mountains
Contemporary Photo 2: Site feature, entry gate from East Valley Road, view north
Contemporary Photo 3: Site feature, driveway to Main house
Contemporary Photo 4: Main house, entry courtyard, west façade
Contemporary Photo 5: Main house, central courtyard with water feature, elevated view
Contemporary Photo 6: Main house, central courtyard, view of octagonal tower office
Contemporary Photo 7: Main house, central courtyard, view of formal landscaping and octagonal tower office
Contemporary Photo 8: Main house, central courtyard, elevated southwest view of courtyard and tiled loggia
Contemporary Photo 9: Main house, staircase from central courtyard to tower office with landscaping
Contemporary Photo 10: Main house, loggia and central courtyard landscaping
Contemporary Photo 11: Main house, exterior, wing with lawn and mountain setting, showing shingled roof, green shutters, rooftopline and whitewashed red brick
Contemporary Photo 12: Main house, interior, central gallery
Contemporary Photo 13: Main house, interior, staircase to master bedroom wing
Contemporary Photo 14: Main house, interior, parquet-floored gallery with murals
Contemporary Photo 15: Main house, interior, mural detail
Contemporary Photo 16: Main house, interior, mural detail
Contemporary Photo 17: Main house, interior, mural detail
Contemporary Photo 18: Main house, interior, mural detail
Contemporary Photo 19: Main house, interior, wood-paneled living room with fireplace
Contemporary Photo 20: Main house, interior, wood-paneled living room
Contemporary Photo 21: Main house, interior, wood-paneled living room
Contemporary Photo 22: Main house, interior, door detail
Contemporary Photo 23: Main house, interior, library
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 24</td>
<td>Main house, interior, library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 25</td>
<td>Main house, interior, library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 26</td>
<td>Main house, interior, dining room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 27</td>
<td>Main house, interior, dining room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 28</td>
<td>Main house, interior, kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 29</td>
<td>Main house, interior, butler’s pantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 30</td>
<td>Main house, interior, master bedroom sitting room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 31</td>
<td>Main house, interior, bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 32</td>
<td>Main house, interior, guest bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 33</td>
<td>Main house, interior, guest bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 34</td>
<td>Main house, interior, guest bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 35</td>
<td>Main house, interior, guest bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 36</td>
<td>Main house, interior, basement pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 37</td>
<td>Main house, interior, basement pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 38</td>
<td>Main house, basement, badminton court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 39</td>
<td>Main office, exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 40</td>
<td>Ranch cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 41</td>
<td>Ranch cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 42</td>
<td>Round barn, exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 43</td>
<td>Round barn, exterior, roof and vane detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 44</td>
<td>Round barn, interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 45</td>
<td>Wood frame and stucco barn and courtyard, exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 46</td>
<td>Fenced paddocks, exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 47</td>
<td>Corrals with mountain view, exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 48</td>
<td>Corrals with mountain view, exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 49</td>
<td>Corrals and pasture with ocean view, exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 50</td>
<td>Covered riding arena, interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 51</td>
<td>Rancho San Carlos from Ortega Ridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 52</td>
<td>Rancho San Carlos from Ortega Ridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 53</td>
<td>Rancho San Carlos from Ortega Ridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Photo 54</td>
<td>Rancho San Carlos from Ortega Ridge Trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic Photos:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Photo 1</td>
<td>Historic aerial photo, approximately current boundary of property outlined in yellow, note extant octagonal barn, 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Photo 2</td>
<td>Historic aerial photo, approximately current boundary of property outlined in yellow, 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Photo 3</td>
<td>Historic aerial photo, approximately current boundary of property outlined in yellow, 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Photo 4</td>
<td>Historic aerial photo, approximately current boundary of property outlined in yellow, 1956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Historic Photo 5: Historic aerial photo, approximately current boundary of property outlined in yellow, 1967

Historic Photo 6: Historic photo of model (Ryerson & Burnham Archives, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, circa 1930)

Historic Photo 7: Interior courtyard, view north (Ryerson & Burnham Archives, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, circa 1931)

Additional Contemporary Photo 1: Panoramic view of orchards and mountains with main office in foreground, view north

Additional Contemporary Photo 2: Panoramic view of pastures, orchards, and ocean, view southwest

Additional Contemporary Photo 3: Main house, note rambling plan, view northeast

Additional Contemporary Photo 4: Main house, south wing (left), east elevation overlooking the formal garden (center), and service wing (right), view northeast

Additional Contemporary Photo 5: Main house, east elevation overlooking formal garden (left) and north wing (right), view southwest

Additional Contemporary Photo 6: Road approaching main house, note grove of oak trees at left and stone wall lining drive, view e

Additional Contemporary Photo 7: Main house, south elevation of north wing facing entry court, note stone wall delineating change in grade, view north

Additional Contemporary Photo 8: Main house, central courtyard from stair, view southwest

Additional Contemporary Photo 9: Main house, east elevation (left) and service wing (right), note elevated terrace, view northwest

Additional Contemporary Photo 10: Ranch Cottage I

Additional Contemporary Photo 11: Ranch Cottage F

Additional Contemporary Photo 12: Ranch Cottage L, west elevation from Romero Canyon Road, view east (East Valley Preservation Association, 2018)

Additional Contemporary Photo 13: Round barn, view west

Additional Contemporary Photo 14: Stables and round barn, view west

Additional Historic Drawing 1: Proposed landscape plan for main entrance, prepared by Lakewood de Forest, Jr. (In the Lockwood de Forest, Jr. landscape drawings, Architecture & Design Collection, Art, Design & Architecture Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara, not dated)

Additional Historic Drawing 2: Proposed landscape plan for “Head Groom” cottage, prepared
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

by Lakewood de Forest, Jr. (In the Lockwood de Forest, Jr. landscape drawings, Architecture & Design Collection, Art, Design & Architecture Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara, not dated)

Additional Historic Photo 1: Photograph of model of Main House, south elevation, view northwest (Huntington Library, undated)

Additional Historic Photo 2: Main house under construction, south elevation, view north (Huntington Library, circa 1928)

Additional Historic Photo 3: Main house, entry court and west elevation, view east (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 4: Main house, entry court, west elevation, view east (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 5: Main house, entry court, west elevation (right) and south elevation of north wing (left), note retaining wall, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 6: Main house, south elevation terrace wall (left), view east toward orchards (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 7: Main house, south elevation terrace wall (left), view east toward orchards (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 8: Main house, east garden under construction, view northwest, note installation of mature trees (Huntington Library, circa 1930)

Additional Historic Photo 9: Main house, south elevation, view northwest (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 10: Main house, south elevation, view east toward orchards (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 11: Main house, east elevation, view northwest (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 12: Main house, terrace at east elevation, view north (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 13: Main house, north elevation of north wing, view southeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 14: Main house, north elevation of north wing (left) and east elevation of north wing (right), view southwest (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 15: Main house, north elevation of north wing, note shell tiles lining walkway, view east (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 16: Main house, garden north of north wing, view northwest (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 17: Main house, east elevation of north wing, view west (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 18: Main house, north (center) and east (right) elevation of north wing, note view west (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 19: Main house, north elevation of north wing, view southeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 20: Main house, east elevation of north wing, view west (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 21: Main house, drawing by Florence Yoch showing detail of pebble paving (Huntington Library, dated May 11, 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 22: Main house, detail of custom bench (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 23-24: Main house, central courtyard, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 25: Main house, central courtyard, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 26: Main house, central courtyard, view north (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 27: Main house, central courtyard, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 28: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 29: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 30: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 31: Entry gate from East Valley Road, view northeast (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 32: Drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 33: Drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 34: Drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 35: Drive to Main house through orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 36: Drive to Main house, view north toward Main Office (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 37: Detail of stone curb and gutter along drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 38: Detail of stone wall along drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 39: Main house, entry court, view west (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 40: Main house, east elevation (left), view southwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 41: Main house, south elevation, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 42: Main house, south elevation, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 43: Main house, south elevation, note orchard, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 44: Main house, south elevation, note orchard, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 45: Main house, south elevation, note orchard, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 46: Main house, south elevation, balcony off living room, view east (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 47: Main house, east parterre, view northeast toward orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 48: Main house, east parterre, view northeast toward orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 49: Main house, east parterre, view northeast toward orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 50: Main house, north garden, view southeast (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 51: Main house, north garden, view northwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 52: Main house, north garden, view northwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 53: Main house, north garden detail (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 54: Main house, west elevation of north wing, view south (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 55: Main house, terrace above entry court view east (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 56: Main house, north wing, terrace above entry court view southwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 57: Main house, pebble paving (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 58: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 59: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 60: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 61: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 62: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 63: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 64: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 65: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 66: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 67: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 68-69: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

* All maps and photos from Sotheby’s International Realty, 2014, unless otherwise indicated.
Map 1: Topographic map showing boundaries of Rancho San Carlos and extant buildings (Sotheby’s International Realty)
Map 2: Contemporary aerial photograph showing property outline in yellow (Sotheby’s International Realty)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Map 3: Rancho San Carlos – Structures Location (Sotheby’s)
Map 4: Rancho San Carlos – Structures Location (Sotheby’s)
Map 5: Assessor parcel maps showing property outline in yellow (Santa Barbara County Assessor)
Map 6: Historic map showing Montecito estates circa 1937, Rancho San Carlos circled (Myrick, back end paper)
Map 7: Composite Map of Certificates of Compliance (www.suzanneperkins.com)
Map 8: Rancho San Carlos Certificate of Compliance Map

Map 9: Rancho San Carlos Certificate of Compliance Map
Map 10: Rancho San Carlos Certificate of Compliance Map

Map 11: Rancho San Carlos Certificate of Compliance Map
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Public Road
(County of Santa Barbara,
Book 152, page 35 Deeds)
Note: The exact location is not disclosed of record

Chicago Title
This plat is for your aid in locating your land with reference to streets and other parcels. While this plat is believed to be correct, the Company assumes no liability for any loss occurring by reason of reliance thereon.
Map 12: Rancho San Carlos Certificate of Compliance Map

Utility Easement
(Southern California Edison, Inst. No. 3383,
Book 1055, page 6 OR)

Chicago Title
This plat is for your aid in locating your land with reference to streets and other parcels. While this plat is believed to be correct, the Company assumes no liability for any loss occurring by reason of reliance thereon.
Map 13: Rancho San Carlos Certificate of Compliance Map
Map 14: Rancho San Carlos Certificate of Compliance Map

Map 15: Rancho San Carlos Certificate of Compliance Map
Map 16: Rancho San Carlos Certificate of Compliance Map

Map 17: Rancho San Carlos Certificate of Compliance Map
Map 18: Main house, first floor plan (Sotheby’s International Realty)

Map 19: Main house, second floor plan (Sotheby’s International Realty)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

**Contemporary Photo 1:** Panoramic view of orchards and mountains

**Contemporary Photo 2:** Site feature, entry gate from East Valley Road, view north
Contemporary Photo 3: Site feature, driveway to Main house

Contemporary Photo 4: Main house, entry courtyard, west façade
Contemporary Photo 5: Main house, central courtyard with water feature, elevated view

Contemporary Photo 6: Main house, central courtyard, view of octagonal tower office
Contemporary Photo 7: Main house, central courtyard, view of formal landscaping and octagonal tower office

Contemporary Photo 8: Main house, central courtyard, elevated southwest view of courtyard and tiled loggia
Contemporary Photo 9: Main house, staircase from central courtyard to tower office with landscaping
Contemporary Photo 10: Main house, loggia and central courtyard landscaping

Contemporary Photo 11: Main house, exterior, wing with lawn and mountain setting, showing shingled roof, green shutters, roofline and whitewashed red brick
Contemporary Photo 12: Main house, interior, central gallery
Contemporary Photo 13: Main house, interior, staircase to master bedroom wing

Contemporary Photo 14: Main house, interior, parquet-floored gallery with murals
Contemporary Photo 15: Main house, interior, mural detail

Contemporary Photo 16: Main house, interior, mural detail
Contemporary Photo 17: Main house, interior, mural

Contemporary Photo 18: Main house, interior, mural detail
Contemporary Photo 19: Main house, interior, wood-paneled living room with fireplace

Contemporary Photo 20: Main house, interior, wood-paneled living room
Contemporary Photo 21: Main house, interior, wood-paneled living room
Contemporary Photo 22: Main house, interior, door detail
Contemporary Photo 23: Main house, interior, library

Contemporary Photo 24: Main house, interior, library
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Contemporary Photo 25: Main house, interior, library

Contemporary Photo 26: Main house, interior, dining room
Contemporary Photo 27: Main house, interior, dining room

Contemporary Photo 28: Main house, interior, kitchen
Contemporary Photo 29: Main house, interior, butler’s pantry

Contemporary Photo 30: Main house, interior, master bedroom sitting room
Contemporary Photo 31: Main house, interior, bedroom

Contemporary Photo 32: Main house, interior, guest bedroom
Contemporary Photo 33: Main house, interior, guest bedroom

Contemporary Photo 34: Main house, interior, guest bedroom
Contemporary Photo 35: Main house, interior, guest bedroom

Contemporary Photo 36: Main house, interior, basement pub
Contemporary Photo 37: Main house, interior, basement pub

Contemporary Photo 38: Main house, basement, badminton court
Contemporary Photo 39: Main office, exterior

Contemporary Photo 40: Ranch cottage
Contemporary Photo 41: Ranch cottage

Contemporary Photo 42: Round barn, exterior
Contemporary Photo 43: Round barn, exterior, roof and vane detail

Contemporary Photo 44: Round barn, interior
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Contemporary Photo 45: Wood frame and stucco barn and courtyard, exterior

Contemporary Photo 46: Fenced paddocks, exterior
Contemporary Photo 47: Corrals with mountain view, exterior

Contemporary Photo 48: Corrals with mountain view, exterior
Contemporary Photo 49: Corrals and pasture with ocean view, exterior

Contemporary Photo 50: Covered riding arena, interior
Contemporary Photo 51: Rancho San Carlos from Ortega Ridge Road

Contemporary Photo 52: Rancho San Carlos from Ortega Ridge Road
Contemporary Photo 53: Rancho San Carlos from Ortega Ridge Road

Contemporary Photo 54: Rancho San Carlos from Ortega Ridge Trail
Historic Photo 1: Historic aerial photo, approximately Contemporary boundary of property outlined in yellow, note extant octagonal barn, 1928
Historic Photo 2: Historic aerial photo, approximately Contemporary boundary of property outlined in yellow, 1938
Historic Photo 3: Historic aerial photo, approximately Contemporary boundary of property outlined in yellow, 1947
Historic Photo 4: Historic aerial photo, approximately Contemporary boundary of property outlined in yellow, 1956
Historic Photo 5: Historic aerial photo, approximately Contemporary boundary of property outlined in yellow, 1967
Historic Photo 6: Historic photo of model (Ryerson & Burnham Archives, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, circa 1930)
Historic Photo 7: Interior courtyard, view north (Ryerson & Burnham Archives, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, circa 1931)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Contemporary Photo 1: Panoramic view of orchards and mountains with main office in foreground, view north (video still from www.susanneperkins.com)

Additional Contemporary Photo 2: Panoramic view of pastures, orchards, and ocean, view southwest (video still from www.susanneperkins.com)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Contemporary Photo 3: Main house, note rambling plan, view northeast (video still from www.susanneperkins.com)

Additional Contemporary Photo 4: Main house, south wing (left), east elevation overlooking the formal garden (center), and service wing (right), view northeast (video still from www.susanneperkins.com)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Contemporary Photo 5: Main house, east elevation overlooking formal garden (left) and north wing (right), view southwest (video still from www.susanneperkins.com)

Additional Contemporary Photo 6: Road approaching main house, note grove of oak trees at left and stone wall lining drive, view east (video still from www.susanneperkins.com)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Contemporary Photo 7: Main house, south elevation of north wing facing entry court, note stone wall delineating change in grade, view north (video still from www.susanneperkins.com)

Additional Contemporary Photo 8: Main house, central courtyard from stair, view southwest (video still from www.susanneperkins.com)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Contemporary Photo 9: Main house, east elevation (left) and service wing (right), note elevated terrace, view northwest (video still from www.susanneperkins.com)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Contemporary Photo 10: Ranch Cottage I (video still from www.susanneperkins.com)

Additional Contemporary Photo 11: Ranch Cottage F (video still from www.susanneperkins.com)
Additional Contemporary Photo 12: Ranch Cottage L, west elevation from Romero Canyon Road, view east (East Valley Preservation Association, 2018)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Contemporary Photo 13: Round barn, view west (video still from www.susanneperkins.com)

Additional Contemporary Photo 14: Stables and round barn, view west (video still from www.susanneperkins.com)
Additional Historic Drawing 1: Proposed landscape plan for main entrance, prepared by Lakewood de Forest, Jr. (In the Lockwood de Forest, Jr. landscape drawings, Architecture & Design Collection, Art, Design & Architecture Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara, not dated)
Additional Historic Drawing 2: Proposed landscape plan for “Head Groom” cottage, prepared by Lakewood de Forest, Jr. (In the Lockwood de Forest, Jr. landscape drawings, Architecture & Design Collection, Art, Design & Architecture Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara, not dated)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 1: Photograph of model of Main House, south elevation, view northwest (Huntington Library, undated)

Additional Historic Photo 2: Main house under construction, south elevation, view north (Huntington Library, circa 1928)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

**Additional Historic Photo 3:** Main house, entry court and west elevation, view east (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

**Additional Historic Photo 4:** Main house, entry court, west elevation, view east (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 5: Main house, entry court, west elevation (right) and south elevation of north wing (left), note retaining wall, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 6: Main house, south elevation terrace wall (left), view east toward orchards (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 7: Main house, east garden under construction, view southeast toward orchard, note installation of mature trees (Huntington Library, circa 1930)

Additional Historic Photo 8: Main house, east garden under construction, view northwest, note installation of mature trees (Huntington Library, circa 1930)
Additional Historic Photo 9: Main house, south elevation, view northwest (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 10: Main house, south elevation, view east toward orchards (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 11: Main house, east elevation, view northwest (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 12: Main house, terrace at east elevation, view north (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 13: Main house, north elevation of north wing, view southeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 14: Main house, north elevation of north wing (left) and east elevation of north wing (right), view southwest (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 15: Main house, north elevation of north wing, note shell tiles lining walkway, view east (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 16: Main house, garden north of north wing, view northwest (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 17: Main house, east elevation of north wing, view west (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 18: Main house, north (center) and east (right) elevation of north wing, note view west (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 19: Main house, north elevation of north wing, view southeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 20: Main house, east elevation of north wing, view west (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 21: Main house, drawing by Florence Yoch showing detail of pebble paving (Huntington Library, dated May 11, 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 22: Main house, detail of custom bench (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 23-24: Main house, central courtyard, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 25: Main house, central courtyard, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

**Additional Historic Photo 26**: Main house, central courtyard, view north (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

**Additional Historic Photo 27**: Main house, central courtyard, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 28: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 29: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 30: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
Additional Historic Photo 31: Entry gate from East Valley Road, view northeast (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 32: Drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 33: Drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 34: Drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 35: Drive to Main house through orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 36: Drive to Main house, view north toward Main Office (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 37: Detail of stone curb and gutter along drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 38: Detail of stone wall along drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 39: Main house, entry court, view west (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 40: Main house, east elevation (left), view southwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 41: Main house, south elevation, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 42: Main house, south elevation, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

**Additional Historic Photo 43:** Main house, south elevation, note orchard, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

**Additional Historic Photo 44:** Main house, south elevation, note orchard, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 45: Main house, south elevation, note orchard, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 46: Main house, south elevation, balcony off living room, view east (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 47: Main house, east parterre, view northeast toward orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 48: Main house, east parterre, view northeast toward orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

**Additional Historic Photo 49:** Main house, east parterre, view northeast toward orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

**Additional Historic Photo 50:** Main house, north garden, view southeast (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 51: Main house, north garden, view northwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 52: Main house, north garden, view northwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

**Additional Historic Photo 53:** Main house, north garden detail (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

**Additional Historic Photo 54:** Main house, west elevation of north wing, view south (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 55: Main house, terrace above entry court view east (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 56: Main house, north wing, terrace above entry court view southwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 57: Main house, pebble paving (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 58: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 59: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 60: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 61: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 62: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 63: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 64: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 65: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 66: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

Additional Historic Photo 67: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Rancho San Carlos
2500 East Valley Road

Additional Historic Photo 68-69: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Assessor parcel maps showing property outline in yellow (Santa Barbara County Assessor)
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
Rancho San Carlos

THE LAND REFERRED TO HEREBIN BELOW IS SITUATED IN THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

PARCEL ONE:

That portion of Lot 1, Section 15, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a deed granted to Charles H. Jackson, recorded April 1, 1932 in Book 262, Page 334 of Official Records and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a live oak tree fractional section corner on Santa Barbara Pueblo Line between Sections 10 and 15, said Township and Range, the same being the Northwest corner of said Lot One, and shown on a Map of Survey made by F.F. Flournoy of the Rancho San Carlos, property of C.B. Raymond, East Montecito, Santa Barbara County, California, August 1917 and filed in Book 11, Pages 117 through 120, inclusive, of Maps, in the office of the County Recorder of said County;

thence along the line between the property now owned by Guy T. Stetson and that of C.H. Jackson North 89° 55' East, 130.70 feet to an "F" on a boulder;

thence through the property of Guy T. Stetson South 8° 08' 20" East, 77.14 feet to a 2" pipe with brass cap marked C.B. Raymond Property, et ux.;

thence North 89° 55' West, 75.43 feet to a point at the intersection of the South line of the C.H. Jackson property and the Santa Barbara Pueblo Line;

thence along the Santa Barbara Pueblo Line and the line between the properties of C.H. Jackson and Guy T. Stetson North 41° 00' West, 100.90 feet to the point of beginning.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119887 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-03 (Portion)

PARCEL TWO:

That portion of Lot 4, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a Final Decree of Partition recorded April 3, 1896 in Book 57, Page 309 of Deeds and being the first parcel described in said Deed, said parcel is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a large rock marked F. on North face and on line between Sections 10 and 15, said Township and Range, from which the corner to Sections 10, 11, 14 and 15 bears East 6 chains;

thence North parallel with line between Sections 10 and 11 at 14.04 chains to a rock containing about 6000 cubic inches from which a live oak tree about one foot in diameter bears South 3° 30' East, 56 links;

thence West 40 feet to a stake near West side of ravine; thence South parallel with said Section line 10 and 11 at 13.14 chains to a point 6 inches West of a chaparral tree 3 inches in diameter with 4 notches on West side;

thence West 26 links to a stake in mound of rocks under fence;

thence along said fence South 41° 15' East, 120 links to a live oak tree marked 1/4S 10 on line between Sections 10 and 15 and Pueblo Lands;

thence along line between Sections 10 and 15 East 198 links to place of beginning.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion that lies Northerly of the Southwesterly line of the third parcel described in
a deed granted to Ralph Radcliffe Whitehead and recorded December 18, 1896 in Book 58, Page 584 of Deeds, said third described parcel is shown as No. 3 on a Survey filed in Book 1, Page 48 of Maps and Surveys, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119888 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-03 (Portion)

PARCEL THREE:

That portion of Lot 4, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described as the third parcel in a deed granted to Ralph Radcliffe Whitehead and recorded December 18, 1896 in Book 58, Page 584 of Deeds, said third described parcel is shown as No. 3 on a Survey filed in Book 1, Page 48 of Maps and Surveys, in the office of the County Recorder of said County, said parcel is more particularly described as follows:

EXCEPT therefrom that portion that lies Westerly of the Westerly line of the first described parcel in a Final Decree of Partition recorded April 3, 1896 in Book 57, Page 309 of Deeds.

ALSO EXCEPTING therefrom that portion that lies Northerly of the Southerly line of the land described in a deed granted to Mary P. Raymond recorded August 3, 1917 in Book 160, Page 449 of Deeds.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119889 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-03 (Portion)

PARCEL FOUR:

That portion of Lot 4, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described as the third parcel in a deed granted to Ralph Radcliffe Whitehead and recorded December 18, 1896 in Book 58, Page 584 of Deeds, said third described parcel is shown as No. 3 on a Survey filed in Book 1, Page 48 of Maps and Surveys, in the office of the County Recorder of said County, said parcel is more particularly described as follows:

EXCEPT therefrom that portion that lies Easterly of the Westerly line of the first described parcel in a Final Decree of Partition recorded April 3, 1896 in Book 57, Page 309 of Deeds.

ALSO EXCEPTING therefrom that portion that lies Northerly of the Southerly line of the land described in a deed granted to Mary P. Raymond recorded August 3, 1917 in Book 160, Page 449 of Deeds.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119890 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-03 (Portion)

PARCEL FIVE:

That portion of Lot 4, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a deed granted to Mary P. Raymond recorded August 3, 1917 in Book 160, Page 449 of Deeds, in the office of the County Recorder of said County, said parcel is more particularly described as follows:

EXCEPT therefrom that portion that lies Easterly of the Easterly line of the first described parcel in a Final Decree of Partition recorded April 3, 1896 in Book 57, Page 309 of Deeds.

ALSO EXCEPTING therefrom that portion that lies Westerly of the Westerly line of the first described parcel in a Final Decree of Partition recorded April 3, 1896 in Book 57, Page 309 of Deeds.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119891 of Official Records, records of said County.
APN# 155-070-03 (Portion)

PARCEL SIX:

That portion of Lot 4, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a deed granted to Mary P. Raymond recorded August 3, 1917 in Book 160, Page 449 of Deeds, in the office of the County Recorder of said County, said parcel is more particularly described as follows:

EXCEPT therefrom that portion that lies Easterly of the Westerly line of the first described parcel in a Final Decree of Partition recorded April 3, 1896 in Book 57, Page 309 of Deeds.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119892 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-03 (Portion)

PARCEL SEVEN:

That portion of Lot 4, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a deed granted to Mary P. Raymond recorded August 3, 1917 in Book 160, Page 449 of Deeds, in the office of the County Recorder of said County, said parcel is more particularly described as follows:

EXCEPT therefrom that portion that lies Westerly of the Easterly line of the first described parcel in a Final Decree of Partition recorded April 3, 1896 in Book 57, Page 309 of Deeds.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119893 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-03 (Portion)

PARCEL EIGHT:

That portion of Lot 4, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a Final Decree of Partition recorded April 3, 1896 in Book 57, Page 309 of Deeds and being the first parcel described in said deed, said parcel is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a large rock marked F. on North face and on line between Sections 10 and 15, said Township and Range, from which the corner to Sections 10, 11, 14 and 15 bears East 6 chains;

thence North parallel with line between Sections 10 and 11 at 14.04 chains to a rock containing about 6000 cubic inches from which a live oak tree about one foot in diameter bears South 3° 30' East, 56 links;

thence West 40 feet to a stake near West side of ravine;

thence South parallel with said Section line 10 and 11 at 13.14 chains to a point 6 inches West of a chaparral tree 3 inches in diameter with 4 notches on West side; thence West 26 links to a stake in mound of rocks under fence;

thence along said fence South 41° 15' East, 120 links to a live oak tree marked 1/4S 10 on line between Sections 10 and 15 and Pueblo Lands;

thence along line between Sections 10 and 15 East 198 links to place of beginning.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion that lies Southerly of the Northwesterly line of the third parcel described in a deed granted to Ralph Radcliffe Whitehead and recorded December 18, 1896 in Book 58, Page 584 of Deeds, said third described parcel is shown as No. 3 on a survey filed in Book 1, Page 48 of Maps and Surveys, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.
Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119894 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-03 (Portion)

PARCEL NINE:

That portion of Lot 4, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a Final Decree of Partition recorded April 3, 1896 in Book 57, Page 309 of Deeds and being the fourth parcel described in said deed, said parcel is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a stake in mound of rocks under fence on the Northeasterly line of the Pueblo Lands, from which a live oak about twenty inches in diameter, on line between Sections 10 and 15, said Township and Range, and marked 1/4S 10 on Northeast side, bears South 41° 15' East, 120 links;

thence East parallel with said Section line between Sections 10 and 15 at 216 links to a point 6 inches West of a chaparral tree three inches in diameter marked with four notches on its West side;

thence North parallel with line between Sections 10 and 11, 13.14 chains to a stake near West side of a ravine from which a rock, containing about 6000 cubic inches, marked F. on top, bears East 40 feet;

thence West, 13.26 chains to stake in mound of whitish rocks under fence on West line of Lot 4, said Section 10; thence South 0° 45' East along said fence and West line of said Lot 4, 51 links to a charred post in corner of fence;

thence along general course of fence on the line between said Lot 4 and the Pueblo Lands South 41° 15' East, 16.80 chains to the point of beginning.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion within the boundaries of the third parcel described in a deed granted to Ralph Radcliffe Whitehead and recorded December 18, 1896 in Book 58, Page 584 of Deeds, said third described parcel is shown as No. 3 on a survey filed in Book 1, Page 48 of Maps and Surveys, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119895 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-03 (Portion)

PARCEL TEN:

That portion of Lot 4, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a Final Decree of Partition recorded April 3, 1896 in Book 57, Page 309 of Deeds and being the fourth parcel described in said deed, said parcel is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a stone monument 10x10x12 inches and buried 6 inches in the ground marked F. on top; said monument is on the North boundary line of Lot 4, Section 10, said Township and Range, from which the line between Sections 10 and 11 bears East 6 chains;

thence West following general course of fence on the North line of said Lot 4, at 13.95 chains to corner post of said fence;

thence South 00° 45' East, along general course of fence, on the West line of said Lot 4, at 6.00 chains to stake in mound of whitish rocks under said fence;

thence East, 13.87 chains to a rock, containing about 6000 cubic inches, from which a live oak tree about one foot in diameter marked F. in bark bears South 3° 30' East, 56 links;

thence North parallel with line between Sections 10 and 11 at 6.00 chains to the point of beginning.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion that lies Easterly of the line described in a deed recorded December 12,

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119896 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-03 (Portion)

PARCEL ELEVEN:

Lot 3, the South Half of the Northeast Quarter and the Northeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, according to the Official Plat of said land filed in the District Land Office.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion that lies Easterly of the line described in a deed recorded December 12, 1932 in Book 276, Page 61 of Official Records.

ALSO EXCEPTING therefrom that portion that lies Easterly of the Westerly line of the first parcel described in a deed granted to Ralph Radcliffe Whitehead and recorded December 18, 1896 in Book 58, Page 584 of Deeds, said first described parcel is shown as No. 1 on a survey filed in Book 1, Page 48 of Maps and Surveys, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

ALSO EXCEPTING therefrom that portion described in a granted to Ralph Radcliffe Whitehead recorded July 18, 1918 in Book 168, Page 391 of Deeds.

ALSO EXCEPTING therefrom that portion excepted and reserved from a deed granted to Petan Investment Corporation recorded September 3, 1936 in Book 371, Page 458 of Official Records.

ALSO EXCEPTING therefrom that portion shown and designated as "Parcel 500" on the map of the "Romero Creek Debris Barrier R/W, Site 18" filed August 1, 1973 in Book 47, Page 90 of Miscellaneous Maps.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119897 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-01 & 03 (Portion) and 155-030-45 (Portion)

PARCEL TWELVE:

That portion of the Southeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter and the Northeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, according to the Official Plat of said land filed in the District Land Office described as the first parcel in a deed granted to Ralph Radcliffe Whitehead and recorded December 18, 1896 in Book 58, Page 584 of Deeds, said first described parcel is shown as No. 1 on a survey filed in Book 1, Page 48 of Maps and Surveys, both in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion that lies Easterly of the line described in a deed recorded December 12, 1932 in Book 276, Page 61 of Official Records.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119898 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-03 (Portion) and 155-030-45 (Portion)

PARCEL THIRTEEN:

That portion of the Northwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, according to the Official Plat of said land filed in the District Land Office, granted to Mary P. Raymond in a deed recorded July 24, 1918 in Book 168, Page 418 of Deeds in the office of the County Recorder of said County and described as follows:
Beginning at the Northeast corner of a tract land conveyed to Alice McCurdy Hart by R. Radcliffe Whitehead and Jane Radcliffe Whitehead, his wife, by deed dated June 4, 1898 and recorded in Book 63, Page 352 of Deeds;

thence first, South 66° 11' East, 309.8 feet to a 2" pipe survey monument with brass cap on top of hill and on the Northerly line of the land owned by Mary P. Raymond;

thence second, South 89° 55' West along the said Northern line of land owned by Mary P. Raymond 173 feet;

thence third, North 41° 23' West 167.1 feet to the point of beginning.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119999 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-030-45 (Portion)

PARCEL FOURTEEN:

That portion of the Northwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, according to the Official Plat of said land filed in the District Land Office, granted to Mary P. Raymond in a deed recorded July 29, 1918 in Book 167, Page 499 of Deeds in the office of the County Recorder of said County and described as follows:

Beginning at the Northeast corner of a tract land conveyed to Alice McCurdy by R. Radcliffe Whitehead and Jane Radcliffe Whitehead, his wife, by deed dated June 4, 1898, and recorded in Book 63, Page 352 of Deeds, said Northeast corner being a letter F on rock and almost obliterated, a 2" iron pipe survey monument with brass cap set in its place;

thence 1st, South 41° 23' East, 167.1 feet to another 2" pipe survey monument with brass cap set on the Northern line of land conveyed by Henry P. Lincoln, administrator, to Mary P. Raymond, by deed dated September 13, 1916 and recorded in Book 150, Page 538 of Deeds;

thence 2nd, along the Northern line of last above mentioned tract, South 89° 54' West, 120.05 feet to an old monument at the Southeast corner of the first above mentioned tract;

thence 3rd, North 4° 20' East, 126.00 feet to the point of beginning.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119900 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-030-45 (Portion)

PARCEL FIFTEEN:

That portion of the Northwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, according to the Official Plat of said land filed in the District Land Office, granted to Alice McCurdy Hart by R. Radcliffe Whitehead and Jane Radcliffe Whitehead, his wife, by deed dated June 4, 1898 and recorded in Book 63, Page 352 of Deeds in the office of the County Recorder of said County and described as follows:

Beginning at a live oak tree about 2 feet in diameter and marked F on Northeast side, said tree is on top of a low ridge and on the line between lands owned by the parties hereto from which a 2x2 stake set in center of county road at the Northwest corner of the land of Alice McCurdy Hart bears West one hundred and for (104) feet;

thence North 27° 30' East, two hundred forty six (246) feet to a letter F marked on rock in mound of rock;

thence South 75° 45' East at two hundred seventy nine (279) feet to a cross on top of rock on top of bluff bank on Easterly side of Romero Creek at three hundred seventy three (373) feet to a letter F marked on
top of rock in Westerly tract of old road bed;

thence South 4° 25' West, one hundred twenty eight feet to a redwood stake in mound of rock on the
North line of land owned by Alice McCurdy Hart;

thence along said North line of land of Alice McCurdy Hart three hundred seventy seven (377) feet to the
point of beginning.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion described in a deed granted to Robert M. Hutchins, et ux., recorded March

ALSO EXCEPTING therefrom that portion shown and designated as "Parcel 500" on the map of the
"Romero Creek Debris Barrier R/W, Site 18" filed August 1, 1973 in Book 47, Page 90 of Miscellaneous
Maps.

APN# 155-030-45 (Portion)

PARCEL SIXTEEN:

That portion of Lot 3 and the Southwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter, Section 10, Township 4 North,
Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, according
to the Official Plat of said land filed in the District Land Office, excepted and reserved from a deed
granted to the Petan Investment Corporation, recorded September 3, 1936 in Book 371, Page 458 of
Official Records in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2,

APN# 155-070-02 (Portion)

PARCEL SEVENTEEN:

That portion of Lot 2, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the
County of Santa Barbara, State of California, according to the Official Plat of said land filed in the District
Land Office, shown as No. 5 on a survey filed in Book 1, Page 48 of Maps and Surveys, in the office of the
County Recorder of said County.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion of said land shown as No. 5 that lies Southwesterly of the Northeasterly
line of the Outside Pueblo Lands;

ALSO EXCEPTING therefrom that portion that lies Northerly of the Southeasterly line of the land granted
to Ralph Radcliffe White by a deed recorded July 18, 1918 in Book 168, Page 391 of Deeds.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2,

APN# 155-070-01 (Portion)

PARCEL EIGHTEEN:

That portion of Lot 2, Section 10, Township 4 North, Range 26 West, San Bernardino Meridian, in the
County of Santa Barbara, State of California, according to the Official Plat of said land filed in the District
Land Office, described as Parcel 1 in a deed granted to Alice McCurdy Hart, recorded June 7, 1898
in Book 63, Page 352 of Deeds, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion of said Parcel 1 that lies Southwesterly of the Northeasterly line of the
Outside Pueblo Lands.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2,

APN# 155-070-01 (Portion)
PARCEL NINETEEN:

That portion of the Outside Pueblo Lands of Santa Barbara, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described as Parcel 1 in a deed granted to Alice McCurdy Hart, recorded June 7, 1898 in Book 63, Page 352 of Deeds, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion of said Parcel 1 that lies Northeasterly of the Northeasterly line of the Outside Pueblo Lands.

ALSO EXCEPT therefrom that portion of said Parcel 1 that lies Southerly of the Southerly line of the land described in a deed granted to David Davis, recorded May 7, 1860 in Book D, Page 146 of Deeds.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119903 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-08 (Portion)

PARCEL TWENTY:

That portion of the Outside Pueblo Lands of Santa Barbara, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, shown as No. 5 on a Survey filed in Book 1, Page 48 of Maps and Surveys, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion of said land shown as No. 5 that lies Northeasterly of the Northeasterly line of the Outside Pueblo Lands.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119904 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-08 (Portion)

PARCEL TWENTY-ONE:

That portion of the Outside Pueblo Lands of Santa Barbara, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, shown as No. 4 on a Survey filed in Book 1, Page 48 of Maps and Surveys, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion of said land shown as No. 4 that lies Northwesterly of the Northwesterly line described as Parcel 1 in a deed granted to Alice McCurdy Hart, recorded June 7, 1898 in Book 63, Page 352 of Deeds.

APN# 155-070-08 (Portion)

PARCEL TWENTY-TWO:

That portion of the Outside Pueblo Lands of Santa Barbara, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described as Parcel 1 in a deed granted to Alice McCurdy Hart, recorded June 7, 1898 in Book 63, Page 352 of Deeds, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion of said Parcel 1 that lies Easterly of the Westerly line of the land shown as No. 4 on a survey filed in Book 1, Page 48 of Maps and Surveys, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

ALSO EXCEPT therefrom that portion of said Parcel 1 that lies Northerly of the Southerly line of the land described in a deed granted to David Davis, recorded May 7, 1860 in Book D, Page 146 of Deeds.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119906 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-08 (Portion)
PARCEL TWENTY-THREE:

That portion of the Outside Pueblo Lands of Santa Barbara, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described as follows:

Beginning at the Southwesterly corner of the land described in a deed granted to Alice McCurdy Hart, recorded April 27, 1896 in Book 45, Page 306 of Deeds, said Southwesterly corner is shown on a Record of Survey filed in Book B, Page 43 of Maps;

thence 1st, North 9° 04' East along the Westerly line of said land described in a deed granted to Alice McCurdy Hart to its intersection with the 12th course of Parcel One described in a deed granted to Flora J. Basham recorded February 7, 1961 in Book 1823, Page 572 of Official Records, and shown on a Record of Survey filed in Book 61, Page 77 of Record of Surveys;

thence 2nd, North 46° 19' 30" East along said 12th course to the Northeasterly terminus thereof;

thence 3rd, North 1° 56' 30" East 186.22 feet along the 13th course of said last mentioned deed to the Northerly terminus thereof;

thence 4th, North 11° 20' 10" East 243.08 feet along the 14th course of said last mentioned deed to the Northerly terminus thereof and the Southwesterly corner of the land shown as No. 4 on a survey filed in Book 1, Page 48 of Maps;

thence 5th, North 77° 05' East along the Southerly line of said No. 4, 245.52 feet to the Southeasterly corner of said No. 4;

thence 6th, North 21° East along the Easterly line of said No. 4, 242.88 feet to the Northerly line of said first mentioned deed;

thence 7th, East along said Northerly line to the Northeasterly corner of said first mentioned deed;

thence 8th, South 41° 15' East, along the Northeasterly line of said first mentioned deed, 1089.00 feet to the Southeasterly terminus thereof:

thence 9th, South along the Easterly line of said first mentioned deed, 595.32 feet to the Southeasterly corner of said first mentioned deed;

thence 10th, West along the Southerly line of said first mentioned deed 1189.32 feet to the point of beginning.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119907 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-08 (Portion)

PARCEL TWENTY-FOUR:

That portion of the Outside Pueblo Lands of Santa Barbara, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a deed granted to Thomas McKeon, recorded August 21, 1877 in Book S, Page 52 of Deeds, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119908 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-07 (Portion)

PARCEL TWENTY-FIVE:

That portion of the Outside Pueblo Lands of the City of Santa Barbara, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California described in a deed granted to Eugene Lies recorded October 3, 1868 in Book F, Page 668 of Deeds and more particularly described in said deed as follows:
Beginning at the Southeast corner of Survey No. 436, in the name of Edward Bodie; thence North 22.00 chains to mark "X" on rock bears South 0.06 links;

thence East, at 5.93 chains intersect N.E. boundary of the Pueblo Lands;

thence along the same South 41°15' East, 29.28 chains to post 73 links West of land formerly owned by Dr. J.B. Shaw;

thence along the same 25.20 chains West to the place of beginning.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119909 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-07 (Portion)

PARCEL TWENTY-SIX:

That portion of the Outside Pueblo Lands of Santa Barbara, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a deed granted to Charles H. Jackson Jr., et ux., recorded August 24, 1928 in Book 151, Page 277 of Official Records, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119911 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-08 (Portion)

PARCEL TWENTY-SEVEN:

That portion of the Outside Pueblo Lands of Santa Barbara, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a deed granted to the Petan Company, recorded March 18, 1846 in Book 676, Page 149 of Official Records.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119912 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-08 (Portion)

PARCEL TWENTY-EIGHT:

That portion of the Outside Pueblo Lands of Santa Barbara, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a deed granted to C.R. Holmes, recorded August 24, 1928 in Book 156, Page 75 of Official Records, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion described in a deed granted to the Petan Company, recorded March 18, 1946 in Book 676, Page 149 of Official Records.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119913 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-08 (Portion)

PARCEL TWENTY-NINE:

That portion of the Outside Pueblo Lands of Santa Barbara, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a deed granted to the Petan Company, recorded November 27, 1946 in Book 686, Page 343 of Official Records, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion of said land that lies Easterly of the Westerly line of the land described in a deed granted to C.R. Holmes, recorded August 24, 1928 in Book 156, Page 75 of Official Records.

ALSO EXCEPTING therefrom that portion of said land that lies Southerly of the Northerly line of the land described in a deed granted to Thomas Van Buren, recorded October 3, 1887 in Book 17, Page 194 of
Deeds.

ALSO EXCEPT therefrom that portion of said land within the boundaries of the land described as Parcel One in a deed granted to Flora J. Basham, recorded February 7, 1961 in Book 1823, Page 572 of Official Records.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119914 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-08 (Portion)

PARCEL THIRTY:

That portion of the Outside Pueblo Lands of Santa Barbara, in the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described in a deed granted to the Petan Company, recorded November 27, 1946 in Book 686, Page 343 of Official Records, in the office of the County Recorder of said County.

EXCEPT therefrom that portion of said land that lies Easterly of the Westerly line of the land described in a deed granted to C.R. Holmes, recorded August 24, 1928 in Book 156, Page 75 of Official Records.

ALSO EXCEPTING therefrom that portion of said land that lies Northerly of the Southerly line of the land described in a deed granted to Thomas Van Buren, recorded October 3, 1887 in Book 17, Page 196 of Deeds.

ALSO EXCEPT therefrom that portion of said land within the boundaries of the land described as Parcel Two in a deed granted to Flora J. Basham, recorded February 7, 1961 in Book 1823, Page 572 of Official Records.

Said land is described in a County of Santa Barbara Certificate of Compliance recorded September 2, 2003, as Instrument No. 2003-119919 of Official Records, records of said County.

APN# 155-070-08 (Portion)
EXHIBIT E
RANCHO SAN CARLOS ESTATE
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY HISTORIC LANDMARK
(PROPOSED) SPECIAL CONDITIONS
JUNE 2017

The Rancho San Carlos Estate is a preeminent historic landmark in Montecito, unincorporated Santa Barbara County. In recognition of its special historical significance, the Estate has been nominated for designation as an historic landmark under Section 18A of the County Code of Ordinances. Section 18A-5 allows the Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission to impose special conditions on designation of historic landmarks to protect them from inconsistent alterations, provide notice of regulatory requirements to owners and potential purchasers and address special or unique circumstances.

In the case of the 237-acre Rancho San Carlos Estate, all of which forms a unified historic site, the need for special conditions is especially acute. Just as the Estate was originally created through the unified vision of its original designers and occupants, Ann and Pete Jackson, any redevelopment of this historic landmark should be accomplished as part of a unified plan of reuse, rather than as unrelated single-lot developments. Given the national reputations of the architect and landscape designer selected by the Jacksons, whose work has been lovingly preserved by the Jackson family, the highest standards of historic preservation should be applied to necessary modifications. At the same time, it may be necessary to consider special site-specific regulations to facilitate permanent protection of the historic relationship between the imposing buildings designed by master architect Reginald Johnson and the equestrian and agricultural uses that characterized the majority of the historic Estate.

The potential for incompatible redevelopment of the Rancho San Carlos Estate is especially challenging because the property is currently subdivided into 30 parcels, ranging in size from less than an acre to almost 77 acres. In addition to its unique historic character, recognized in this nomination, the Estate is subject to potentially inconsistent requirements under County planning criteria due to the presence of environmentally sensitive habitat, special biological communities, waterways, prime agricultural soils, significant viewsheds and visual resources, and steep hillsides. The property fronts on East Valley Road, which is a scenic view corridor proposed for designation as a state scenic highway in the Montecito Community Plan. Uncoordinated development may result in the loss of important historic and other resources intended for protection under the County General Plan and the Montecito Community Plan.

Proposed special conditions for designation of the Rancho San Carlos Estate include the following:

A. No subdivision or development of any portion of the Estate shall be permitted until a Specific Plan for future development of the 237-acre Estate in its entirety has been approved by the County, including the HLAC. The Specific Plan may be processed concurrently with other approvals.

B. The Specific Plan will include provisions addressing each of the following:
a. Preservation of the unified historic character of the Estate, including the relationship between residential structures, agriculture and equestrian uses.
b. Protection of historic public views of the historic structures, historic orchards and natural habitats with the Estate. Public views include those from public roads, trails and other viewing sites.
c. Protection of the existing historic orchards and other prime agricultural lands in accordance with County goals and policies. Incentives to retain and maintain agricultural uses should be considered.
d. Protection of the character of East Valley Road as a significant historic and scenic resource.
e. Compatibility of proposed development with the character of surrounding neighborhoods and uses.
f. Identification of areas suitable for conversion of agricultural areas to residential use, consistent with achievement of historic, aesthetic, biological, agricultural and view protection goals and policies.
g. Architectural design standards to ensure that any new development is compatible with the historic character of the multiple Reginald Johnson-designed structures on the Estate.
h. Landscape design standards to ensure that any new landscaping is compatible with the historic character of the Lockwood de Forest-designed gardens on the Estate.

C. All demolition, removal or destruction of any character-defining elements of the Estate, including structures, equestrian features and orchards will require a certificate of demolition issued after notice and hearing by the HLAC, and will only be approved if there are no feasible alternatives to the proposed removal, after full environmental review.

D. All alterations, repairs, additions, relocations or changes (other than normal maintenance and repair work) will require a certificate of appropriateness issued after notice and hearing by the HLAC to ensure that the proposed work is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings and the Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes will be applied, as appropriate.

E. Requirements for certificates of appropriateness shall not require the expenditure of an unreasonable amount of money to carry out the preservation purposes of the designation.

F. Designation shall not prevent the owner of the Estate from making any and all reasonable uses of the Estate which are not in conflict with the preservation purposes of the designation.
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INTRODUCTION

The project site is a 2.5-acre site located on the north side of East Valley Road (State Highway 192) approximately .25 mile west of its intersection with Sheffield Drive. The site is situated near the southeast corner of a 76.87-acre parcel (APN 155-070-008) which, in turn, is part of the larger approximately 237-acre Rancho San Carlos. The project site contains a lemon tree orchard. The project parcel has been part of the Rancho San Carlos for about 79 years and its history is inseparable from the history of the ranch. The following significance assessment therefore will evaluate the potential historical significance of the Rancho San Carlos as a whole. (See Site Boundaries and Vicinity Map, Appendix 1) The Montecito Fire Protection District (MFPD) proposes to acquire the 2.5-acre site and build a fire station consisting of three structures. (See Proposed Project Site Plan and Conceptual Station Elevations, Appendix 2)

Ronald L. Nye, historian, was retained by Amec Foster Wheeler to prepare a Phase 1-2 Historic Resources Survey on the study property. The survey followed the guidelines and criteria for significance set forth in the County of Santa Barbara Resource Management Department’s Cultural Resources Guidelines, Historic Resources Element document, dated January 1993. The property was also assessed using the criteria for significance established by the California Register of Historical Resources and the National Register of Historic Places.

RECORDS REVIEW

Research for this study was conducted at the following repositories of historical information:

Ancestry.com (city directories, federal census returns, voter registers)  
Architecture and Design Collections, UCSB (architectural drawings)  
Community Development and Conservation Collection, UCSB Library (local history archives)  
County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development Department  
Building and Safety Division (building permit street files)  
Zoning Division (permit and violation street files)  
County of Santa Barbara Surveyor’s Office (historical maps and property surveys)  
Montecito History Committee Archives (historical maps, clippings, address files)  
Santa Barbara Historical Museum, Cledhill Library (historical maps, clippings, biographical files, history volumes, oral histories)  
Santa Barbara Public Library (city directories, history volumes)
FIELD INVENTORY

Neither the project site nor the Rancho San Carlos was accessible for on-site reconnaissance. The following description was based on a visual inspection from East Valley Road, which runs parallel to the study property and ranch proper on their southern boundaries; a previous on-site visit to the Rancho San Carlos in 2015; and archival and online textual and visual sources.

The project site contains a lemon orchard arrayed in rows of trees running east and west. It is part of a larger orchard on the Rancho San Carlos that extends to the north and east of the site. There are no structures on the site. The 2.5-acre property is bordered by orchard trees on the north and east, an oak tree-lined drainage ditch on the west, followed by more orchard trees on a separate ranch property; and by East Valley Road on the south. A seven-foot-high chain link and barbed wire fence runs along the property line facing East Valley Road. The larger orchard extends to the north and northeast on a very gently south-sloping surface gradient before gradually rising in elevation as it approaches finger-like foothills at distances varying from about .25 to .5 mile from the study parcel. The approximately 420-foot-long East Valley Road right-of-way that borders the project site contains a line of mature oak trees and scrub oak that varies in height and density. The gaps between trees and variations in foliage density allows brief glimpses of the orchard, foothills, and Santa Ynez Mountains backdrop to motorists driving by on the road.

The approximately 237-acre Rancho San Carlos features a rambling California Monterey Revival Style estate house designed by Reginald G. Johnson and completed in 1932. The home, which is located about .5 mile north of East Valley Road, is considered one of Johnson's finest residential projects. It is a horizontally-massed one-and two-story home with several cross-gabled roof forms topped by clay tile shingles. The sprawling residence is perched on two
natural terraces and is arranged around a central courtyard. Its walls consist of a sophisticated combination of rusticated red brick and sandstone block masonry. The second-story bedroom wing features an octagonal tower with a hipped roof and a long balcony with squared support posts and ornamental wrought iron railing. The home's numerous wall openings are symmetrically arranged, rectangular, and recessed, and contain multiple-light window sashes and door leafs made of wood. Wood shutters adorn the windows. Johnson also designed the home's garage, ranch office building, three of the ranch's ten residential cottages, a round stable, and probably an adjacent U-shaped stable, all of which reflect the same rustic Spanish California aesthetic exemplified by the estate house. There are several additional equestrian and agricultural-related structures and facilities on the ranch. The Jacksons retained the acclaimed landscape architect Lockwood de Forest, Jr. to design the estate house's grounds and gardens. These landscaped grounds appear to be confined for the most part to the acreage immediately surrounding the estate house and to be located approximately .5 miles north of East Valley Road. The property presently includes over 100 acres of cultivated orchards that produce lemons, avocados, oranges, and limes.1 (See Project Site Field Photographs, Appendix 3)

![Courtyard view of Rancho San Carlos estate house. Source: suzannerpkins.com](image)

NEIGHBORHOOD OVERVIEW

The neighborhood in the vicinity of the project site may be generally classified as semi-rural. East Valley Road is the central feature that bisects neighborhood along its east-west running axis. Orchards and oak trees, some in lines and some in groups, belonging to the Rancho San Carlos, extend to the west, north and east of the project site. The adjacent Feather Hill Ranch, an active ranch, stretches approximately 600 feet to the west, on the north side of East Valley Road, until it reaches Romero Canyon Creek. The masonry Romero Canyon Creek Bridge on East Valley Road, built in 1917, approximately 800 feet west of the project site, has been found by Caltrans historians to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Residential subdivisions consisting of one-acre and smaller lots extend westward beyond the bridge for at least 0.5 mile on the north side of the East Valley Road. East of the project site on the north side of the road the Rancho San Carlos continues for approximately 0.5 mile before giving way to oak forests interspersed with scattered homes on large lots. This stretch of State 192 is bordered on both sides by a semi-continuous but at times dense stands of oak trees. Directly across East Valley Road from the project site is the 16-acre "Stalloreggi" equestrian ranch and residential compound which extends approximately 1,800 feet along the road from Romero Canyon Creek on the west to Ortega Ridge Road on the east. A seven-foot-tall stump block wall, interrupted by two driveways, parallels the road across from the project site. Two large two-story residences with clay tile roofing stand behind the wall, and several yards behind them, sits a two-story, 16,000-square-foot, Spanish Colonial Revival Style barn. Horse corrals with wood fencing border the roadway for the approximately 600 feet from the end of the stump block wall east to Ortega Ridge Road. The Bitnam Wood residential and golfing complex stretches along the south side of East Valley Road west of Romero Canyon Creek.

Source: suzannepalkins.com


2 JRP Historical Consulting, "Historical Resources Evaluation Report: Masonry Features Within the Right-of-Way along Route 192, Santa Barbara County, California," May 2006, 32, on file at the Moorpark History Committee Archives (MHC).

PROJECT SITE AND RANCH HISTORY

The area north of East Valley Road in the vicinity of its intersection with Sheffield Drive was settled in the 1860s. Most of the newcomers were farmers who had journeyed from one of the eastern states or from Europe. By 1883, according to a map compiled by David F. Myrick, the project site was part of a larger 45-acre holding whose southern boundary paralleled East Valley Road. The property was owned by Rollin Dunshee, a farmer who was born in Vermont, and about whom little more is known.4

The 2.5-acre project site was not a part of the Rancho San Carlos when the Jacksons purchased the ranch in 1927. A recorded survey map of the Dunshee Tract reveals that by 1928 the tract had been subdivided into two parcels and sold to two new owners: the eastern 22 acres adjacent to the Rancho San Carlos had been acquired by the Jacksons; and the western 23 acres, which contained the future project site, had been purchased by Christian R. Holmes. Holmes had established the Feather Hill Ranch in 1924 by combining parcels of land lying on both sides of Romero Creek. The well-heeled rancher’s father was a prominent Ohio physician and hospital developer, and his mother, Bettie Fleischmann, was the daughter of the founder of the Fleischmann Yeast Company and the brother of local philanthropist Max C. Fleischmann. He initially began as a poultry rancher, but then developed an interest in collecting and exhibiting exotic animals. What came to be known as his ranch “zoo” included bears, mountain lions, chimpanzees, and an elephant. Holmes had established an orchard in the eastern portion of the 2.5-acre future study parcel, as in shown by an aerial photograph from 1928. The western portion of it, in the vicinity of a tree-lined drainage channel which is still present today, was an unplanted area containing scattered oaks trees. Holmes is said to have sold his ranch in the 1930s and it appears that the Jacksons acquired his 23-acre portion of the old Dunshee Tract in about 1937. An aerial photograph from 1938 indicates that by this time the entire tract had been integrated into the operations of the Rancho San Carlos. Orchards extended seamlessly across the tract and the 2.5-acre project site assumed the appearance that it has retained to the present time.5

REGINALD D. JOHNSON

Reginald D. Johnson (1882-1952), the designer of the Rancho San Carlos estate house and additional structures on the ranch, is recognized as one of the most distinguished architects to have practiced in Santa Barbara and Southern California. He was born in New York State, and after graduating from MIT and working in a Los Angeles architectural firm, he established his own practice in Pasadena in 1912. Johnson went on to become an acclaimed architect who was known for his unique version of the Spanish Colonial Revival style that blended elements from the English vernacular, Mediterranean, and early California Hispanic traditions. His residential estate designs for his wealthy clientele emphasized horizontal, flowing forms and a restrained, informal sophistication. He was one of the leaders of a generation of architects who collectively created an architectural style that reflected California’s singular historical and cultural heritage. His best-known buildings in the Santa Barbara area include: Jefferson House, “Mira Flores,” 1915, 1918; Rives House, “Casa del Sueño,” 1916; Cavit House, “Cuesta Linda/Lotusland,” 1919; Chase House, “Las Terrazas,” 1925; Santa Barbara Biltmore Hotel, 1926-1927; Clark House, “Bellosguarda,” 1938; and Santa Barbara Post Office, 1937.¹

LOCKWOOD DE FOREST, JR.

Lockwood de Forest, Jr. (1895-1949), a celebrated landscape architect, designed the Rancho San Carlos grounds and gardens. De Forest was one of a small group of California designers known as Regionalists who are recognized primarily for their work on behalf of wealthy estate owners during the 1920s. Regionalist landscape design is characterized by the integration of three elements: formal compositions, such as those found in the traditional gardens of the Mediterranean Basin and favored by estate builders of the time; newly-available exotic and tropical plant materials; and the natural palette of plants and trees unique to California. His best-known landscape projects in the Santa Barbara area include: De Forest Garden, 1926; Dickenson Estate, 1928; Ludington Estate, “Val Verde,” 1926-1939; Meeker Estate, “Constantia,” 1930; “Lotusland,” 1941; Steedman House, “Casa del Herrero,” 1920s; and Santa Barbara Botanic Garden, 1920s-1940s.²

SITE HISTORICAL THEMES

A broad theme in Montecito and Southern California history is the building of great estates during the years 1890-1945. During this period many of the newly rich who derived their wealth by exploiting the nation’s emerging industrial economy, as well a number of those whose wealth was “old,” sought to display their affluence by recreating the formality and grandeur of the great European estates. This trend coincided with the newly-found interest in Mediterranean architectural themes, particularly Mission Revival and Spanish Colonial Revival, and other revival styles.³

⁴ Susan Crawford, et al., Gardens of Santa Barbara (Santa Barbara: Haagen Printing, 2000) 43-53; Streatherfield, California Gardens: Creating A New Eden, 104-111
HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

As required by CEQA regulations, the historical significance of the property has been evaluated in terms of its eligibility as a County of Santa Barbara Landmark or Place of Historic Merit, and for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) and National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). CEQA defines a significant historical resource, for the purposes of review, as a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the CRHR, or included in, or be eligible for listing in, a local register of historic resources (Section 15064.5(a)). By definition, the CRHR also includes properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register of Historic Places, as well as selected State Historical Landmarks. The study property is not presently listed on any local, state or national registers of historic places.
County of Santa Barbara Significance Criteria

According to County of Santa Barbara guidelines\textsuperscript{11}, to qualify as a significant historical resource, a property must:

A) Possess integrity of location, design, workmanship, material, and/or setting.
B) Generally, but not in all cases, be at least fifty years old.
C) Demonstrate one or more of the following association-related criteria:

1. Be associated with an event, movement, organization or person that/who has made an important contribution to the community, state or nation.
2. Was designed or built by an architect, engineer, builder, artist or other designer who has made an important contribution to the community, state or nation.
3. Is associated with a particular architectural style or building type important to the community, state or nation.
4. Embodies elements demonstrating a) outstanding attention to design, detail, craftsmanship, or b) outstanding use of a particular structural material, surface materials or method of construction or technology.
5. Is associated with a traditional way of life important to an ethnic, national, racial or social group, or to the community at large.
6. Illustrates broad patterns of cultural, social, political, economic or industrial history.
7. Is a feature (i.e., structure, building, structural element, object, tree, garden, etc.) or a cluster of features that convey a sense of time and place that is important to the community, state or nation.
8. Is able to yield information important to the community or is relevant to the scholarly study of history, historical archaeology, ethnography, folklore or cultural geography.

To evaluate a resource, each of the above elements is assessed and given a significance ranking, from 1 through 3 and E, corresponding to the terms low (1), good (2), high (3), and exceptional (E). Each element is ranked separately. The overall level or threshold of significance is determined by the average of its individual rankings. The resultant level of significance is used to determine what treatment a resource should be given within the planning process. An exceptional rating in any element indicates that the resource should receive special consideration, usually preservation, in the planning process. A good or high rating indicates that the resource is significant, and should be recognized, but not necessarily through preservation. A low rating indicates that the resource is not considered significant for planning purposes.

California Register of Historical Resources Criteria

The significance criteria for determining eligibility for the CRHR, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, are as follows:

\textsuperscript{11} "County of Santa Barbara, Resource Management Department, Cultural Resource Guidelines, Historic Resources Element." Revised, January 1993.
A. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
B. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The resource must also retain integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. Additionally, the resource must be over fifty years old to qualify for the CRHR, unless of exceptional importance.

National Register of Historic Places Criteria

The significance criteria for determining eligibility for the NRHP, as defined in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, Part 60, are as follows:

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

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

ASSESSMENT OF HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

The 2.5-acre project parcel has been part of the larger approximately 237-acre Rancho San Carlos for about 79 years and its history is inseparable from the history of the ranch. The following significance assessment therefore will evaluate the potential historical significance of the Rancho San Carlos as a whole. These findings shall be considered preliminary due to the fact that the ranch was not accessible for in-person surveying and documentation. The assessment methodology used in the following findings included the application of the County of Santa Barbara, California Register of Historical Resources, and National Register of Historic Places criteria for significance to the study property.

County of Santa Barbara Criteria

Integrity – 3 (high)

Integrity means that the resource retains the essential qualities of its historic character. The ranch has retained its integrity of location and setting because it remains in its original place,
although its neighborhood has been impacted somewhat by nearby semi-rural residential development. The ranch estate house, round barn, and other structures designed by Reginald D. Johnson appear to reflect their original plans with few or no substantial alterations. The operating portions of the ranch, in addition, including its orchards, landscaping, horse facilities and overall spatial organization, appear to have changed little since the 1930s. It therefore has retained a high level of design integrity. The Johnson-designed structures appear to have retained most if not all of their original building materials as well as their features exhibiting high levels of workmanship. Likewise, the ranch’s orchards, landscaping, and natural features have retained their original historic horticultural and visual characteristics. The ranch has retained a high level of integrity for its materials and workmanship qualities.

Age – 2 (good)

The ranch earns a good score for its age because it has existed in its present size and spatial configuration for over 75 years.

Association with an event, movement, organization, or person important to the community, state, or nation – 3 (high)

The ranch has a direct association with a pattern of events recognized as the era of great estate building in Montecito and Southern California during the years 1890-1945. The existing Rancho San Carlos, established by Pete and Ann Jackson in 1927, exemplifies a period when wealthy individuals built lavish country estates in the area that were inspired by European precedent and often included a Mediterranean or Spanish architectural palette. The ranch’s period of historic significance is 1927-1945, encompassing its establishment, its development to its present appearance, and the end of the great estate era in the 1940s.12

The ranch does not have a strong association with a person important to history. None of the property’s owners, dating from the late nineteenth century when the first ranches operated portions existing property, are recognized as individuals who have made important contributions to local, state or national history or culture. The owners who acquired the Rancho San Carlos in 1927 and who were responsible for establishing the ranch as it exists today, Charles H. Jackson, Jr. and his wife Ann Jackson, both died less than 50 years ago. Although both were successful in business and ranching, were well known in the community, and were active in philanthropic giving, sufficient time has not passed to determine whether they would be recognized as significant contributors to local or regional history or culture. Although at some time in the future their significance may be acknowledged, it is too soon after their deaths to make that assessment at this time.

Designer – E (exceptional)

Reginald D. Johnson (1882-1952), the designer of the Rancho San Carlos estate house and additional structures on the ranch, is recognized as one of the most distinguished architects to

---

have practiced in Santa Barbara and Southern California. Lockwood de Forest, Jr. (1896-1949), a celebrated landscape architect, designed the Rancho San Carlos grounds and gardens.

Architectural Style or Building Type – E (exceptional)

The ranch structures appear to represent an exceptional example of an equestrian and citrus ranch complex dating to the period 1920s-1940s and an increasingly rare surviving example of its type. It typifies the era during which large opulent estates were established, many incorporating the outward trappings of agricultural production, while others, such as the Rancho San Carlos, encompassed both recreational and horticultural operations. The estate house, in particular, was built in the California Monterey Revival Style and is considered to be one of the best examples of the style in the Santa Barbara area. It appears to have retained all of its character-defining attributes associated with this style, as well as its Johnson-inspired embellishments, including its: one- and two-story horizontal massing; clay shingled gabled roofing; use of rusticated materials such as red brick and sandstone block masonry in its walls; recessed wall openings; second story balcony with ornamental iron railing; and its octagonal tower. Johnson also designed several ranch and accessory structures that are stylistically the same or compatible in style, if not in detail, with the main house. These buildings appear to have retained their architectural integrity, and among them, the round barn and the ranch office appear to exhibit a high level of stylistic achievement. The ranch structures that were not designed by Johnson may not exhibit the same architectural qualities as do his creations, but many appear to date to the ranch’s period of significance, 1927-1945. The spatial organization of the ranch’s residential, agricultural, equestrian, ornamental landscaping, and natural features appears to have undergone few significant changes and has retained a high level of historical integrity.

Construction and Materials – 3 (high)

The ranch’s structural, horticultural, and natural features have retained most of their historic design, materials, spatial organization characteristics. The ranch estate house is an outstanding example of the artistic use of construction materials and fine craftsmanship, as exemplified by its brick and sandstone block walls; the siting of the structure on two hilltop terraces; ornamental wood columns and wrought iron railings; and pedimented main entry doorway. The ranch office and round barn also rate a high score in this criterion. Several accessory and residential ranch structures, in addition, appear to have retained a high level of original historical fabric and form. The historic arrangement of the ranch land use sectors, such as residential and equestrian clusters, orchards, and natural features, have retained their historic patterns and visual identities.

Traditional Lifeways – Not Applicable

Association with Broad Themes of History – 3 (high)

The ranch has a direct association with the broad historical theme of great estate building in Montecito and Southern California during the years 1890-1945. The existing Rancho San Carlos, established by Pete and Ann Jackson in 1927, exemplifies a period when wealthy individuals built lavish country estates in the area that were inspired by European precedent and often included a Mediterranean or Spanish architectural palette.
Conveys an Important Sense of Time and Place – 3 (high)

The Rancho San Carlos has retained a high level of historical integrity and therefore conveys an important sense of time and place dating to the early twentieth century. Its potentially historic residential and accessory structures, orchards, equestrian facilities, landscaping, and natural topographic and vegetative features, remain in their original locations and relationships. The resource thus appears to contribute to a visual historic landscape that defines an earlier era dating to the period 1927-1945.

Able to Yield Information – Not Applicable

Summary of County Significance Criteria Findings

The Rancho San Carlos, which includes the 2.5-acre project site, potentially earns an overall exceptional rating in historical significance under County of Santa Barbara criteria as a result of its: historical integrity; association with the great estate building pattern of events; California Monterey Revival Style structures and their architect, Reginald D. Johnson; exemplification of a great estate era ranch complex: representative structural, horticultural, and natural materials and fabric; embodiment of the broad historical theme of great estate building; and ability to convey a bygone historical era. The property was thus found to potentially qualify as a historic Landmark under County significance criteria.

California Register of Historic Resources Criteria

The ranch appears to have retained a high level of historical integrity and it is over 50 years old. It has a direct association with the broad historical theme of great estate building in Montecito and Southern California, 1890-1945, and thus contributes to the broad patterns of state history. It therefore meets Criterion A. It does not have a strong association with individuals who are important to the history of the state of California. Hence, it does not meet Criterion B. The ranch’s California Monterey Revival Style structures, residential and operational secondary structures, orchards, natural vegetation, and spatial arrangement of man-made and natural features embody the distinctive stylistic and functional characteristics of the opulent ranch estate type of properties developed in the 1890-1945 period in state history. It therefore meets Criterion C. The property would appear not to have the potential to yield information important to history or prehistory, and thus does not meet Criterion D. In summary, the Rancho San Carlos is potentially eligible for listing on the CRHR.

National Register of Historic Places Criteria

The ranch appears to have retained a high level of historical integrity and it is over 50 years old. It has a direct association with the broad historical theme of great estate building in Montecito and Southern California, 1890-1945, and thus contributes to the broad patterns of history. It therefore meets Criterion A. It does not have a strong association with individuals who are important to the history of the state of California. Hence, it does not meet Criterion B. The ranch’s California Monterey Revival Style structures, residential and operational secondary structures, orchards, natural vegetation, and spatial arrangement of man-made and natural
features embody the distinctive stylistic and functional characteristics of the opulent ranch estate type of properties developed in the 1890-1945 period in state history. It therefore meets Criterion C. The property would appear not to have the potential to yield information important to history or prehistory, and thus does not meet Criterion D. In summary, the Rancho San Carlos is potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP.

HISTORIC DISTRICT EVALUATION

According to the National Park Service (NPS), a Historic District is defined as “a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.” To qualify for listing on the National Register of Historic Places the NPS requires that a district meet the following criteria:

1. Its resources must constitute a “unified entity… which can convey a visual sense of the overall historical environment or be an arrangement of historically or functionally related properties.”
2. It must meet the significance criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.
3. It must possess historic integrity.
4. It must be a “definable geographic area that can be distinguished from surrounding properties.”

My preliminary finding is that the Rancho San Carlos potentially qualifies as a Historic District because it appears to meet the criteria established by the NPS. It meets Criterion 1 because the ranch has been operated as a unified entity since 1927 and has retained the historical arrangement of its natural features and its functioning activities that was begun at that time. This includes its historical orchard growing, horse raising, ranch maintenance, and residential living functions, which based on this initial review, appear to be largely unchanged. The ranch meets Criterion 2 because it qualifies under NRHP Criterion A for its association with the broad historical theme of great estate building and NRHP Criterion C for its embodiment of the distinctive stylistic and functional characteristics of the opulent ranch estate type of properties developed in the 1890-1945 period in state history. It meets Criterion 3 because it has retained a high level of historic integrity in its location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association aspects. With the exception of the development of semi-rural residential neighborhoods in the vicinity of the ranch, there have apparently been few if any significant changes since 1927 in the ranch’s location and setting; the design, materials, and workmanship exhibited by its residential and operational structures; its feeling as expressed by its physical features that convey a sense of a historical period of time; and its ability to convey its association with the period of great estate building. The ranch meets Criterion 4 because it exhibits a definable geographic area that coincides with its 237-acre property boundaries. Its orchards and grazing areas along its western property line are distinguishable from its neighboring properties by the trajectories of Romero Canyon Road and a meandering line of oak trees; its northern boundary is distinguishable because its water storage facilities and orchards border neighboring oak trees and hillside vegetation; its oak tree woodland and equestrian

facilities on the ranch’s east boundary are distinguishable because neighboring properties contain hilly residential development; and its southern boundary parallels East Valley Road.

**Summary of Property Significance Assessment**

The Rancho San Carlos was found to be potentially eligible for listing as a County of Santa Barbara Landmark. It was also found to be potentially eligible for listing as a historic resource on the California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. Finally, it appears to qualify as a potential Historic District under National Park Service guidelines.

**ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL PROJECT IMPACTS**

**Proposed Project Overview**

The proposed project would build a new MPPD 12,560-square foot fire station complex. The station would include three structures: a Fire Station in the central portion of the parcel; a Maintenance Building in the northeast portion of the site; and a Training and Hose Tower Building in the northwest portion of the site. The Fire Station would be a multiple-height, one-story structure that would reach 27 feet in height at its tallest element. It would exhibit a 107-foot horizontal frontage to East Valley Road. The Maintenance Building would have a 44-foot frontage and would reach 25 feet in height. The three-story hose drying tower portion of the Training and Hose Tower Building would be 35 feet in height while the structure’s total horizontal frontage would be 46 feet. The structures would be Mediterranean in style with gabled roofs, clay tile roofing, stucco siding, and recessed wall openings. The structures would be set back various distances from East Valley Road: Fire Station, about 60 feet; Maintenance Building, about 180 feet; and Training and Hose Tower Building, about 205 feet. Two driveways would provide access to the station from East Valley Road. Nearby all of the existing mature oak trees that line East Valley Road in front of the project site would be retained. Fifty-foot-wide densely-planted landscape buffers would be installed on the northern and eastern sides of the project property. A habitat restoration buffer, 50 feet in width, would be planted on the western boundary of the site. A 50-foot wide landscape buffer of small and medium stature shrubs and trees would be planted along East Valley Road on the southern boundary of the project property. (See Proposed Project Conceptual Plans, Appendix 2)

**Potential Project Impacts Analysis**

The Rancho San Carlos, of which the 2.5-acre project site comprises a small part, was found to potentially qualify as a historic resource under County, State, and National criteria for significance. It was also found to potentially qualify as a Historic District under National Park Service significance criteria. Under CEQA, a significant impact to a historic resource occurs when a substantial adverse change to the resource is brought about by “demolition, destruction, relocation or alteration” of the physical characteristics of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that its significance would be “materially impaired.” CEQA guidelines provide that if a project involving significant historical resources adheres to “The Secretary of
the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties," the project shall be considered to be mitigated to a level of Less Than Significant (Class III). (CEQA Guidelines 15064.5)

The following analysis will assess the potential impacts of the proposed project by applying the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, Rehabilitation Approach (1995), where applicable, to it. The Standards are as follows:\textsuperscript{14}

1. A property shall be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.

The proposed project meets this standard because although the fire station would constitute a new use of the existing 2.5-acre project site, presently an orchard, the project site occupies less than 3 percent of the Rancho San Carlos's total land devoted to orchard production, and the proposed project would therefore introduce minimal change to the ranch's distinctive materials, features, and spatial relationships.

2. The historic character of the property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

The proposed project meets this standard because the Rancho San Carlos's potentially historic character would be retained and preserved. It would not physically remove or alter any substantial amount of distinctive materials or features, spaces, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. The project site is located on the margin of the 237-acre ranch property and near the southwest corner of a larger approximately 100-acre orchard. The proposed fire station would also be a considerable distance from potentially historic as well as potentially non-historic structures. Potentially historic structures are located at the following distances from the project site: ranch estate house, .5 mile; ranch office, 1.650 feet; round equestrian barn and stables, 2,000 feet. The nearest potentially non-historic structures are a cottage, 400 feet distant, and a shop building, 850 feet distant. The project site is located approximately 450 feet west of the ranch's main entry driveway. There exists little or no meaningful visual continuity between the project site and any structures due to the extended distances as well as existing ranch topography, vegetation, orchards, and landscaping.

Existing views of the project site and Rancho San Carlos from East Valley Road along its approximately 420-foot frontage include a foreground of oak trees, a middle area of orchards, oak trees, and vegetated foothills, and finally the Santa Ynez Mountains backdrop. Such public views are brief, however, because motorists' views are limited to intermittent gaps between oak trees along the road and by the typically relatively high travel speeds along this portion of East Valley Road. Viewing opportunities are from passing motor vehicles are thus reduced to only a few seconds in duration. Passersby in vehicles cannot clearly discern Rancho San Carlos structures from East Valley Road, if at

all. The proposed fire station project would nonetheless change existing views of the ranch. The proposed three project structures would be visible when viewed from East Valley Road near the southwest corner of the project site or directly south of the project site. This would result in the loss of orchard views, but would not diminish mountain views. Views of the structures would be filtered by the existing line of oak trees in the foreground, a proposed 50-foot-wide landscaping screen between the road and the structures, and by their deep setbacks from the road. The station structures’ Mediterranean Style, materials, size, and heights would also reduce visual impacts due to their consistency with the style, materials, sizes, and heights of other structures in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. Views of the proposed station structures would be substantially filtered for motorists approaching the project site from the east on East Valley Road due to an existing stand of oak trees and a proposed screen of rehabilitated landscaping. Motorists passing a gap in the oak tree line when approaching from the west on East Valley Road would lose some nearby orchard views. They would view instead the proposed 50-foot landscape buffer on the east boundary of the station, the oak trees running along the western boundary, and the mountain backdrop.

The Rancho San Carlos’ character defining features include its: potentially historic structures; orchards; equestrian facilities; native oak woodlands; spatial organization of these features; and semi-rural setting that affords extended views of orchards, foothills, and mountains. The proposed project would not directly or indirectly significantly impact these features. While the project would remove about 2.5 acres of orchard, this would result in a loss of than 3 percent of the larger orchard in which it is located. The proposed fire station would be located at the outer fringe of a 237-acre property and hence physically widely separated from most of these features. Although it would be situated within an existing orchard, it would be located at its margin along its East Valley Road frontage. Motorists’ existing orchard and ranch views would be briefly interrupted by the proposed project but existing views along the entire approximately .5 mile of remaining ranch frontage would not be diminished. The proposed project would not change existing mountain views from East Valley Road. In summary, although the proposed project would alter a small portion of the ranch property, it would retain its character defining features and continue to convey its potential historical significance as a potential historic district.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

This standard is not applicable to the proposed project.

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

This standard is not applicable to the proposed project.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

This standard is not applicable to the proposed project.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

This standard is not applicable to the proposed project.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

This standard is not applicable to the proposed project.

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

This standard is not applicable to the proposed project.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing, to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

The proposed project meets this standard. As noted above, the proposed project would not destroy potentially historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. The Rancho San Carlos's character defining features include its: potentially historic structures; orchards; equestrian facilities; native oak woodlands; spatial organization of these features; and semi-rural setting that affords extended views of orchards, foothills, and mountains. The proposed project would remove less than 3 percent of the larger orchard in which it is located. The proposed fire station would be located at the outer fringe of a 237-acre property and hence physically widely separated from most of these features. Although it would be situated within an existing orchard, it would be located at its margin along its East Valley Road frontage. There exists little or no meaningful visual continuity between the project site and any structures due to the extended distances as well as existing ranch topography, vegetation, orchards, and landscaping. Motorists' existing brief orchard and ranch views would be somewhat interrupted by the proposed project but existing views along the entire approximately .5 mile of remaining ranch frontage would not be diminished. The proposed project would not change existing mountain views from East Valley Road. The isolated project site would develop approximately 1 percent of the existing ranch property and would not
physically or visually diminish in a substantial way the potential historic character of the ranch. The spatial organization of its large-scale features, such as its orchards, residential areas, equestrian complex, and wooded oak lands would remain unchanged, as would their potential historic integrity, thus preserving their semi-rural character and setting. In summary, although the proposed project would alter the ranch property it would retain its character defining features and continue to convey its potential historical significance.

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

The proposed project meets this standard. In the unlikely event that the proposed fire station was removed in the future the essential form and integrity of the ranch would remain substantially unimpaired.

As provided under CEQA, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties were applied to the proposed MFPD fire station project. The potential impact analysis found that the proposed project conforms to the standards established by the Secretary of the Interior and therefore the project’s potential for a significant impact shall be considered mitigated to a Less Than Significant (Class III) level.

Potential Indirect Impacts

The neighborhood bordering East Valley Road between Sheffield Drive on the east and Ortega Ridge Road on the west appears to contain few structures or features that have either been listed, found to be eligible to be listed, or identified for potential listing, as significant historic resources by one or more local, state, or federal government agencies. Caltrans historians have determined that the masonry Romero Canyon Creek Bridge, built in 1917 and located on East Valley Road approximately 800 feet west of the project site, is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The County of Santa Barbara, Planning and Development Department lists a structure or structures on APN 155-070-013 on its potentially historic resources list. This small parcel, which may contain up to three agricultural outbuildings, is a part of the Rancho San Carlos and is located on its western boundary approximately 500 feet northwest of the project site. The proposed project would introduce minimal changes to the semi-rural character of the neighborhood. Although the proposed project would result in changes to a small portion of the existing Rancho San Carlos, the potential indirect impacts to potential historic resources in the nearby neighborhood would be Less Than Significant (Class III).

---

15 JRP Historical Consulting, “Historical Resources Evaluation Report: Masonry Features Within the Right-of-Way along Route 192, Santa Barbara County, California,” May 2006, 32, on file at the MHC; see also, Dudek, “Phase I Archaeological Investigation, Montecito Fire Protection District Fire Station No. 3,” July 2010.
16 County of Santa Barbara, Planning and Development Department, Permit History for Parcel Number 155-170-013, May 2, 2016.
Potential Cumulative Impacts

The following discussion will assess potential cumulative impacts of known past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects to the project site, Rancho San Carlos, and to nearby historic resources in the neighborhood. No relevant past or reasonably foreseeable future projects in the area were identified. The proposed MFPD project would replace 2.5 acres of orchard trees with a fire station consisting of three structures. The proposed project would combine landscaped visual buffers with existing oak tree screening and establish deep setbacks for the structures. It would also design buildings consistent with the style, materials, size, and heights of structures in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. Although some loss in the ranch’s character defining materials would occur and views of the ranch would be slightly altered, these changes to the project site and the surrounding Rancho San Carlos would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to the potential historic character of the ranch or to the semi-rural nature of the neighborhood. The potential cumulative impacts to the potential historic resources under study would be Less Than Significant (Class III).

Residual Impacts

Since no significant impacts to potential historic resources would occur as a result of the proposed project it is anticipated that any residual impacts would be Less Than Significant (Class III).

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This historical assessment report evaluated the potential historical significance of the Rancho San Carlos as a whole. This is because the 2.5-acre project site parcel has been part of the larger approximately 237-acre ranch for about 79 years and its history is inseparable from that of the larger property. Due to the fact that neither the project site nor the Rancho San Carlos was accessible for in-person surveying and documentation these findings shall be considered preliminary. A visual inspection of the property from East Valley Road, a previous on-site visit to the Rancho San Carlos in 2015, and archival and online textual and visual sources were relied upon for evaluating existing ranch structures and features.

Potential Significance Findings

The Rancho San Carlos was found to be potentially eligible for listing as a County of Santa Barbara Landmark. It was also found to be potentially eligible for listing as a historic resource on the California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, it appears to qualify as a potential Historic District under National Park Service guidelines.

Potential Project Impacts Findings

The proposed MFPD Fire Station No. 3 project conforms to the standards established by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and therefore, as provided under CEQA, the project’s potential for a significant impact shall be considered.
mitigated to a Less Than Significant (Class III) level. The potential indirect and cumulative impacts posed by the proposed project were also found to be Less Than Significant (Class III).
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Southwest corner of project site, looking northeast from East Valley Road.

Western portion of project site, looking north from East Valley Road.
Southern boundary of project site, looking east along East Valley Road.

View of central portion of project site looking north from East Valley Road.
Southeast portion of project site, looking northwest through gap in trees.

Rancho San Carlos main entrance gate, looking northeast.
Horserunnels, East Valley Road, opposite Rancho San Carlos, looking west.

Equestrian property entrance gate, opposite project site, looking southwest.
Wall and home opposite project site, East Valley Road, looking southwest.

Main entrance, equestrian property, opposite project site, looking south.
Main gate and residence on equestrian property, looking southwest.

Feather Hill Ranch entrance, adjacent to project site on the west, looking northwest.
Through grand gates where giant palms stand as silent sentinels is the magnificent Ranch San Carlos, a 237 acre estate property that for nearly 100 years has been under the ownership of one family. This extraordinary property cascades down the foothills of Montecito and offers panoramic vistas across the valley to the shimmering blue Pacific. A long gently curving driveway over a half-mile long is edged with Santa Barbara stone ascends through acres of citrus groves to the sprawling hilltop mansion home designed in 1931 by master architect Reginald Johnson for one of America’s most prestigious families. Johnson was the pre-eminent architect of the era and continues to be celebrated for the many notable homes he designed in Pasadena and Montecito.

His spectacular Monterey Colonial of approximately 29,483 square feet is comprised of over thirty rooms. From the vast motor court one passes through the front door and into the grand entry hall where one is immediately transported back in time to an era of elegance and refinement where men wore formal dress and women donned Parisian couture gowns to welcome dinner guests to glittering soirees. The home is infused with an atmosphere of sophistication and refinement. The barrel vaulted central gallery which connects the sumptuous public rooms to the upper bedroom wings is lined with hand-painted period murals and windowed display cases. This grand hall sets a tone of luxury and attention to detail for which Johnson was so well known.

Reginald Johnson’s architectural ingenuity is no better showcased then in his brilliant use of the natural slope and contours of the property. He astutely sited the home on two natural terraces. By planning the formal living rooms around a central courtyard and placing the Master and family bedroom wings on the upper terrace he effectively created a spatial separation that afforded privacy, calm and exceptional views.

Offered at $85,000,000
TheRanchoSanCarlos.com
The grandeur of the light-filled Library and formal Living and Dining rooms is remarkable. The wide “L” shaped central gallery is on perfect axis with both the Living and Dining rooms and overlooks a formal inner courtyard where graceful palms stand over clipped boxwood hedges that enframe a peaceful water feature. This is yet another example of Johnson’s intimate knowledge of scale and symmetry. During the 1920s the Owners acquired a stately Manor Home in Great Britain. The oak panelled formal rooms were meticulously disassembled and shipped to Santa Barbara where Johnson incorporated them with stunning results into their new Santa Barbara home. The exceptional artistry and workmanship of these panelled rooms would be impossible to duplicate today and the beautiful patina, exquisite moldings, finials and mantle pieces are timeless testaments to a bygone era. With its ocean-viewing south terrace, the baronial-sized living room with two majestic fireplaces and spectacular crystal chandeliers is without doubt, one of the most exquisite rooms in all of Santa Barbara.

The Library is lined with the Owner’s personal collection of books, many of them first editions, French doors open to the south facing terrace that is shared with the Living Room. A Trophy room replete with brightly polished cups from the Owners’ many Polo match victories and horse racing triumphs is located off the entrance to the Library. A secret hallway leads from the library to the Living room where a hidden door in a panelled
Dining Room

At the entrance to the Dining Room is a marvelous card room with walls covered in 18th c. Grisaille wallpaper by Dufour and furnished with lacquered card tables; the sedate setting for competitive backgammon and card games. The marvelously proportioned dining room is located at the eastern end of the central gallery and is grand in scale, yet intimate in ambiance. It too has a private stone terrace for al-fresco dining on temperate Santa Barbara evenings. The Dining Room also overlooks formal parterre gardens that would be the ideal setting for a reflecting pool as it enjoys a large level site.

The dining room is served by two large butler's pantries that have ample storage for crystal, china and silver. The expansive kitchens (Main and Prep) were state of the art in the 1930s and feature stainless island and counters and retain the original vintage ovens and refrigerators. Beyond the kitchens are Staff dining room, employee lounge and sitting room, plus three service bedrooms. On the north side of the Central Courtyard is the staff hallway that serves a very large storage area, laundry and drying rooms, plus the Staff Office.
Up several steps at the north end of the central gallery is the spacious sitting area that is located just below the family quarters. A graceful staircase leads to the Master bedroom wing. A very large Master suite enjoys both ocean and mountain views and features a fireplace and period décor. The Master's dressing room is paneled in the deco style and the oversized bath is also tiled in a deco motif. Beyond the Master is the Boudoir/dressing room. This very feminine room features numerous built-in closets; there is also a spa sized bathroom with separate dressing area. Three additional staff bedrooms are down a private hallway from the Boudoir. In addition, there is a linen/sewing room. A lower office with incredible views is located above the Master suite and is accessed by an exterior staircase.

Down a separate hallway away from the Master suites is the guest room wing. Located here are two oversized guest suites with fireplaces and spacious bath rooms. These rooms look out over expansive lawns and garden areas to the east. Beyond the guest rooms is the very separate Children's wing. Three wonderful bedrooms look over a terraced garden with views out to the sea. Each is well proportioned and enjoys its own bathroom. There is also a large recreation room with its own separate nanny's kitchen and a spacious Arts and Crafts room. These rooms also look out over the garden and lawn areas.
Located off the Service Motor court and adjacent to the home is a five-car garage, one stall service garage, as well as additional storage rooms and service areas.

The property's 237.82 acres are comprised of 30 legal parcels (each with Certificate of Compliance). At present there are approximately 100 acres of cultivated orchards: 60 acres in lemons, 30 acres in avocados, and five acres each of oranges and limes.

Additional features: ten residential cottages sited around the property, three of which were designed by Johnson. An office building also designed by Johnson is conveniently located in the center of the property. Equestrian facilities include two stables, a 10-stall round barn that was built in 1928, as well as an 11-stall rectangular wood frame and stucco barn plus an approximately 11,250 sq. ft. covered riding Arena that was built in 1930. An additional large service garage is conveniently located near the Main Residence.

One of the most important features of the property is its continuous, uninterrupted access to water via seven agricultural water meters: four 2" meters, one 1 1/2" meter and two 1" meters, plus three water storage reservoirs. The property also receives 50% of a water diversion system from adjacent Romero Creek that is piped directly into the reservoirs. Rights to the creek water provide a resource of immeasurable value.
Rancho San Carlos is without question one of the most historic period homes still in private hands; one that has remained untouched by the passing of time. Situated in idyllic Montecito, a highly exclusive community that offers a delightful yearlong Mediterranean climate and a quality and pace of life without equal, this trophy property offers the ultimate in privacy, security, beauty and calm. This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to acquire a unique property of unprecedented grand scale, exceptional architecture, and prestigious historical significance, ... the Crown Jewel of Montecito.
GENERAL NOTES

- 237.82± acres with 30 legal parcels
  (Certificate of Compliance)
  - in current configuration between
    10 to 14 lots would be optimal to develop

- 100 acres of orchards include:
  - 60 acres in lemons
  - 30 acres in Avocados
  - 5 acres in oranges
  - 5 acres in limes

- Main Residence of approximately
  29,483 sq.ft. with 30 rooms

- Monterey Colonial by Reginald Johnson
  constructed in 1931

- 10 Residential Cottages - 3 designed by
  Reginald Johnson, most constructed between
  1917 & 1928

  • Office Building

  • Garages

  • Three Water Reservoirs

  • Two Stables

- One 10-stall round barn built in 1928

- One 11-stall rectangular wood frame/stucco barn

  • Covered Riding Arena (built in 1930)
  of approximately 11,250 sq.ft.

  • Water availability

  • Seven Agricultural Water Meters - ranging in size from:
    4 - 2" inch meters
    1 - 1.5" inch meter
    2 - 1" inch meters

- 50 percent of a water diversion system from
  Romero Creek (which is piped to the above ground
  water storage tanks)
RANCHO SAN CARLOS - STRUCTURES LOCATION
Rancho San Carlos

2500 East Valley Rd, Montecito, CA 93108
$85,000,000

Through grand gates where giant palms stand as silent sentinels is the magnificent Ranch San Carlos, a 237 acre estate property that for nearly 100 years been under the ownership of one family. This extraordinary property cascades down the foothills of Montecito and offers panoramic vistas across the valley to the shimmering blue Pacific. A long, gently curving driveway edged with Santa Barbara stone ascends through acres of citrus groves to the sprawling hilltop manor home designed in 1929 by master architect Reginald Johnson for one of America’s most prestigious families. Johnson was the pre-eminent architect of the era and continues to be celebrated for the many notable homes he designed in Pasadena and Montecito.

His spectacular Monterey Colonial of approximately 25,000 square feet is comprised of over thirty rooms. From the vast motor court one passes through the front door and into the grand entry hall where one is immediately transported back in time to an era of elegance and refinement; where men wore formal dress and women donned Parisian couture gowns to
welcome dinner guests to glittering soirees. The home is infused with an atmosphere of sophistication and refinement. The barrel vaulted central gallery which connects the sumptuous public rooms to the upper bedroom wings is lined with hand-painted period murals and windowed display cases. This grand hall sets a tone of luxury and attention to detail for which Johnson was so well known.

Reginald Johnson’s architectural ingenuity is no better showcased than in his brilliant use of the natural slope and contours of the property. He astutely sited the home on two natural terraces. By planning the formal living rooms around a central courtyard and placing the Master and family bedroom wings on the upper terrace he effectively created a spatial separation that afforded privacy, calm and exceptional views.

The grandeur of the light-filled Library and formal Living and Dining rooms is remarkable. The wide "L" shaped central gallery is on perfect axis with both the Living and Dining rooms and overlooks a formal inner courtyard where graceful palms stand over clipped boxwood hedges that encircle a peaceful water feature. This is yet another example of Johnson's intimate knowledge of scale and symmetry. During the 1920s the Owners acquired a stately Manor Home in Great Britain. The oak paneled formal rooms were meticulously disassembled and shipped to Santa Barbara where Johnson incorporated them with stunning results into their new Santa Barbara home. The exceptional artistry and workmanship of these paneled rooms would be impossible to duplicate today, and the beautiful patina, exquisite moldings, finials and mantle pieces are timeless testaments to a bygone era. With its ocean-viewing south terrace, the baronial- sized living room with two majestic fireplaces and spectacular crystal chandeliers is without doubt one of the most exquisite rooms in all of Santa Barbara.

The Library is lined with the Owner’s personal collection of books, many of them first editions. French doors open to the south facing terrace that is shared with the Living Room. A Trophy room replete with brightly polished cups from the Owners’ many Polo match victories and horse racing triumphs is located off the entrance to the Library. A secret hallway leads from the Library to the Living room where a hidden door in a paneled wall opens to reveal a staircase that descends to an authentic English Whisky pub, complete with wooden casks, a long oak bar, stone fireplace plus an ample seating area. This oversized room could easily be transformed into a wonderful home theater. There is also an extensive cellar for a collection of vintage wines.

At the entrance to the Dining Room is a marvelous card room with walls covered in silver foil art-deco wall paper and furnished with lacquered card tables; the sedate setting for competitive backgammon and card games. The marvelously proportioned dining room is located at the eastern end of the central gallery and is grand in scale, yet intimate in ambiance. It too has a private stone terrace for al-fresco dining on temperate Santa Barbara evenings. The Dining Room also overlooks formal parterre gardens that would be the ideal setting for a reflecting pool as it enjoys a large, level site.
The dining room is served by two large butler’s pantries that have ample storage for crystal, china and silver. The expansive kitchens (Main and Prep) were state-of-the-art in the 1930s and feature stainless island and counters and retain the original vintage ovens and refrigerators. Beyond the kitchens are Staff dining room, employee lounge and sitting room, plus three service bedrooms. On the north side of the Central Courtyard is the staff hallway that serves a very large storage area, laundry and drying rooms, plus the Staff Office.

Up several steps at the north end of the central gallery is the spacious sitting area that is located just below the family quarters. A graceful staircase leads to the Master bedroom wing. A very large Master suite enjoys both ocean and mountain views and features a fireplace and period décor. The Master’s dressing room is paneled in the deco style and the oversized bath is also tiled in a deco motif. Beyond the Master is the Boudoir/dressing room. This very feminine room features numerous built-in closets; there is also a spa size bathroom with separate dressing area. Three additional staff bedrooms are down a private hallway from the Boudoir. In addition, there is a linen/sewing room. A tower office with incredible views is located above the Master suite and is accessed by an exterior staircase.

Down a separate hallway away from the Master suites is the guest room wing. Located here are two oversized guest suites with fireplaces and spacious bath rooms. These rooms look out over expansive lawns and garden areas to the east. Beyond the guest rooms is the very separate Children’s wing. Three wonderful bedrooms look over a terraced garden with views out to the sea. Each is well proportioned and enjoys its own bathroom. There is also a large recreation room with its own separate nanny’s kitchen and a spacious Arts and Crafts room. These rooms also look out over the garden and lawn areas.

Located off the Service Motor court and adjacent to the home is a five-car garage, one stall service garage, as well as additional storage rooms and service areas.

The property’s 237.82 acres are comprised of 30 legal parcels (each with Certificate of Compliance). At present, there are approximately 100 acres of cultivated orchards: 60 acres in lemons, 30 acres in avocados, and five acres each of oranges and limes.

Additional features: ten residential cottages sited around the property, three of which were designed by Johnson. An office building also designed by Johnson is conveniently located in the center of the property. Equestrian facilities include two stables, a 10-stall round barn that was built in 1928, as well as an 11-stall rectangular wood frame and stucco barn; plus an approximately 11,250 sq. ft. covered riding Arena that was built in 1930. An additional large service garage is conveniently located near the Main Residence.

One of the most important features of the property is its continuous, uninterrupted access to water via seven agricultural water meters: four – 2” meters, one – 1.5” meter, and two – 1” meters, plus three water storage reservoirs. The property also receives 50% of a water diversion system from adjacent Romero Creek that is piped directly into the reservoirs. Rights to the creek water provide a resource of immeasurable value.
Rancho San Carlos is without question one of the most historic period homes still in private hands; one that has remained untouched by the passing of time. Situated in idyllic Montecito, a highly exclusive community that offers a delightful yearlong Mediterranean climate and a quality and pace of life without equal, this trophy property offers the ultimate in privacy, security, beauty and calm. This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to acquire a unique property of unprecedented grand scale, exceptional architecture, and prestigious historical significance... the Crown Jewel of Montecito.
EXHIBIT H
5.17 HISTORICAL RESOURCES

5.17.1 Existing Conditions

Historical Overview

The history of Montecito has played a large role in the character and aesthetics of the present day community. The proposed project area was once part of the territory occupied at historic contact by the Barbareno Chumash. Beginning with the Spanish presence of the 1700's and early 1800's, Montecito was settled by land grants given or sold to the Santa Barbara Presidio. The original landowners developed farms and orchards. Later residents consisted of affluent Easterners, Midwesterners and Californians seeking vacation villas or permanent residences in Montecito's temperate climate.

Significant historic buildings and gardens of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries abound in Montecito. At what is today 1300 East Valley Road, East Valley Catholics built an adobe chapel known as the Carmelo Mission on the Juarez property, a predecessor to Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church. The San Ysidro Ranch, the Miramar and Biltmore Hotels, Music Academy of the West and the Hosmer, San Ysidro and Massini Adobes constitute other Montecito landmarks. Montecito's natural tranquility finds its roots in famous gardens and groves of the past. Colonel Silas Bond established Montecito's first large horticultural nursery on Hot Springs Road, and Colonel William Alston Hayne, confederate veteran, built a Southern style plantation house and laid the first of Montecito's famous formal gardens. The Garden Club of America made its first venture westward in 1926 for the purpose of visiting Montecito and touring over 20 estates known for their beautiful ornamental gardens.

Colonel B.T. Dinsmore bought historic San Ysidro Ranch from Mexico and planted Montecito's first orange grove. He also purchased the Juarez adobe, built in 1830 at 461 San Ysidro Road (now called "Hosmer Adobe" after Dinsmore's son-in-law). William P. Gould built a stone olive mill (El Molino) at 200 Olive Mill Road, an avenue so named due to the olive groves along its sides leading to the beach. The olive groves have since been destroyed.
Josiah Doulton (of the royal chinaware family) bought 20 waterfront acres in Montecito and named it “Ocean View”. Doulton’s property later became known as “Miramar“, Spanish for “a view of the ocean”, and attracted tourists. When hard times forced Doulton’s wife to take in boarders, the future Miramar Hotel was born.

In 1887, William H. Crocker and his mother-in-law, Mrs. Caroline Sperry, bought Rancho Las Fuentes (the fountains) south of East Valley Road, and it became the Crocker-Sperry Ranch devoted to citrus. The packing house for lemons now houses the Birnam Wood Golf Club. China Flat Road at the south end of the ranch was so named to commemorate the Chinese stone masons who camped there in the 1890’s.

The 1890’s marked the beginning of the wealthy migration to Montecito, known worldwide as a health resort and frequented by such men as Rockefeller, Carnegie and DuPont. “Hill barons” began to build huge estates overlooking Montecito, and the working class population began to increase so as to work for the newly resident wealthy class. Places such as, the Peppers (now 430 Hot Springs Road), and the Santa Barbara Country Club (now the Music Academy of the West) served as elite social centers.

Many of Montecito’s hispanic citizens resided in what came to be known as “Old Spanish Town”, an area bordered by East Valley Road to the North and Sycamore Canyon and Hot Springs Road to the east and west, respectively. Remnants of walls and buildings from the town can still be found in Montecito.

In 1927, the State Division of Highways (now CALTRANS) proposed to widen the Coast Highway through Montecito. The Montecito Association, led by Harold Gladwin and John Jameson working with the State Division of Highways and the County, acquired additional right-of-way for the proposed projects; and thus was created one of California’s first scenic sections of the old State highways. Billboards and commercial housing were banned and the Montecito Parkway (the first segment between San Ysidro and Olive Mill Roads, extended to Sheffield Road in 1949) became the model for cities and the beginning of the California freeway system.
Historic Landmarks

According to the State Historic Resources Commission (Mrs. Sandra Elder, 1992), the Montecito Planning Area has one Nationally registered historic landmark - the Steedman Estate at 1387 East Valley Road. There are no Points of State Historical Significance in the area.

The Santa Barbara County Historical Landmark Committee (Mr. David Myrick, 1992) has identified the following sites as County landmarks:

- Deane School on the Westmont College Campus;
- San Ysidro Adobe on San Ysidro Lane;
- Hammond's Estate on Channel Drive; and
- Rancho Los Fuentes on East Valley Road (now the site of the Birnham Wood Golf Club)

Potential Historic Structures

In addition to sites listed above, the County Resource Management Department has identified 56 potential historic structures in the Montecito Planning Area. The general location of these sites are illustrated on Figure 36 and are listed in Appendix D. As the figure indicates, potential historic structures appear to be concentrated in the western portion of the Planning Area. The cluster of eight structures located in the vicinity of the intersection of Bolero Drive and East Valley Road suggest that the area may be worthy of a "historic district" designation.

Existing Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element Historical and Archaeological Sites Policy Nos. 1-4 provide mandates for preservation of significant historic properties (see Archaeological Resources 5.16.1). The County Historic Element incorporates SHPO guidelines listed in Policy No. 3. Ordinance 1716 provides the County Historical Landmark Committee authority over historic properties of outstanding historical character.
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FIGURE 36
5.17.2 Threshold of Significance

A list of significance criteria for evaluation of historical resources is found in the Historic Element of the County Cultural Resource Guidelines and is summarized below. Any structure 50 years or older is considered potentially significant and shall be subject to the following criteria:

A significant resource a) possesses integrity of location, design, workmanship, material, and/or setting; b) is at least fifty years old (an historic resource less than fifty years old may be considered significant if it is unique or possesses extraordinary elements of integrity, design, construction, or association); and c) demonstrates one or more of the following:

1) is associated with an event, movement, organization, or person that/who has made an important contribution to the community, state, or nation;

2) was designed or built by an architect, engineer, builder, artists, or other designer who has made an important contribution to the community, state, or nation;

3) is associated with a particular architectural style or building type important to the community, state, or nation;

4) embodies elements demonstrating a) outstanding attention to design, detail, craftsmanship, or b) outstanding use of a particular structural material, surface material, or method of construction or technology;

5) is associated with a traditional way of life important to an ethnic, national, racial, or social group, or to the community-at-large;

6) illustrates broad patterns of cultural, social, political, economic, or industrial history;

7) is a feature or a cluster of features which convey a sense of time and place that is important to the community, state, or nation;
is able to yield information important to the community or is relevant to the scholarly study of history, historical archaeology, ethnography, folklore, or cultural geography.

5.17.3 Project Impacts

Physical Impacts

Buildout of the proposed Montecito Community Plan could result in the following potentially significant adverse impacts to historical resources:

- Disturbance of a significant historical resources through introduction of disruptive visual or auditory elements;

- Adverse physical or aesthetic impacts to potentially significant historic structures.

With respect to known historic resources, the two County landmarks, the Biltmore Hotel and Deane School on the Westmont Campus, would be placed in the Mixed-Use Affordable Housing Overlay Zone under the proposed Community Plan. The overlay zone would allow dwelling units to be built on these properties in an attempt to increase affordable housing within the Planning Area. Depending on the location and scale of these dwelling units, development of residential uses on these properties has the potential to result in significant disruptive visual impacts to the existing historic structures.

With respect to the potential historic structures identified in Figure 36, approximately 5 structures are located adjacent to vacant or potentially subdividable parcels as identified on the RMD's 1989 vacant parcel map. Development on these vacant and subdividable parcels may also visually detract from the potential historic structures. This would be especially true in the area of East Valley Road and Bolero Drive where several potentially historic structures are located.

Finally, the limited residential growth allowed under the proposed Plan along with the proposed Affordable Housing Overlay may encourage the rehabilitation, expansion or even demolition of existing, potentially historic structures. These
activities would likely be ministerial in nature, and therefore potential historic structures on these sites would not be afforded the added protection of discretionary review.

All of these potential impacts that could occur to existing and potential historic resources as buildout of the Community Plan proceeds are considered to be potentially significant. However, existing procedural measures and proposed policies would reduce potential impacts to a level of insignificance for discretionary projects. These measures include site checking potential development sites for existing structures and, if the structure appears to be over 50 years in age, forwarding the application to the RMD staff archaeologist for review. If the structure is found to be significant, measures can be recommended to ensure that the structure is retained on-site or relocated, if feasible. These procedural measures and proposed policies do not apply to ministerial development, and as such there remains the potential for significant adverse impacts to historical structures to occur.

Policy Impacts

Approximately half of the historical policies and actions in the proposed Community Plan were mitigation measures in the EIR prepared for Montecito Growth Management Plan (90-EIR-15). These policies and actions include: provisions for development of an historic resources survey; study of enactment of a demolition ordinance to prevent tear down or deterioration of an historic resource; and County incorporation of the Mills Act to provide tax relief for property of historic merit in Montecito. The remaining policies call for: preservation and protection of historic adobes; limitation of improvements to the Coral Casino to protect and enhance its historic architectural integrity; and preservation of ornamental trees and shrubs with important historical value. Effective implementation of these policies would serve to mitigate potentially significant impacts to historic resources to insignificant levels (Class II) in the Planning Area.

5.17.4 Cumulative Impacts

Loss of known and unknown historical structures within the Planning Area is considered to be cumulatively significant due to the information those structures may contribute to further understanding of the region’s history.
5.17.5 Mitigation Measures

None identified.

5.17.6 Level of Impact Significance

Effective implementation of the proposed policies would reduce potentially significant adverse impacts to historic resources to a less than significant level for discretionary projects, however, the potential for significant impacts to occur due to ministerial projects would remain, resulting in an unavoidable impact to historic resources (Class I).
EXHIBIT I
APPENDIX D

List of Potentially Historic Sites/Structures
### APPENDIX D

Potential Historic Structures in Montecito

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Assessor’s Parcel Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Popeilian Court (R. Isham)</td>
<td>009-080-015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 San Ysidro Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Breakers (Raymond)</td>
<td>009-352-031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1180 Channel Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Adobe</td>
<td>007-050-017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 San Ysidro Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladwin House</td>
<td>007-220-040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555 East Valley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piranhurst</td>
<td>013-060-011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971 Cold Springs Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovelace House</td>
<td>007-120-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780 El Bosque Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station</td>
<td>011-200-080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486 East Valley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Assessor's Parcel Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantia</td>
<td>007-220-019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597 East Valley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonehedge</td>
<td>011-180-014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630 Hot Springs Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal Houses</td>
<td>009-311-008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304 Danielson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Ravenscroft</td>
<td>013-220-012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>779 Ayala Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa Dorinda</td>
<td>009-640-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Hot Springs Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcady</td>
<td>013-192-067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817 Knapp Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Mirador</td>
<td>013-060-039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980 Cold Springs Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Assessor's Parcel Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Of Mount Carmel</td>
<td>011-172-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300 East Valley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard School</td>
<td>009-140-032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 San Ysidro Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane School</td>
<td>007-340-028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795 San Leandro Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito Inn</td>
<td>009-293-007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1295 Coast Village Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramar Hotel</td>
<td>009-371-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555 S. Jameson Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Mill</td>
<td>009-181-020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 Olive Mill Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Du Pont</td>
<td>007-130-009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880 East Valley road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Assessor's Parcel Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Chiquita (Biltmore)</td>
<td>009-352-009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260 Channel Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539 Periwinkle Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>011-220-016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555 Periwinkle Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.G. Bromfield</td>
<td>009-060-072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338 School House Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>011-210-014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556 Periwinkle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotusland</td>
<td>013-090-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695 Ashley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>011-120-036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2791 Sycamore Canyon Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Assessor's Parcel Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantia</td>
<td>007-220-051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599 East Valley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantia</td>
<td>008-220-061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599 1/2 East Valley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzana Adobe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para Grande Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conklin House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ortega Ridge Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masini</td>
<td>007-350-010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 Sheffield Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>011-120-071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725 Riven Rock Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos Ranch</td>
<td>155-070-013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300 East Valley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX D (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Assessor's Parcel Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bingham House</td>
<td>011-140-006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699 San Ysidro Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham House</td>
<td>011-140-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741 San Ysidro Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca’ De Sopra</td>
<td>013-060-019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050 Cold Springs Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon House</td>
<td>009-164-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 Middle Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calef</td>
<td>009-222-035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1169 Oriole Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Verde and Pool House</td>
<td>011-120-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2561 Sycamore Canyon Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Johnson House</td>
<td>009-020-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2845 Sycamore Canyon Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Assessor's Parcel Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>011-020-042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2725 Sycamore Canyon Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot Walker</td>
<td>013-090-023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501 Sycamore Canyon Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa Del Herrero</td>
<td>009-060-018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387 East Valley Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa Del Greco</td>
<td>009-122-020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 Mesa Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>013-192-022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>843 Knapp Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>015-050-026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256 Eucalyptus Hill Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>015-162-012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736 Cima Linda Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Assessor's Parcel Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence 710 Mountain Drive</td>
<td>013-040-024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence 801 Hot springs Road</td>
<td>011-050-073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence 818 Hot springs Road</td>
<td>011-050-020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence 670 Hot Springs Road</td>
<td>011-130-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence 415 Hot Springs Road</td>
<td>009-070-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence 280 Middle Road</td>
<td>009-130-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence 1169 Oriole Road</td>
<td>009-222-035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Assessor's Parcel Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Academy Of The West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070 Fairway Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>007-130-060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656 Park Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>007-130-036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644 Buena Vista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>011-220-011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 Perwinkle Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA 93108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
density resulting from buildout of the community plan could result in potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources. The proposed project would result in similar, potentially significant impacts to those discussed in that EIR (Pgs. 5-186 through 5-191). Mitigation measures in the EIR which were incorporated as policies in the Montecito Community Plan, along with existing County policies, were considered adequate to mitigate impacts to archaeological resources to a level of insignificance.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No mitigation required. Policy CR-M-2.1 and Development Standard CR-M-2.1.1 would serve to mitigate any potential impacts resulting from the proposed increase in density and subsequent construction activities. This policy language calls for protection of cultural resources, and identification of these resources through Phase I surveys. Given the proximity of this site to archaeological resources, a Phase I survey would be required upon submittal of future discretionary permits. Further mitigation may required depending on the results of that survey in order to mitigate potentially significant impacts. Mitigation may include further testing, avoidance of the resource entirely, or archival and collection.

4.8 HISTORIC RESOURCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the proposal result in:</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Adverse physical or aesthetic impact on a structure or property at least 30 years old and/or historic or cultural significance to the community, state, or nation?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Beneficial impacts to historic resource due to non-disruptive rehabilitation, preservation in a conservation easement, etc.?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Discussion:

The subject property is listed in the Montecito Community Plan EIR as having potential historic structures. This list consists of structures which may have important historic potential but have not been officially designated as historic. Conversations with the Montecito History Committee indicate that the entire San Carlos and Featherhill Ranches are considered to have great historic interest given the individuals who have lived on the ranch in the past, the nature of operations onsite, and the historic structures. An increase in density on this property could potentially impact the historic character of the San Carlos Ranch. This is considered a potentially significant impact. In order to mitigate this potential impact to a level of significance, it will be necessary to evaluate and archive historic resources upon submittal of future discretionary permits.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: Policy CR-M-2.1 which requires that historic resources in the Montecito area be protected and preserved to the extent feasible is adequate to mitigate impacts of the proposed general plan amendment and rezone. However, additional, project specific mitigation measures will have to be implemented at the time future discretionary permits are submitted and reviewed. These mitigations may include the requirement to perform a Phase I and Phase II historical survey on the property, with possible Phase III
historical surveys being performed in the event that historic structures are required to be removed. With implementation of such mitigations, residual impacts would be less than significant.

4.9 NOISE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the proposal result in:</th>
<th>Zoning Plan</th>
<th>Environmental Project</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Filing</th>
<th>Mitigation and Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Long-term exposure of people to noise levels exceeding County thresholds (e.g., locating noise sensitive area next to an airport, etc.)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Short-term exposure of people to noise levels exceeding County thresholds?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Project-generated substantial increase in the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas (either day or night)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Discussion:

The Montecito Community Plan EIR identified one potentially significant noise impacts which could occur as a result of buildout. This impact was associated with the exposure of people to short-term noise levels during construction activities, exceeding County thresholds. Short-term noise impacts associated with the rehabilitation, teardown, or reconstruction of an increased number of existing dwelling units were also found to be potentially significant. Policies which have been included in the Community Plan which limit the hours of construction were considered adequate to mitigate this impact to a level of insignificance.

The proposed project would eventually result in the construction of approximately 93 additional homes, instead of the 78 homes contemplated in the Montecito Community Plan. This construction would generate significant but mitigable noise levels to the surrounding area in exceedance of County thresholds. It is not possible at this point to determine exactly how significant these noise impacts would be given that phasing of construction is unknown.

The project is not, however, expected to generate long-term noise or expose individuals to significant noise levels, as the project is residential in nature. 92-EIR-03 evaluated long-term noise exposure and found these impacts to be less than significant with buildout of the community plan. This analysis was based upon noise studies conducted along major roadways within the planning area which found that even with full buildout, long-term traffic noise would remain below County thresholds. No other significant long-term noise generating sources were identified within the Planning Area.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No mitigation required. Policies included in the Montecito Community Plan (Policy N-M-1.1, Development Standards N-M-1.1.1 & 1.1.2) would serve to mitigate potential noise impacts to a level of insignificance. Project specific conditions may be applied at the time further discretionary permits are submitted.
TO: Decision-Makers

FROM: Dianne Meester, Supervising Planner
Development Review Division, Planning and Development
Staff Contact: Gordon Bell

DATE: August 18, 1995

RE: CEQA Determination: Finding that CEQA section 15164 (Addendum) applies to Palmer Jackson General Plan Amendment and Rezone, 95-GP-003, 95-RZ-003. CEQA section 15164 allows an addendum to be prepared when only minor technical changes or changes which do not create new significant impacts would result. The Montecito Community Plan EIR, 92-EIR-03, prepared for the Montecito Community Plan, is hereby amended by this 15164 letter for 95-GP-003, 95-RZ-003.

Location: The proposed project is located just east of Romero Canyon Road and north of East Valley Road and is known as 2500 East Valley Road, also known as Rancho San Carlos and the Featherhill Ranch, Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 155-030-043, 155-070-01, -02, -03, -07, -08, -12, -13, -14, Montecito area, First Supervisorial District.

Project Description: The proposed project is a request by Palmer Jackson for a General Plan Amendment to change General Plan Land Use designations of a mixture of SRR-0.33 (Semi-rural residential, 3 acres minimum parcel size) and SRR-0.2 (five acres minimum parcel size) to a mixture of SRR-0.5 (2 acres minimum parcel size), SRR-0.33, and SRR-0.2 zoning on 257 acres. The redesignation would result in 141 acres designated SRR-0.5, 27 acres designated SRR-0.33, and 89 acres designated SRR-0.2.

The proposal also includes a request for a rezone to rezone portions of the property to be consistent with the proposed General Plan Land Use designations. The project would change existing zoning of 5-E-1 and 3-E-1 to a mixture of 5-E-1, 3-E-1, and 2-E-1 on 141, 27, and 89 acres respectively.

In addition to the proposed rezone, the proposed project includes a request to augment the text of the Montecito Community Plan to include the following text:

"In order to avoid onsite sensitive resources, minimize impacts, provide planning flexibility and be consistent with good planning practice, the County would consider a future..."
use, public facilities (solid waste & schools), and aesthetic/visual resources. Significant but mitigable impacts were identified in the areas of geology, cultural resources, and noise. However, the proposed project would not result in any new impacts not previously identified in 92-EIR-03. The discussion below outlines potential changes in impacts than those discussed for issue areas in 92-EIR-03.

MINOR CHANGES AND CLARIFICATION OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES:

GEOLOGY

Impact Discussion: The Montecito Community Plan EIR (92-EIR-03) identified several potentially significant but mitigateable geologic impacts which could occur as a result of buildout of the community plan. Impacts identified in the Community Plan are generalized, as the EIR recognized that each project site is different in geologic character and that "determination of (impact) significance is based on expert opinion of the State-registered geologist employed by the County at the time of project permit application and environmental review." In general, significant geologic impacts which could occur in all those issue areas listed below:

- Exposure to or production of unstable earth conditions such as landslides, soil creep, mudslides, ground failure (including expansive, compressible, collapsible soils), or similar hazards.

- Disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcovering of the soil by cuts, fills, or extensive grading.

- Permanent changes in topography.

- The destruction, covering or modification of unique geologic, paleontologic, or physical features.

- Increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site.

- Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands or dunes, or changes in situtation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river, or stream, or the bed of the ocean, or any bay, inlet or lake.

- Exposure to or increase in the impact of earthquakes, tsunamis, liquefaction, lurching, or other ground failure.

- Exposure to radon hazards.
1.5.1, 1.5.2, 1.5.3, and 1.5.4, and Policy GEO-M-1.6.1 and Development Standard GEO-M-1.6.1. These policies speak to development on steep slopes and near active earthquake faults and require measures such as special engineering techniques and revegetation to minimize impacts to a level of insignificance.

With incorporation of the above listed policies into the project design, residual impacts due to seismic shaking and unstable soil conditions due to construction on steep slopes would be less than significant.

**AIR QUALITY**

**Impact Discussion:** The proposed project, a general plan amendment and rezone, would not directly result in the creation of extensive dust generation or any other air quality impacts associated with smoke and odors. Project-related impacts associated with construction generated dust will be reviewed at the time of application for further discretionary permits (e.g. tract map), when specific construction phasing is known. However, as discussed in the Montecito Community Plan EIR (92-EIR-03) and its supporting addendums, the Plan’s impacts with regards to ozone precursors are considered to be significant at full buildout (Class 1). Project-specific impacts with respect to long-term generation of ozone precursors due to the buildout of the subject property with 93 units (includes increased density resulting from the proposed project) is expected to be less than significant based on the current County threshold which utilizes 125 single family units as a guideline for screening significant long-term air quality impacts. However, the buildout of the property including the proposed increase in density would add incrementally to this long-term air quality impacts identified as significant and unavoidable, resulting in a cumulatively significant impact.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:** No mitigation is required. Policies included in the Montecito Community Plan would help to mitigate adverse impacts associated with dust and vehicular emissions during construction. These policies include Policy AQ-M-1.3.1, and Development Standards AQ-M-1.3.1, and 1.3.2. These policies and development standards require Best Available Control Technology to be used for all construction, and to incorporate dust mitigation techniques into the project design.

Residual cumulative impacts would remain significant as indicated in Montecito Community Plan EIR.

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

**Existing Plant and Animal Communities/Conditions:** The project site contains a mixture of plant and animal communities ranging from orchards, to grasslands associated with pasture, chaparral habitat, and southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest habitat. The orchards are primarily located on the western two-thirds of the property with areas of specimen native trees.
given the sensitive nature of the habitat in this area. Impacts would result primarily from the following:

- Direct destruction of habitat for grading of roads, utilities, and building pads,
- Increased siltation and sedimentation in riparian areas.
- Increased human presence (light, noise, odors) in wildlife corridors.
- Introduction of non-native species.
- Removal of specimen trees.
- Fragmentation of habitat areas.

This area has not been identified as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat (ESH) area in the Montecito Community Plan. However, the riparian area along Picay Creek meets the criteria for an ESH overlay designation. Pursuant to Section 35-430.3 of the Article IV Zoning Ordinance, when ESH areas are identified during the review of a project, the provisions of the ESH Overlay shall apply and the County shall update the maps to incorporate these new areas. If the area had been mapped as such, policies in the community plan may be adequate to ensure that impacts to the biological resources along Picay Creek would be less than significant. At this time, however, general resource policies may not be adequate to provide guidance for future development near the creek, and the limitations on the development in order to mitigate potential impacts. It is therefore recommended that the ESH overlay be extended as part of this general plan amendment, to include the tributaries of Picay Creek. The applicant’s consultant, P&D Technologies, has shown areas on maps submitted to the County which suggest areas which would be delineated as ESH. At this time it is not possible to evaluate the adequacy of the policies contained in the Community Plan and those listed below to guide development such that significant biological impacts would be avoided given the likely ultimate parcelization of the site. It could be expected therefore that some habitat will be destroyed and significant impacts of the nature discussed above and in 92-EIR-03 would occur.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: In order to partially mitigate potential impacts to biological resources resulting from development near Picay Creek, the area designated as Southern Coast Live Oak Riparian Forest along Picay Creek shall be designated as an ESH area on the Montecito Community Plan ESH Overlay map (concurrent with the approval of this general plan amendment and rezone) consistent with the Article IV Zoning Ordinance which requires that ESH policies apply when new ESH areas are identified during review of a project application.

Application of policies included in the Montecito Community Plan which apply to ESH areas as well as those which apply to General Resources would serve to partially mitigate potentially significant impacts. These include Policy BIO-M-1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.12, 1.13, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.20, 1.21, 1.22, and 1.23; along with their accompanying development standards and action items. In summary, these policies call for the following:
potentially significant impact. In order to mitigate this potential impact to a level of significance, it will be necessary to evaluate and archive historic resources upon submittal of future discretionary permits.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No mitigation required. Policy CR-M-2.1 and Development Standard CR-M-2.1.1 would serve to mitigate any potential impacts resulting from the proposed increase in density and subsequent construction activities. This policy language calls for protection of cultural resources, and identification of these resources through Phase I surveys. Given the proximity of this site to archaeological resources and the location of historic resources onsite, a Phase I survey would be required upon submittal of future discretionary permits. Further mitigation may be required depending on the results of that survey in order to mitigate potentially significant impacts. Mitigation may include further testing, avoidance of the resource entirely, or archival and collection. With implementation of such mitigations, residual impacts would be less than significant.

NOISE

Impact Discussion: The Montecito Community Plan EIR identified one potentially significant noise impacts which could occur as a result of buildout. This impact was associated with the exposure of people to short-term noise levels during construction activities, exceeding County thresholds. Short-term noise impacts associated with the rehabilitation, teardown, or reconstruction of an increased number of existing dwelling units were also found to be potentially significant. Policies which have been included in the Community Plan which limit the hours of construction were considered adequate to mitigate this impact to a level of insignificance.

The proposed project would eventually result in the construction of approximately 93 additional homes, instead of the 78 homes contemplated in the Montecito Community Plan. This construction would generate significant but mitigable noise levels to the surrounding area in exceedance of County thresholds. It is not possible at this point to determine exactly how significant these noise impacts would be given that phasing of construction is unknown.

The project is not, however, expected to generate long-term noise or expose individuals to significant noise levels, as the project is residential in nature. 92-EIR-03 evaluated long-term noise exposure and found these impacts to be less than significant with buildout of the community plan. This analysis was based upon noise studies conducted along major roadways within the planning area which found that even with full buildout, long-term traffic noise would remain below County thresholds. No other significant long-term noise generating sources were identified within the Planning Area.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No mitigation required. Policies included in the Montecito Community Plan (Policy N-M-1.1, Development Standards N-M-1.1.1 & 1.1.2)
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Staff Report for Palmer Jackson

Hearing Date: September 28, 1995
Staff Report Date: September 11, 1995
Case No.: 95-GP-003, 95-RZ-003
Environmental Document: Addendum to 92-EIR-03

OWNER/APPLICANT/AGENT/ENGINEER

Palmer Jackson
P.O. Box 5580
Santa Barbara, CA 93150

Mullen & Henne
P.O. Box 787
Santa Barbara, CA 93102-0787
Attn: Rick Battles
(805) 66-1501

P&D Consultants
1100 Town & Country Road
Orange, CA 92668
Attn: Patrick Callihan

1.0 REQUEST

Application Filed: March 2, 1995
Application Complete: June 14, 1995
Processing Deadline: Not applicable

Hearing on the request of Palmer Jackson to consider case numbers 95-GP-003 and 95-RZ-003 proposing to amend the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element/Montecito Community Plan by changing the Land Use Designation from a mixture of SRR-0.33 and SRR-0.2 designations to a mixture of SRR-0.5, SRR-0.33, SRR-0.2 designations and allowing a text amendment to the Montecito Community Plan which would allow for planning flexibility on the Palmer Jackson property, and rezoning from a mixture of 3-E-1 and 5-E-1 zoning to a mixture 2-E-1, 3-E-1, and 5-E-1 zoning under the provisions of Santa Barbara County Code Chapter 35 of Article IV; and to accept the addendum to 92-EIR-03 pursuant to the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act.
on these resources that cause great concern to the citizenry of Montecito, as evidenced in their letters of comment which are attached to the addendum (Attachment B). The Montecito Community Plan EIR identified many significant impacts which could occur as a result of buildout of the planning area. This proposal could exacerbate these significant impacts due to the proposed increase in density. These potential impacts are discussed in the attached addendum (Attachment B). The two most significant issues discussed in the comment letters received from the public are those summarized below.

Given the undeveloped nature of the Palmer Jackson property and the fact that it is currently and has been historically used for agriculture and horse ranching, it represents one of the largest areas of open space within the urban Montecito area. As such, it provides aesthetically pleasing views from the foothill areas, along East Valley Road, and from Ortega Ridge Road. Development of the property either under the existing zoning or the proposed zoning would significantly degrade these views. This has been cause for great community concern.

Another cause for community concern is the potential traffic/circulation problems that any proposed development on this property may have. While no tract map has been proposed at this time, it is possible that secondary access routes may be proposed along Featherhill Road which could have the effect of overtaxing this small private road with increased vehicular traffic. Impacts of related to any proposed infrastructure would be analyzed at the time future development proposals are submitted.

In conclusion, the proposed project represents good planning practice at this time as it does reconfigure that Land Use and Zoning designations to consider the environmental constraints of the property. It also provides for the potential to further address environmental concerns by allowing for the potential for clustering of units away from biologically and visually sensitive areas by including the amended text language and by providing for designation of an ESH area along Picay Creek and its tributaries. In addition, the proposed zoning would be consistent with parcel sizes in the surrounding areas while maintaining larger parcel sizes in the steeper areas of the site. The current zoning would allow for smaller, 3 acre parcels in areas which are currently constrained by steep slopes and high value biological habitat. In addition, it should be noted that the proposed project does not negate the potential to reduce densities when appropriate to address environmental constraints. At the time future discretionary review would occur, for example when a tract map is submitted, further environmental review would occur and constraints and impacts to resources would be analyzed in detail at that time.

4.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

4.1 Site Information
which would allow for a maximum buildout potential of 78 units.

In December of 1992, Palmer Jackson filed lawsuits against the County essentially claiming that the downzoning of his property represented a "taking" and also claiming that the environmental document prepared for the Montecito Community Plan was inadequate. Subsequent to the filing of these lawsuits, the trial court upheld the County's actions in connection with the adoption of the Montecito Community Plan and the environmental review thereof. Subsequent to that decision, an appeal was filed in the Court of Appeals by Palmer Jackson. In the interim, the County and Palmer Jackson came to an understanding to stay the litigation until the County has had a chance to process a General Plan Amendment and Rezone which would ultimately allow for a maximum buildout potential of 93 units and would include a textual amendment to the Community Plan which would allow for planning flexibility for eventual development. The two parties have filed numerous extensions to the stay of appeal with the court and no additional extensions are expected to be granted. The County's appellate briefs are due in court on December 5th of this year. It is expected that the proposed project would be heard by the Board of Supervisors at its November 28th Land Use Element Window Date, and that the lawsuit would be dismissed in the event it is rendered to the applicant, per the Memorandum of Understanding.

5.0 PROJECT ANALYSIS

5.1 Environmental Review

An addendum to the Montecito Community Plan EIR (92-EIR-03), pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, was prepared for the proposed project. 92-EIR-03 previously identified impacts which might occur as a result of buildout of the proposed parcel with a mixture of 3-E-1 and 5-E-1 zoning which would allow for an eventual buildout of approximately 78 units. The EIR also analyzed a full range of alternatives, including the No-Project Alternative which analyzed the site with one acre zoning and a buildout potential of approximately 257 units, and a lower density alternative which considered no further subdivision of the Palmer Jackson property. The proposed project contemplates a mixture of 2-E-1, 3-E-1, and 5-E-1 zoning which would allow for an ultimate buildout of approximately 93 units. The EIR found that potentially significant impacts could occur with respect to land use, traffic/circulation, sewage, fire hazards, police protection, schools, solid waste, flooding/storm drainage, biological resources, historical resources, visual/aesthetic resources, and air quality. Impacts of a similar nature could occur with the proposed project. More specifically, the proposed project may have significant and unavoidable impacts in the areas of air quality, biological resources, land use, public facilities (solid waste & schools), and aesthetic/visual resources. Significant but mitigable impacts were identified in the areas of geology, cultural resources, and noise. However, the proposed project would not result in any new impacts not previously identified in 92-EIR-03. The addendum was circulated for courtesy public review with the public comment period ending September 1, 1995. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FD-M-1.2</td>
<td>New development shall be located in a manner that minimizes the need for flood control measures.</td>
<td>Consistent: At the time future discretionary permits are applied for, project plans would be reviewed to ensure that the project has not been designed to include unnecessary flood control measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD-M-4.5, Dev. Std. 4.5.1, 4.5.2</td>
<td>If the project is located in a manner that results in increased drainage flows, the project may be required to implement measures to minimize the increase in drainage flows. The County will secure through public and private projects that adequate drainage is provided to minimize existing community-wide flooding and drainage problems.</td>
<td>Consistent: County Flood Control would review future project plans in order to ensure that drainage plans are designed such that community-wide flooding problems are not exacerbated, and on-site drainage is designed properly and adequately to prevent flooding problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD-M-4.6</td>
<td>Other than projects that are currently approved and/or funded, no further concrete channelization or major alteration of streams shall be permitted.</td>
<td>Consistent: Future project plans would be reviewed by P&amp;D and Flood Control in order to ensure that no major alterations or concrete channelization occur to streams onsite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-M-1.2, Dev. Std. AQ-M-1.2.a, 1.2.b</td>
<td>Air pollution emissions from new development and associated construction activities shall be minimized to the maximum extent feasible. These activities shall be consistent with the Air Quality Attachment Plan and Air Pollution Control District guidelines.</td>
<td>Consistent: Future project plans would be reviewed by P &amp; C and APCD to ensure consistency with the Air Quality Attachment Plan and all Air Pollution Control District guidelines, and to ensure that Best Available Control Technology and that measures to control fugitive dust have been included as project conditions of approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-M-1.1</td>
<td>Designate and provide protection to important or sensitive environmental resources and habitats in the pixelated portion of the Montecito Area.</td>
<td>Consistent: The attached Board Resolution and Ordinance reference indicates that the following biological resources and habitats are to be protected and preserved to the extent feasible through the ESH Overlay:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-M-1.2</td>
<td>The following biological resources and habitats are to be protected and preserved to the extent feasible through the ESH Overlay: Riparian woodland corridor, Coastal sage scrub, Sensitive native flora.</td>
<td>Riparian woodland corridor, Monarch Butterfly rooms, Coastal sage scrub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-M-1.3, Dev. Std. BIO-M-1.3.a, 1.3.b</td>
<td>Environmental sensitive Habitat (ESH) areas within the Montecito Planning Area shall be protected, and when appropriate, enhanced.</td>
<td>Environmentally sensitive Habitats (ESH) areas within the Montecito Planning Area shall be protected, and when appropriate, enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy BIO-M-1.10: All development, including dredging, filling and grading within stream corridors, shall be limited to activities necessary for the construction of uses specified in Policy 1.7. When such activities require removal of riparian plant species, re-vegetation with local native plants shall be required on both banks and extending 25' outward from each top of bank, except where it would preclude reasonable development of a parcel.</td>
<td>Consistent: At the time future discretionary permits are applied for, project plans would be reviewed to ensure that no structures are located within the riparian corridor with the exception of those listed in this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy BIO-M-1.12: The Montecito Biological Resources map shall be consulted as a reference along with other relevant information during review of development applications in order to identify areas containing potentially significant biological resources. The Montecito Biological Resources map shall be updated periodically to incorporate new information as it becomes available.</td>
<td>Consistent: The Montecito Biological Resources map has been consulted in reviewing the proposed project. It did not identify any ESH areas on the project site. However, supplemental biological surveys have identified ESH areas along a tributary of Pico Creek on site, as well as other sensitive biological resources throughout the site (i.e., sensitive trees, native vegetation, etc.). Mitigation included in the addendum requires that the area along the tributary of Pico Creek be identified as an ESH area consistent with Article IV Zoning Ordinance requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy BIO-M-1.14, Dev. Std. BIO-M-1.14.1 - 1.14.5: Significant biological communities shall not be fragmented into small non-viable pocket areas by development.</td>
<td>Consistent: Future development plans shall be reviewed to ensure that proposed development does not fragment wildlife corridors along Pico Creek and its tributaries. Where appropriate, measures shall be taken to ensure protection of the site during construction and re-vegetation/restoration where necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy BIO-M-1.16, Dev. Std. BIO-M-1.16.1: All existing native trees regardless of size that have biological value shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible.</td>
<td>Consistent: At the time future discretionary permits are applied for project plans shall be reviewed to determine if all existing native trees of biological value (which might be affected by potential development) have been located on these plans and all efforts have been made to have potential development avoid these trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy BIO-M-1.17: Oak trees, because they are particularly sensitive to environmental conditions, shall be protected to the maximum extent feasible. All land use activities, including agriculture shall be carried out in such a manner as to avoid damage to native oak trees. Regeneration of oak trees shall be encouraged.</td>
<td>Consistent: At the time future discretionary permits are applied for project plans shall be reviewed to determine if all existing oak trees (which might be affected by potential development) have been located on these plans and all efforts have been made to have potential development avoid these trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy VIS-M-1.1: Development shall be subordinate to the natural open space characteristics of the mountains.

Policy VIS-M-1.2: Grading required for access roads and site development shall be limited in scope so as to protect the viewshed.

Policy VIS-M-1.3: Development of property should minimize impacts to open space views as seen from public roads and viewpoints.

Policy VIS-M-1.4: In hillside areas where water tanks are required for structural fire-fighting purposes, tanks should be designed to: 1) blend in with natural land forms; 2) not impinge on the viewshed; and 3) be screened by landscaping.

Policy CIRC-M-1.5: A determination of project consistency with the standards and policies of this Community Plan Circulation Section shall constitute a determination of consistency with the Local Coastal Plan Policy 42-6 and LUDP #4 with regard to roadway and intersection capacity.

Policy LUC-M-2.1: Agriculture activities on residential parcels that are consistent with the provisions of the applicable residential zone district shall be supported and encouraged by the County.

Consistent: At the time future discretionary permits are applied for, the project plans, including architectural design, would be reviewed by P&D and BAR in order to ensure that the proposed development is subordinate to the open space characteristics of the mountains.

Consistent: At the time future discretionary permits are applied for, project plans, including grading plans, would be required to be reviewed by P&D and BAR in order to ensure that excessive grading does not occur and that significant scarring does not result from this grading. In addition, landscape/vegetation plans would be required to prevent washout and minimize visual impacts.

Consistent: The proposed project would be served by the Montecito Water District and would not require water tanks for fire-fighting purposes. The fire district would require that adequate infrastructure exist prior to construction of combustible materials.

Consistent: The proposed project would be served by the Montecito Water District and would not require water tanks for fire-fighting purposes. The fire district would require that adequate infrastructure exist prior to construction of combustible materials.

Consistent: The proposed general plan amendment and rezon would increase density on the project site, thus increasing the development potential and potential degradation of open space views as seen from public viewing areas.

Consistent: The proposed project would be served by the Montecito Water District and would not require water tanks for fire-fighting purposes. The fire district would require that adequate infrastructure exist prior to construction of combustible materials.

Consistent: At the time future discretionary permits are applied for, project plans would be reviewed and all efforts to maintain agricultural activities onsite would be encouraged by the County.
5.3 Ordinance Compliance

5.3.1 Compliance with Ordinance Requirements

The proposed project is a general plan amendment and rezone (legislative action) with no other project components attached to the request. At the time future discretionary permits are applied for, that future project will be required to comply with all ordinance requirements and provisions of Article IV.

The proposed text amendment, which intended to allow for planning flexibility through potential clustering, would not be consistent with the proposed estate zoning for the property. The 2-E-1, 3-E-1, and 5-E-1 zoning proposed for the property would not allow for clustering of units in order to avoid constraints on the property. Said zoning requires the property to be divided into 2, 3, and 5 acre parcels and allows for only one primary residence to be located on said parcel. In order to allow clustering and maintain consistency with the Article IV zoning ordinance, it would be necessary for the applicant to request a rezone in the future to another zone district which allows clustering, such as the Design Residential or Planned Residential District zoning designations.

5.4 Subdivision/Development Review Committee

The project was reviewed by the Subdivision/Development Review Committee on March 23, 1995. As the project represents a legislative action with no specific permit to be issued concurrently with the proposed project, departmental condition letters were not issued as part...
TO THE HONORABLE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA

In the matter of: Hearing on the request of Palmer Jackson to consider:

- Case number 95-GP-003 [application filed 03/02/95] proposing to amend the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element/Montecito Community Plan by changing the Land Use Designation from a mixture of SRR-0.33 and SRR-0.2 designations to a mixture of SRR-0.5, SRR-0.33, SRR-0.2 designations and to amend the text of the Montecito Community Plan under the provisions of Santa Barbara County Code Chapter 35 of Article IV; and

- Case number 95-RZ-003 [application filed 03/02/95] proposing to rezone from a mixture of 3-E-1 and 5-E-1 zoning to a mixture 2-E-1, 3-E-1, and 5-E-1 zoning under the provisions of Santa Barbara County Code Chapter 35 of Article IV; and

- Accept the addendum to 92-EIR-03 pursuant to the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act.

The applications involve APNs 155-030-005, 155-070-01, -02, -03, -07, -08, -12, -13, and 155-070-14, located just east of Romero Canyon Road and north of East Valley Road and is known as 2500 East Valley Road, also known as Rancho San Carlos and the Featherhill Ranch. (GB)

Planning Commission Recommendations: Commissioner Wilde moved, seconded by Commissioner O'Neal and carried by a vote of 5 to 0**, to recommend that the Board of Supervisors:

A. Adopt the required findings for the project as set forth in Attachment A of staff's report dated September 11, 1995, including CEQA findings; and

B. Adopt Resolution (95-GP-003) set forth in Attachment C and Ordinance (95-RZ-003) as indicated in Attachment D of staff's report, approving the land use designation and text change and the rezone.

**Commissioner Relis stated the following for the record:

"For the record I did support the motion, however, I would like to send a message to the Board that they carefully consider the text amendment request as I believe it is inconsistent with the current zoning and may set a negative precedent for other project applicants that come before the County."

The attached findings, draft Resolution (Attachment C) and draft Ordinance (Attachment D) reflect the Planning Commission's actions.
Dear Mr. Jackson:

At the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors regular meeting of November 28, 1995, Supervisor Schwartz moved, seconded by Supervisor Graffy and carried by a unanimous vote to:

a) Adopt the required findings including California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) findings; and

b) 95-GP-003, adopt a resolution proposing specific amendments to the Land Use Element of the County Comprehensive Plan by changing the Land Use designation from a mixture of SRR (Semi-Rural Residential)-0.33 and SRR-0.2 designations to a mixture of SRR-0.5, SRR-0.33 and SRR-0.2 designations and amending the text of the Montecito Community Plan under the provisions of Santa Barbara County Code Chapter 35 of Article IV; and

c) 95-RZ-003, adopt an ordinance amending §15-487, adopting a new zoning map, of Article IV of Chapter 35 of the Code of Santa Barbara County, California, by adopting by reference one zoning map identified as Board of Supervisors' Exhibit Nos. 35-404.7.1 and 35-404.9.1, to rezone APN's 155-030-45, 155-070-01, -02, -03, -07, -12, -13, and 155-070-14, from a mixture of 3-E-1 and 5-E-1 zoning to a mixture 2-E-1, 3-E-1, and 5-E-1 and to amend the Montecito Environmentally Sensitive Habitat (ESH) Overlay Zone District to include ESH area along Picay Creek and its tributaries.

Dew Mr. Jackson:

At the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors regular meeting of November 29, 1995, Supervisor Schwartz moved, seconded by Supervisor Graffy and carried by a unanimous vote to:

a) Adopt required findings including California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) findings; and

b) 95-GP-003, adopt a resolution proposing specific amendments to the Land Use Element of the County Comprehensive Plan by changing the Land Use designation from a mixture of SRR (Semi-Rural Residential)-0.33 and SRR-0.2 designations to a mixture of SRR-0.5, SRR-0.33 and SRR-0.2 designations and amending the text of the Montecito Community Plan under the provisions of Santa Barbara County Code Chapter 35 of Article IV; and

c) 95-RZ-003, adopt an ordinance amending §15-487, adopting a new zoning map, of Article IV of Chapter 35 of the Code of Santa Barbara County, California, by adopting by reference one zoning map identified as Board of Supervisors' Exhibit Nos. 35-404.7.1 and 35-404.9.1, to rezone APN's 155-030-45, 155-070-01, -02, -03, -07, -12, -13, and 155-070-14, from a mixture of 3-E-1 and 5-E-1 zoning to a mixture 2-E-1, 3-E-1, and 5-E-1 and to amend the Montecito Environmentally Sensitive Habitat (ESH) Overlay Zone District to include ESH area along Picay Creek and its tributaries.
Case Files: 95-GP-003 and 95-RZ-003
Permanent File
Richard Corral, Planning Technician
Jeri Williams, Planning Technician
Donato Mano
Address File: 2500 Bear Valley Road

Agent/Attorney: Mullins & Haneill, ATTN: R. Berlson, PO Box 787, Santa Barbara, CA 93102-0787

Engineer: PhD Consultants, ATTN: Patrick Callahan, 1100 Tower & Country Road, Orange, CA 92868

Interested Parties: Bowie, Arneson, Koda, Wilco & Goodman, 4920 Campus Drive, Newport Beach, CA 92660

Monarch Association
Fire Department
Flood Control
Park Department
Public Works
Environmental Health Services
APCOD
Deputy County Counsel
County Surveyor
Clark of the Board (File #95-19,060)
Planner: D. Meever

Attachments:
ATTACHMENT A: Findings
ATTACHMENT C: Resolution No. 95-340 (95-GP-003)
ATTACHMENT D: Ordinance No. 4210 (95-RZ-003)
1.4.3 Biological Resources. Implementation of policies and development standards included in the Montecito Community Plan which apply to ESH areas as well as those which apply to General Resources would serve to partially mitigate potentially significant biological impacts. In summary, these policies call for the following:

* Designation, protection, and preservation of ESH areas.
* Specific habitat protection for refineries.
* Encouragement of restoration projects.
* Periodic updating of biological resources maps.
* Prevention of fragmentation of significant biological communities.
* Protection of riparian areas and native trees.
* Preservation of riparian vegetation and riparian areas.
* Encouragement of the use of conservation or open space easements and native landscaping.

In addition to these policies, designation of the area along Paseo Creek and its tributaries as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat area (consistent with the Article IV Zoning Ordinance which requires such designations when sensitive habitats are discovered during review of a project) would serve to further mitigate biological impacts. However, residual biological impacts would be significant (Class I). Residual cumulative impacts resulting from the incremental loss of biological resources, which would inevitably occur as a result of the construction of 93 residential units, are considered to be significant and unavoidable (Class I). A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted with the Montecito Community Plan EIR to address these impacts.

1.4.4 Cultural Resources. Implementation of Policy CR-M-2.1 and Development Standard CR-M-2.1.1 which call for the protection of cultural resources and identification of these resources through Phase I surveys would serve to mitigate potentially significant impacts to a level of insignificance (Class II).

1.4.5 Notes: Implementation of policies included in the Montecito Community Plan which call for a limitation on the hours of construction and protection of new sensitive residential land use through sound shielding or proper siting would serve to mitigate potentially significant noise impacts to a level of insignificance (Class II).

1.4.6 Land Use: Impacts to agricultural resources are considered to be significant and unavoidable with no mitigation available. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted with the Montecito Community Plan EIR to address these impacts.

1.4.7 Public Facilities: Impacts to public facilities, specifically school sites and schools, are considered to be significant and unavoidable (Class I). Standard statutory fees would partially offset impacts to schools, but not fully. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted with the Montecito Community Plan EIR to address these impacts. Impacts to the sewer system and other infrastructure were considered to be less than significant (Class III), as the applicant would be responsible for the funding of these facilities and adequate capacity is available.

1.4.8 Architectural/Visual Resources: Impacts to visual resources due to the change in character of the area are considered to be significant and unavoidable (Class I). Implementation of policies included in the Montecito Community Plan along with the Montecito Architectural Guidelines would serve to lessen visual impacts associated with increased...
3. The request is consistent with good zoning and planning practices.

The proposed project represents good planning practice at this time as it does reconfigure that land use and zoning designations to consider the environmental constraints of the property. It also provides for the potential to further address environmental concerns by allowing for the potential for clustering of units away from biologically and visually sensitive areas by including the amended text language and by providing for designation of an ESH area along Picay Creek and its tributaries. In addition, the proposed zoning would be consistent with parcel sizes in the surrounding areas while maintaining larger parcel sizes in the steeper areas of the site. The current zoning would allow for smaller, 3-acre parcels in areas which are currently constrained by steep slopes and high value biological habitat. In addition, it should be noted that the proposed project does not negate the potential to reduce densities when appropriate to address environmental constraints. At the time future discretionary review would occur, for example when a tract map is submitted, further environmental review would occur and constraints and impacts to resources would be analyzed in detail at that time.
C. Public officials and agencies, civic organizations, and citizens have been consulted on and have advised the Planning Commission on the said proposed amendment(s) in noticed public hearing pursuant to Section 65353 of the Government Code, and the Planning Commission has sent its written recommendation to the Board pursuant to Section 65354 of the Government Code.

D. This Board has held a duly noticed public hearing, as required by Section 65355 of the Government Code, on the proposed amendment(s), at which hearing the amendment(s) was/ were explained and comments invited from the persons in attendance.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED as follows:

1. The above recitations are true and correct.

2. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 65356 of the Government Code, the above described changes are hereby adopted as an amendment(s) to the Land Use Element of the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan.

3. Pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65357, the chair and the Clerk of this Board are hereby authorized and directed to sign and certify all maps, documents and other materials in accordance with this Resolution to reflect the above described action by the Board.

4. Pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 65357 the Clerk of the Board is hereby authorized and directed to send endorsed copies of said COMP-2 map to the planning agency of each city within this County.
ATTACHMENT 'D'

ARTICLE IV

'DRAFT' ORDINANCE NO. ______

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 35-487,
ADOPTING A NEW ZONING MAP.
OF ARTICLE IV OF CHAPTER 35 OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF
SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA, BY ADOPTING BY REFERENCE
ONE ZONING MAP IDENTIFIED AS BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EXHIBIT NO. 35-____, TO REZONE ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBERS
155-070-045, 155-070-01, 155-070-02, 155-070-03, 155-070-07,
155-070-08, 155-070-12, 155-070-13, AND 155-070-14
FROM A MIXTURE OF 3-E-1 AND 5-E-1 ZONING TO A MIXTURE OF
2-E-1, 3-E-1, AND 5-E-1 ZONING AND TO AMEND THE MONTECITO
ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE HABITAT (ESH) OVERLAY ZONE DISTRICT MAP
TO INCLUDE ESH AREAS ALONG PICA CREEK AND ITS TRIBUTARIES

Case No. 95-RZ-003

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara ordains as follows:

SECTION 1

Section 35-487, "Ordinance Text Amendments/Rezones," of Article IV of Chapter 35 of the
Code of the County of Santa Barbara, California, is hereby amended by the adoption by reference
of one zoning map identified as Board of Supervisors Exhibit No. 35-____, which rezone
Assessor's Parcel Numbers 155-070-045, 155-070-01, 155-070-02, 155-070-03, 155-070-07,
155-070-08, 155-070-12, 155-070-13, and 155-070-14 from a mixture of 3-F-1 and 5-E-1 (Residential, 3 and 5-acre
minimum parcel size) zoning to a mixture of 2-E-1, 3-E-1, and 5-E-1 (Residential, 2, 3, and 5-acre
minimum parcel size) zoning, and to amend the Montecito Environmentally Sensitive Habitat
Overlay Zone District Map to include the area along Pica Creek and its tributaries which include
riparian woodland and chaparral; and which is made a part of said section by reference, with the
same force and effect as if the boundaries, location, and lines of the districts therein delineated and
all notations, references and other information shown on said Zoning Map were specifically and
fully set out and described therein.

SECTION 2

The Chair of the Board of Supervisors is hereby authorized and directed to endorse Exhibit
No. 35-____ to show that said map has been adopted by this Board.
July 11, 2017

Mr. Palmer Jackson
Petan Company
2500 East Valley Road
Santa Barbara, California 93108-1661

Re: Historic Landmark Nomination of Rancho San Carlos Estate

Dear Mr. Jackson:

The East Valley Preservation Association is honored to nominate the Rancho San Carlos Estate as an official County of Santa Barbara Historic Landmark due to its extraordinary historic, architectural, social and aesthetic significance. The Jackson family has been a dedicated steward of the Rancho San Carlos Estate for many years, preserving its many important historic and aesthetic features that continue to define Montecito to this day. A copy of the nomination package prepared for submittal to the County of Santa Barbara is attached to this letter.

County Landmark designation will recognize the Rancho San Carlos Estate for its outstanding evocation of historical themes important to the history of Montecito and the entire County. As one of the last and most intact of the large historical agricultural and equestrian estates in the County, if not all of Southern California, Rancho San Carlos is a remarkable vestige of that earlier time when Montecito first gained international prominence as a home of the wealthy and powerful. The Estate also showcases the accomplishments of two prominent designers who created the physical character of the County in general and Montecito in particular during its formative years, architect Reginald Johnson, a leader in the Monterey Revival School of architecture, and landscape architect, Lockwood de Forrest, Jr., a Santa Barbara resident nationally known for his use of exotic and natural plant materials in formal and informal compositions. This nomination also honors the extraordinary vision of its creators, Ann and Pete Jackson, and the stewardship of the entire Jackson family.
The Rancho San Carlos Estate has been publically recognized for its historic significance many times over the past twenty years, including in the Montecito Community Plan and update. Most recently, the historic resources survey certified by the Montecito Fire Protection District found the Estate as having “exceptional” historical significance and qualifies for historic designation at the very highest levels, including the County, State and National Registers. Although the Estate is indisputably an historical resource under the California Environmental Quality Act, it has nonetheless never received appropriate recognition of its significance as a County of Santa Barbara Historic Landmark.

The EVPA is an unincorporated association of local residents, property owners and friends dedicated to preserving the historic, visual and agricultural resources that enhance the semi-rural character of Montecito and the Eastern Montecito Valley. Our members understand private property rights, but also the responsibility to protect important historic resources that help define a community. They recognize that significant historic estates like Rancho San Carlos cannot simply be frozen in time; they must be allowed to evolve in response to changing circumstances, while protecting the elements and features that make up their historic significance. The nomination submitted by EVPA therefore does not propose that all future changes to the individual features of the Rancho San Carlos Estate be prohibited due to historic significance. Instead, EVPA proposes that, prior to any substantial change, subdivision or future development, the unified historic character of the Estate and the architectural importance of its individual elements be acknowledged and protected through preparation of an overall specific plan establishing guidelines and criteria for future development. EVPA’s nomination package calls on the County of Santa Barbara to protect the historic, architectural, visual and social significance of the Estate while allowing it to adapt to the challenges of its second century of existence.

Sincerely,

Mary Rose
For East Valley Preservation Association

Enclosures: Nomination Form
### PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE NOMINATED PROPERTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building/Feature</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
<th>Contributing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Main House</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Office</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Octagonal Barn</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Stables</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Arena</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Garage</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> Cottages:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage A</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage B</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage C</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> Cottages:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage E</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage for Cottage E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage F</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage G/H</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage for Cottage G/H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> Cottage I</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> Cottage J</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> Cottage K</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> Shop</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> Barn 1</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.</strong> Barn 2</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.</strong> Kennels</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Santa Barbara County Permit/Case Files for 95-RZ-003*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cottage I</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage J</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage K</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage L</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn 1</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn 2</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennels</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape features, including orchards, internal roads, stone walls, and formal gardens surrounding main house</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Building Dates from Santa Barbara County Permit/Case Files for 95-RZ-003

The expansive Rancho San Carlos Estate is located at 2500 East Valley Road (also known as State Highway 192) and 900 Romero Canyon Road, in Montecito, an unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County, California. The property consists of buildings and grounds, including (continued...).
formal and informal gardens, orchards, pasture land and natural habitats. The property is divided generally into quadrants, with the southeast quadrant devoted to equestrian uses, the northeast quadrant containing natural open space and some higher-elevation orchards, the southwest quadrant reserved for citrus orchards and the Main house located in the northwest quadrant away from the Estate entrances. In addition to the tightly-grouped equestrian buildings in the southeast quadrant, other clusters of buildings are arranged in nodes throughout the site. (Maps 1-2)

The Main house is very private, located at the end of a long drive through the orchards, just north of the center of the property. (Contemporary Photo 3 and Additional Contemporary Photo 6). The Main house is surrounded on three sides by orchards. It is quite some distance from East Valley Road and not visible from it, with dog kennels and a large garage immediately to the north. In addition to a servant’s wing in the Main house, staff housing (known as “cottages”) is located north and west of the Main house. Additional groupings of cottages lie to the south: in the equestrian area, near the main gate, and at the western edge of the property. A ranch office is sited slightly south of the Main house. Other buildings on the property include a gas station and shop, positioned just north of East Valley Road between the main and service gates. (Map 1)

With the exception of the formal garden associated with the Main house, ornamental plantings surrounding the various buildings are relatively informal, and take full advantage of the numerous oaks and other trees on the property. In several places, stones and boulders are used to create small retaining walls. Curbs, where present, appear to be granite. The road system was in place by 1928, and is well maintained.

1. Main house (Date of Construction 1931, Maps 5-6, Contemporary photos 4-11, Additional Contemporary Photos 3-9)

Exterior

Set on a plateau near the center of the property that affords views of both the Pacific Ocean and the mountains, the Reginald Johnson-designed Main house comprises approximately 29,483 square feet and over thirty rooms, arranged in an irregular, rambling, roughly rectangular plan around a central, enclosed courtyard. Additional courts, open on one or two sides, plus terraces and gardens, are accessed from the radiating wings of the central core of the building, demonstrating a sensitive approach to the topography of the site that maximizes views and cross-breezes. One and two stories in height, with a partial basement, the house is an elegant and subdued example of the Monterey Revival style, combining elements derived from both the Spanish Colonial and Georgian revivals. A complex front-and side-gabled roof, low-pitched and

---

1 The following description is based on referenced maps and contemporary photographs available to the public.
covered with flat terracotta tiles laid in a shingled pattern, caps the masonry structure. Ridgelines are marked by barrel tiles. Whitewashed, with a hint of the red brick peeking through the paint, the building is trimmed with wood and wrought iron detailing. Corners are subtly emphasized by the use of larger, sandstone masonry units that suggest quoining in their arrangement. Roof treatment includes a molded eave with dentil-like brackets in the overhang. Numerous red brick chimneys with corbeled caps rise above the roof. Windows are recessed, and are flat-headed, wood or steel-framed, multi-light, double casements in type, many adorned with wooden shutters held in place by wrought iron brackets. Lintels are suggested by courses of soldier bricks atop the recesses. Exterior lighting includes wrought iron and glass fixtures, both lanterns suspended on chains and attached sconces.

The primary elevation faces west and is accessed from the west via a large, rectangular, brick-paved entry court ringed by a stone wall. Beyond the wall, the court is open to the south, where gardens and orchards slope away from the house. On the north, the stone wall supports a berm, which is topped by an open court and a one-story wing set atop a natural terrace at the same height as the second story of the central wing of the house and housing the children’s rooms. Forming the eastern edge of the entry court, the primary elevation is one-story, side-gabled, and nearly symmetrical. A centered and recessed, three-bay porch is defined by paired posts and a wrought iron railing. The posts are detailed with recessed panels and molded caps and bases. Opening onto the central bay, the main entry is elaborately framed by fluted pilasters with embellished caps and a denticulate cornice. Stone quoins outline the opening, which is topped by a five-light transom. Rectangular and X-patterned paneling distinguishes the front door. Paired casement windows overlook the side bays of the porch. Larger, paired casement windows articulate one bay north of the porch and two bays south of the porch. A third bay on the south is located in the recessed, front-gabled, south wing. The façade of the two-story, front-gabled north wing is also slightly set back from the primary elevation and features an elongated, stone-framed, double-casement window that illuminates the main interior staircase.

The one-story south elevation is L-shaped, consisting of a long, side-gabled wing and a projecting, front-gabled wing at the east end (Contemporary PhotoMap 5). An elevated terrace, enclosed by a wrought iron railing, fills the open space of the “L.” Three pairs of French doors open from the living room onto the terrace, allowing for ocean views and breezes. Another terrace, accessed by an exterior staircase, is located east of the projecting leg of the “L.”

The east elevation overlooks a formal garden, which is encircled by a low stone wall and divided geometrically into parterres. This elevation is varied in design, with one-story sections on the south and across the center and a two-story service wing on the north, which projects eastward much of the depth of the garden (Contemporary PhotosMaps 5-6). An elevated terrace lines the south side of the service wing paralleling the garden. Roof configurations include front and side gables plus a small, hipped roof section. The architectural focal point of the east elevation is the front-gabled dining room, which features a pair of French doors opening onto an iron-railed
balcony. Other fenestration includes the double casement windows flanked by shutters that are evident elsewhere on the residence.

The north elevation is highly irregular, embracing the motor court at the east end and stepping towards the north in increments from east to west (Contemporary Photos 5-6). Paved in cobblestones, the L-shaped motor court is bounded by the two-story service wing on the south, storage rooms and a five-car garage on the north, and the two-story north wing on the west. Because of the sloped site, the motor court is depressed below ground level on the north. The slope allows the second story of the north wing to open onto a large lawn area at grade level. This wing is characterized by a side-gabled roof, several paired casement windows framed by shutters, and a small porch providing access from the master suite hallway. Extending northward at the west end of the north wing, the one-story guest wing and children’s wing are similarly fenestrated and topped by gabled and hipped roofs.

Interior

Interior spaces are generously proportioned, with multiple access points to the exterior courtyards, terraces, and gardens available from each wing. Nearly all corridors are single-loaded, facilitating access to the exterior and cross-ventilation.2 The central courtyard is the core of the floor plan. Spaces within each wing are functionally related, with public rooms including main gallery (corridor), ladies’ and gentlemen’s lounges, living room, library, and dining room, arranged west and south of the central courtyard. Service spaces occupy the east wing and the lower level of the north wing. The north wing extends east beyond the central courtyard (as previously described with the respect to the east elevation), with employee living quarters beyond the kitchens. The master suite, including bedroom, dressing (sitting) room, and his and her bathrooms, comprises the second story of the north wing and overlooks the central courtyard to the south and the lawn on the north. Perpendicular to the north wing, the guest wing incorporates two bedroom suites. Further to the west, the L-shaped children’s wing accommodates three bedrooms and a playroom. The basement contains a pub and badminton court. The main staircase is located in the northwest corner of the central core, with a secondary staircase connecting the service wing with the master suite.

The central courtyard is square in shape and characterized by hedge-rimmed planters, scattered palm trees, and flagstone-paved pathways. An octagonal water basin marks the center. Loggias edge the courtyard on the west and east. On the north, an exterior staircase leads up past the stone3-veneered lower story and brick upper level to a tower which rises over the northeast corner of the space and which contains a small studio (office) room beneath the cupola.

---

2 Prior to World War II and widespread use of air conditioning, it was common to site and design homes to take full advantage of cross-ventilation.
3 See Contemporary Photo 6, Additional Historic Photos 23-24 and 67-69.
attached second story balcony spans most of the south face of the north wing, a signature of the Monterey Revival style. Paired posts support the roof overhang that shades the balcony. The balcony is enclosed by an iron railing and supported beneath by brackets. Several pairs of shutter-framed, casement windows and French doors open onto the balcony.

Oak paneling and architectural features imported from England distinguish the public spaces. The stone-paved gallery is classical in detailing, with engaged, fluted, wood piers rising to a carved triglyph-and-metope frieze topped by an intricate crown molding. Entered via an octagonal foyer and set a few steps lower than the gallery, the grandly scaled living room is entirely paneled, with a denticulated cornice marking the transition to the plastered ceiling. Broken pediments top doorways. Elaborate fireplaces are centered on the north and east walls of the room. Beyond the living room, the library is also generously proportioned and paneled, lined with bookcases, and contains another fireplace. Three large, tiled murals depicting historical and equestrian themes grace the barrel-vaulted hallway that parallels the living room and library, leading to the dining room. The large dining room features murals, paneling, and another fireplace. A small card room creates a transition from the grand public rooms to the service wing.

The upper level is accessed via the main staircase located at the northwest corner of the central core. Wrought iron railings edge the stairs and landing. All the family and guest bedrooms on the upper level are generously sized and have individually designed ensuite bathrooms. Nearly all the bedrooms have fireplaces. The master suite is entered via double doors set into an arched opening; most other doorways are flat-headed. Doors are paneled. Floors throughout the house are hardwood. Additional interior detailing includes extensive but subdued use of moldings, wainscoting, and baseboards. Several spaces feature original wallpaper. Lighting fixtures, including sconces and chandeliers, also appear to be original.

In the basement, the pub features an imported wood bar within an arched recess, stone and quarry tile floors, and a beamed ceiling. Constructed during Prohibition, the pub is accessed by a door concealed in the paneling of a small hallway outside the living room.

The northeast service wing contains the large main kitchen and an equally sizeable preparation room, all with period cupboards and appliances and stainless steel countertops. Kitchen appliances have not been updated over time. Facilities for employees include several bedrooms, shared bathrooms, an employee dining room and lounge, and a self-contained employee apartment complete with fireplace. Laundry facilities are located in the lower level of the north wing.

---

4 As described below, Architecture editor Henry H. Saylor noted in his column dated July 3, 1931 that Reginald Johnson went to England to seek out old paneling. (Alison Clark “Reginald D. Johnson,” Johnson, Kaufmann, Coate: Partners in the California Style (Scripps College Capra Press, 1992), 18.)
The Main house is remarkably intact, with no apparent alterations to design, materials, or floor plan. Original finishes, fixtures, and furnishings are in situ.

2. Office (Date of construction: 1928; square feet: 1,590; Contemporary Photo 39)

The office is located down-slope and south of the Main house. Also reflecting the Monterey Revival style, the office has the appearance of a one-story, single-family residence. It is constructed of whitewashed red brick and topped by a low-pitched, side-gabled roof covered in barrel-shaped terracotta tiles. Windows are deeply recessed beneath wooden lintels and are primarily steel-framed, eight-over-eight double-hung sash on the north-facing façade. The entry is offset to the east in the asymmetrically composed design. A brick chimney, flush with the façade, rises above the roofline near the center of this elevation. Shaded by mature trees, with a paved parking area on the north, the office appears to be unaltered on the exterior.

3. Octagonal Barn (Date of construction: 1928; square feet: 3,215; Contemporary Photos 42-44)

One of the most remarkable buildings on the property, the Octagonal Barn is Spanish Colonial Revival in style, with stucco exterior walls and a tile roof. Brackets punctuate the eave lines. Not only is the Octagonal Barn notable for its architectural design by Reginald Johnson, it is also exceptionally functional. The barn consists of an outer shell containing horse stalls and an inner rotunda whose roof rises above that of the outer ring. The inner roof sits upon a drum that is banded by clerestory windows, three to each wall plane. A cupola surmounts the rotunda roof and is itself crowned by a weather vane in the shape of a polo player atop a horse. Facing west, the primary entry is via a front-gabled projection containing a large archway. Double wood doors attached by iron strap hinges and screen doors are set below a semicircular, wood spandrel. A second entry is on axis with the main entrance and faces the stable yard on the east. The outer walls are fenestrated with broad, tripartite windows which are composed of central, six-light hoppers flanked by two-light fixed windows and which are set high on the wall planes to accommodate horse stalls on the interior. Taller, multi-light windows face the stable yard. The clerestory windows are six-lights, with the center window of each group an operational hopper in type. Stalls and tack rooms are arranged around the periphery and are accessed by paneled and grilled sliding doors, opening onto the rotunda. The stalls feature walls of stained vertical wood paneling and wood floors. Hay storage is located above the stalls. Interior rotunda walls are painted vertical wood planks and the floor is covered with decomposed granite or a similar material. The roof superstructure is exposed, creating a lattice of radiating ribs that meet under an oculus below the cupola.

4. Wood/Stucco Barn (Stables) (Date of construction: 1928; square feet: 4,244; Contemporary photo 45, Additional Contemporary Photos 13-14)
East of the Octagonal Barn, the stable yard is enclosed by additional stalls housed in a one-story, gabled, squared “U”-shaped stable building with 11 stalls. Similarly designed in the Spanish Colonial Revival style by Reginald Johnson, these stables feature bracketed tile roofs, stucco walls, and symmetrical stable yard facades articulated by arched openings. The north wing is five bays wide, with a central, round-headed, screened doorway flanked by pairs of round-headed screened windows. On the east, a front gable caps the projecting central bay, which contains an archway leading to an open passageway. Blind arches with large, paneled wood doors are located to either side of the archway. It has been suggested that the Stables functioned as a foaling barn.

Both the Round Barn and the Stables appear to be substantially unaltered.

5. **Arena** (Date of construction: 1930; square feet: 11,250; Contemporary photo 50)

Linked to the Round Barn by a broad pathway lined by chain link-fenced paddocks (installed circa 1971), the Covered Arena is a large, rectangular structure with partially open sides. The barrel-vaulted wood roof is supported by exposed bowstring trusses. A series of stout wooden posts on concrete bases regularly spaced around the exterior perimeter of the arena carry the roof. The lower third of the sides of the arena are enclosed by a horizontal wood fence. The floor of the arena is covered in dirt or sand. The Covered Arena appears to be in original condition.

6. **Garage** (Date of construction: 1928; square feet: 1,420; No photo available)

Located north of the Main house in a copse, the Garage is a detached, one-story building accommodating multiple vehicles.

7. **Cottages A, B and C** (Date of construction: 1920-1928; square feet: 976-1715; Non-contributing)

These three cottages are located on a separate access drive from East Valley Road along the western boundary of the property. Although they were in existence and occupied during the period of significance, they pre-dated the Jacksons’ tenure and do not appear to have been constructed as part of the estate. They may have originally been constructed as part of the adjacent Featherhill Ranch, and they are not integrated into the design of the estate as envisioned by the Jacksons and their designers Reginald Johnson, Lockwood de Forest, Jr, and Ralph Stevens. Given their location adjacent to the Orchards and historical use as worker housing, these cottages were functionally integrated into the operation of the estate, even though they were not

---

5 Turner Schley, letter to Mr. Bob Scott, Zoning Administrator, Santa Barbara County Planning Department, February 3, 1971.
part of the Jacksons’ building program designed by Reginald Johnson and Lockwood de Forest, Jr.

8. Cottages E, F, G, H, I and J (Date of construction: 1928; square feet: 1,289-2,628, Additional Contemporary Photos 10-11)

These cottages, with associated garages, were among the earliest structures built after the Jacksons purchased the estate, concurrent with construction of the equestrian facilities. They were constructed to house estate workers. Except for Cottage J, they are clustered near East Valley Road, with access provided from a separate service gate east of the main entrance. Four of the cottages are located immediately adjacent to the equestrian facilities, and they may have housed the horse trainer and stable hands employed by the family. Aerial photographs of the property suggest that these cottages and garages are designed in the Spanish Colonial Revival style, with tiled, gabled roofs and stucco exterior walls.

9. Cottage L (Date of Construction: 1920; square feet: 1,680; Additional Contemporary Photo 12)

This L-shaped cottage sits slightly above the service road near the west gate from Romero Canyon Road. Although it pre-dated the Jacksons’ tenure, it appears to have functioned as a secondary gatehouse after the Jacksons occupied the site.

10. Shop and Gas Station (Date of Construction: 1928; square feet: 6,520; Contemporary photo 31)

The Shop and Gas Station are located just north of East Valley Road, between the main and service gates to the property. These functional buildings were among the first constructed as support structures for the estate. They were an integral part of the Jacksons’ vision of Rancho San Carlos as a self-sufficient agricultural operation and country estate. This vision for the estate is illustrated in the murals on the interior of the main house.

11. Landscape, Gardens and Orchards (Date of construction: circa 1927-1933)

Described in a Regionalist style by In keeping with landscape architect Lockwood de Forest, Jr. and Ralph Stevens, the landscape design emphasizes’ emphasis on “capturing views of the regional landscape through the elimination of the middle ground.” The property was laid out to enhance and create mountain, sea, and property vistas and to retain areas of native oaks

---

6 Census data from 1930 shows eight additional dwellings on the site, including a horse trainer Frank J. Holtzbauer.
7 This cottage may have been affected by the landslides of January 2018.
and vegetation. The agricultural and equestrian uses of the property are integrated into the
topography rather than imposed upon it, and the whole tied together by the network of stone-
and tree-lined internal roads. Orchards blend into the landscape without intervening fencing or
separation, interspersed with areas of native vegetation. Paddocks follow the natural contours
of the land. Ornamental landscaping is purposefully restricted to the areas immediately
adjacent to the residences, office, and octagonal barn. The formal gardens at the Main house
are defined geometrically, by box hedges in the central and entrance courts and by parterres in
the east garden. This “tension between wild and clipped foliage” is another de Forest
trademark. Ornamental trees are strategically placed to frame views and to accent the
buildings, courtyards, and terraces. Lawns In accordance with de Forest’s approach to
landscape design, lawns are limited to the terraces around the main house and cottages. The
plant palette combines native, tropical, and Mediterranean trees and shrubs. As evidenced by
historic photographs, the property as a whole, which despite its impressive size still reads as a
single, unified entity, retains an outstanding level of integrity.

---

9. PHYSICAL ALTERATIONS TO THE NOMINATED PROPERTY AND CURRENT HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY

With a period of significance ending in 1945, the subject property appears to have remained remarkably intact from 1927 to 1931, the dates between which the Jacksons purchased the majority of the property, designed the layout of the grounds, and constructed most of the buildings and the Main house, through today. Rancho San Carlos is a stunning survivor from the era of grand estate-building in Montecito that ended in 1945 with the conclusion of World War II, when estates began to be subdivided. It is the last remaining example of an intact property combining high-style architecture with an agricultural lifestyle, including the last extensive groves of citrus that were common to eastern Montecito dating back to 1880s.10

As detailed in the following “historical sketch”10, the Jacksons purchased a portion of the adjacent Feather Hill Ranch for additional orchards early in their tenure. Cottages A, B and C, are segregated from other buildings and appear to have been part of a building campaign for Feather Hill Ranch. As described above, while there have been some minor alterations to individual buildings, including recent neglect of the gardens and orchard visible from East Valley Road or aerials, there do not appear to have been alterations to the location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, or setting of most buildings on the property. As a result, the subject property retains a strong sense of time and place and is the last remaining great estate, consisting of a grand Main house and intact working orchards and agricultural lands in the Montecito area, and one of the few such estates remaining in Southern California.

10. DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT SETTING, INCLUDING ASSOCIATED
HISTORIC CULTURAL FEATURES

The Rancho San Carlos Estate is 237 acres, nestled in the foothills of a small coastal mountain
range, just south of the Santa Ynez Mountain range of the Los Padres National Forest. From
East Valley Road, views of the western half of the property are dominated by tidy rows of citrus
trees sloping gently to the north in the distance, historic stone walls, and a grand gated entry. The
eastern half of the property is largely shielded from close view by oak trees along East Valley
Road, but natural areas of vegetation on elevated slopes are plainly visible from Ortega Ridge
Road. Although the classic Reginald Johnson-designed Main house exceeds 29,000 square feet,
the general impression of the property is rural, agricultural, and human-scaled. Not only do the
buildings and structures on the site have historic and architectural significance, but so does the
cultural landscape consisting of large-scale orchards, natural areas, planted domestic gardens and
equestrian facilities designed on a grand scale. (Contemporary Photos 1-3.)

The topography of the site dictates the locations of agricultural, equestrian, and residential uses
within the property. The eastern third of the property, which contains a steep, narrow canyon
running north-south to the National Forest, is largely an uncultivated landscape of trees, riparian
vegetation and coastal sage scrub. The ravine of the canyon narrows as it extends to the south,
with an unnamed tributary to Picay Creek creating a natural separation between the planted
orchards to the west and a large equestrian facility in the southeast quadrant. The equestrian area
of the property features flat and gradually sloped open fields dotted with steel-and wood-railed
paddocks. A cluster of barns and a covered arena occupy a small hollow near the southeast
corner of the property. To the north of the arena, adjacent to the eastern edge of the property, a
low hill is encircled by a large, oval-shaped practice track. The track, which was used to train
polo ponies, was constructed as early as 1930 and is prominently visible in aerial photographs. (Historic Photo 2)

The western half of the property features relatively gradual topography and has been largely
dedicated to orchards for almost a century, as seen in historic aerial photographs (see Historic
Photos 1-5) as well as a painted mural within the Main House. The agricultural fields are
irrigated from three reservoirs located at the northwest corner of the site, fed by Romero Creek, a
naturally occurring water resource located outside the property boundaries to the north. The
orchards are concentrated in two areas, a narrow strip of land just east of the canyon ridgeline
and south of the three water reservoirs, and a larger grouping of fields that extend north and east

11 One notable feature of the Santa Ynez Mountains is that they are one of the only east-west mountain ranges in the
United States.

12 It is possible the track was slightly regraded after 1967 (see Map 2 and Historic Photo 5). However, based on
historic and contemporary aerial photographs, this change appears to be relatively minor.
of the boundaries to the center of the property. Almost half the property, or approximately 100 acres, is occupied by orchards, consisting of 60 acres of lemons, 30 acres of avocados, and five acres each of limes and oranges, with an additional grove of olive trees. The orchards were among the earliest features of the property, some pre-dating the Jacksons’ ownership, visible on historic aerial photographs.

The southern boundary of the property is delineated by State Highway 192, which was originally part of State Route 150. The road was signed in 1934 and renumbered in 1964. The Montecito Community Plan adopted in 1992 (updated 1995), recognizes the scenic and historic nature of this roadway, and calls for designating East Valley Road as a State Scenic Highway as part of its implementation plan.13

The property is surrounded by stone fencing along the north edge of East Valley Road. There are two vehicular entrances on East Valley Road, a highly visible main entrance with decorative wrought iron gates and a handful of oddly-positioned palm trees located just east of the intersection with Ortega Ranch Road (see Contemporary Photo 2, Additional Historic Drawing 1, and Additional Historic Photo 31). A second gated service area is located slightly to the west, largely hidden by vegetation. A third entrance gives access from Romero Canyon Road, but appears to have been constructed at a different time and is not well integrated into the internal circulation pattern of the property.14,15

Circulation patterns follow roughly the north-south orientation of the site, linking various buildings and improvements. Paved roads extend from each of the entrance gates through the property, forming a loop, with a branch to a secondary gate to Romero Canyon Road on the west. Roughly paralleling East Valley Road, another roadway links the two north-south arteries and the equestrian facilities. Additional unpaved roads service the orchards. Cut sandstone gates mark the entrances to the property as well as the entrance to the Main house (see Contemporary Photo 3, Additional Contemporary Photo 6, and Additional Historic Photos 37-38). Sandstone is a significant local material of some of the larger estates that was used to evoke a sense of permanence.16

Noted landscape architect Lockwood de Forest, Jr. is credited with designing a portion of the
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13 Montecito Community Plan, p.23; Action VIS-M-1.3.1 p. 124. See also Figure 37, Visual Resources from the "Final Environmental Impact Report, Phase II of the Montecito Community Plan Update," prepared by the County of Santa Barbara and Envicom Corporation, June 1992.
14 This third entrance may have been damaged in the debris flow of January 2018.
15 The Jacksons hired local stonemason “luminaries” Joe Buzzella and the Arnoldi brothers to build both walls and buildings. Existing stone walls appear to date from an early period. (Santa Barbara Conservancy, Images of America: Stone Architecture in Santa Barbara (San Francisco: Arcadia Publishing, 2009), 103.)
Rancho San Carlos grounds and gardens, along with Ralph Stevens and Florence Yoch. With the exception of the formal garden associated with the Main house, ornamental plantings surrounding the various buildings are relatively informal, and take full advantage of the numerous oaks and other trees on the property. In several places, stones and boulders are used to create small retaining walls. Curbs, where present, appear to be granite. The internal road system was in place by 1928, and is well maintained.

---


18 Ralph Steven’s participation was suggested by Mrs. Palmer Jackson, Ann Jackson’s daughter-in-law.

19 Photographs and records of Florence Yoch’s contributions to the landscape are available at the Huntington Library - Jackson, Charles H., Jr. house (“Rancho San Carlos”), Montecito. In the Lockwood de Forest, Jr. landscape drawings, Architecture & Design Collection, Art, Design & Architecture Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara. Also: Phase 1-2 Historic Resources Survey prepared for the Montecito Fire Protection District by historian Roland L. Nye, Ph.D., in 2016.
11. BRIEF HISTORY OF THE NOMINATED PROPERTY

Montecito Estates

Development of Montecito paralleled growth of Santa Barbara, located adjacent to the east. As a residential community adjacent to Santa Barbara, settlement began in Montecito in the late 1800s. Santa Barbara’s real estate boom of the late 1800s was the result of construction of Stearns Wharf in 1872 and arrival of the Southern Pacific Railroad from Los Angeles in 1887. Dependable transportation allowed for a “reliable and convenient transportation link to Los Angeles” which established Santa Barbara “as the premier destination for wealthy families from the East Coast, Midwest, and Europe, especially in the winter.”

To meet demand, the Upham Hotel opened in 1871 and the Arlington Hotel opened in 1875. The Arlington Hotel was rebuilt in 1902 as a resort hotel, catering to a wealthier clientele. The Potter Hotel, another resort hotel, also opened in 1902. Some wealthy tourists decided to purchase land and construct winter homes for themselves while maintaining their eastern homes as their permanent addresses. In Montecito, these homes took the form of grand estates for “gentleman farmers” on large tracts of land.

Montecito was originally a part of the Santa Barbara Pueblo lands with tourism and agriculture as early industries. Montecito Hot Springs Hotel (1873, destroyed by fire in 1920) was built near the largest natural hot springs and catered to tourists taking in the curative waters. Montecito also attracted horticulturists who had heard about the legendary “Big Grapevine” or “La Parra Grande,” which was said to be 14-inches in diameter and was put on display at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition in 1876.

Because of the fertile soil cultivated by the early

---

horticulturalists, tourists thought they had found a “rustic ‘Eden’” in Montecito. As David Myrick noted in *Montecito & Santa Barbara: From Farms to Estates*, “Even today [1987], part of the ambience of Montecito stems from considerable acreage dedicated to agricultural use as pasture or avocado and citrus orchards.”

Large estates of wealthy Montecito residents were a final expression of the Gilded Age. On the East Coast, the Gilded Age got its name from the liberal application of gold leaf throughout mansions on Manhattan’s 5th Avenue and “cottages” of Newport, Rhode Island. While some historians date the “Gilded Age” as the period of the 1870s to 1900, others extend it to the onset of World War I in 1917. This was a period of rapid economic growth and increasing industrialization. Documented in novels by writers such as Mark Twain and Edith Wharton, this period was characterized by a large divide of income disparity. Montecito estates were financed by inherited fortunes amassed by “industrialists” and “capitalists” of the Gilded Age. Specifically, although built after World War I, Rancho San Carlos was envisioned, purchased, and created by the heir of Anthony N. Brady, an Albany, New York “capitalist” who exemplified the Gilded Age. Locales similar to Montecito that served as playgrounds for the super-rich during this period included Pasadena, California as well as Sarasota and Palm Beach, Florida. For many heirs of large fortunes, maintenance on large estates became too costly during the Depression, and increasingly so after World War II. Rancho San Carlos is unique in that the estate has remained in the same family for the past 90 years and has not been subdivided into smaller lots, distinguishing it from most of the other large estates in Montecito, as well as regionally throughout Santa Barbara County.

In 1920, John Reginald Southworth wrote: “In this colony live many people of national and international repute …; social leaders known in all the capitals of the world; retired millionaires and famous professional leaders who have all searched the world over for a perfect spot to dwell in and have chosen Montecito as the realization of their dreams.” Some of the more recognizable East Coast and Midwestern family estates included those of the McCormick family, who inherited from Chicago native Cyrus Hall McCormick, inventor of the farm reaper; the Clark family, who inherited from William Andrews Clark, Sr., owner of mines in Montana; and the Fleischmann family, whose fortune derived from a highly successful yeast business. The estates encompassed many acres of land and included a large, typically architect-designed Main

25 Florida high society was photographed by one of their own, Ellen Glendinning Frazer Ordway, who took her camera to luncheons and parties beginning in the 1920s. Many of her photographs are available on the website “New York Social Diary.” (see http://www.newyorksocialdiary.com/social-history/2011/philadelphia-in-palm-beach-part-i/).
house and often formal gardens, orchards, and guest cottages. John Reginald Southworth described Montecito as “home of many wealthy eastern people, whose attractive, and in many instances, magnificent residences are found in all parts of the valley. These homes are often surrounded by a treasure of flowers and shrubs, making the whole neighborhood a delightful place to live.”

One of the earliest estates, “Mira Vista,” was constructed beginning in 1893. It “was the unchallenged show place in Montecito and was included in any tour for visiting dignitaries.”

The house and gardens “marked the beginning of the transition from an agricultural area to a rural residential community with great estates.”

By the 1920s, Montecito had become synonymous with millionaire socialites whose “whole lives revolved around polo, parties, tennis and country clubs.” Murals in the barrel-vaulted hallway in the Main house of Rancho San Carlos depict some of these themes. The three primary panels of the hand-painted tile murals identify the polo fields of the United States, the location of Rancho San Carlos proximate to Santa Barbara, and the land holdings of the estate. Smaller panels painted in a faux bas relief below each of the three main panels depict other leisure activities, including dog breeding and lounging on a beach.

Given the climate, there was a predilection for outdoor entertaining and many estates had elaborate, designed landscapes expressly for this purpose. At Rancho San Carlos, while terraces line the south and east elevations of the Main house, overlooking the orchards to the south and a formal, designed landscape to the east, the focus of activities was likely the equestrian facilities. Although Montecito continues to be synonymous with millionaire socialites, the large estates began to be sold and subdivided after World War II. Rancho San Carlos is one of the last intact Montecito estates representing the lifestyle of the very rich at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Rancho San Carlos and the Jacksons

In 1937, Rancho San Carlos was one of the largest estates in Montecito. In terms of size, Rancho San Carlos was rivaled only by the Ortega Ranch and Las Fuentes Rancho in Montecito, neither of which could boast an architecturally remarkable house in combination with planned landscapes, historic orchards, and equestrian facilities. Today, Rancho San Carlos continues to be one of the largest, intact estates in Montecito, incorporating both a lavish Main house, working orchards, and equestrian facilities. Rancho San Carlos is comparable today to only a

29 Myrick, 235.
31 20 Myrick, back end paper.
few other, although much smaller, intact estates in Montecito and Santa Barbara, including Bellosguardo, the Santa Barbara estate of Huguette Clark, daughter of mining baron William Andrew Clark; Lotusland, which is best known for its lavishly designed landscapes of Madame Ganna Walska; and Casa del Herrero, the estate of George Fox Steedman, a St. Louis native whose family amassed wealth in a foundry and machine shop. Like Rancho San Carlos, the Main houses at both Bellosguardo and Lotusland were designed by prominent architect Reginald Johnson. Also like Rancho San Carlos, both Casa del Herrero and Lotusland feature landscape design contributions by Lockwood de Forest, Jr. and Ralph Stevens. However, all three estates pale in comparison to the sizein number of Rancho San Carlos, and lack its integrated agricultural and equestrian facilities.

In 1927, newlyweds Charles Harvey and Marcia Ann Gavit Jackson purchased San Carlos Rancho from Mary and William Yule. The Yules had received the property from Mary’s parents, Charles B. and Mary Raymond twelve years earlier, who had purchased the property from the estate of Mrs. Alice McCurdy Hart. The earliest available aerial photograph from 1928 shows a few buildings on the estate shortly after the Jacksons took title to the property. Specifically, the aerial photograph clearly shows an octagonal barn at its current location near East Valley Road; there were also orchards and reservoirs. Several other buildings appear to be extant north and west of the octagonal barn, as well as close to the entrance gate at 2500 East Valley Road. Given the building campaign that took place in 1928, it is likely cottages evident in the aerial photograph are the same as the existing ones as they are located in the same place. The 1928 aerial photograph also reveals that when the Jacksons purchased Rancho San Carlos, it was already a working ranch with extensive orchards and buildings that had been constructed by previous owners.

In addition to the Main house designed by prominent architect Reginald Johnson and gardens designed by equally prominent landscape architect Lockwood de Forest, Jr. Ralph Stevens, and Florence Yoch, the estate consists of 21 other buildings, as well as working citrus and avocado orchards and reservoirs. Real estate promotional materials cite Reginald Johnson as architect of many of the cottages and equestrian facilities. It is not known where the Jacksons lived between 1927, when they purchased the property, and 1931, when the Main house was completed, although the 1930 U.S. Census notes they were living on the property. A Main house where the Yules lived is not visible in the 1928 aerial photograph. Nevertheless, it is probable that the Jacksons also resided there prior to the Johnson-designed Main house being completed in

---

32 Myrick, 402.
33 It is not known where, or even if, drawings and correspondence relating to construction of most of Rancho San Carlos are located. There are two main repositories of Reginald Johnson’s papers: the Reginald Johnson papers, Architecture and Design Collection, Art, Design and Architecture Museum, University California Santa Barbara, and the Reginald D. Johnson Collection, Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, Architecture Collections. With the exception of the two blueprints of the stable for C. H. Jackson, dated 1927, located in the UCSB collections, these archives do not include this property.
1931. Likely in the mid-1930s, the Jacksons purchased a portion of the adjacent Feather Hill Ranch from Christian R. Holmes, who was related to the Fleischmann family, bringing the total acreage of Rancho San Carlos to approximately 237 acres. Several cottages were extant at Feather Hill Ranch that were incorporated into Rancho San Carlos and continued to be used through the period of significance.

Charles Harvey “Pete” Jackson, Jr. (1898-1978) and Marcia Ann Gavit (1906-1990), both originally from Albany, NY but living in Santa Barbara when they met, announced their engagement in 1926 and married later that year on September 7 at All Saints Church in Santa Barbara. According to the engagement announcement, Mrs. Jackson and Marcia Ann Gavit’s step-mother, Marie Gavit, were close friends. At the time of his engagement, Pete Jackson was the head of the bond department of the Bank of Italy in Santa Barbara. He had been educated at Eastern preparatory schools and attended the University of California to study agriculture. By 1930, Pete Jackson had retired from Bank of Italy and was listed in the U.S. census that year as the owner of a ranch, following the line of work he had pursued in college. Headlines of the wedding announcements also noted that Pete Jackson was the grandnephew of President Chester A. Arthur.

Marcia Ann Gavit, later known as Ann Jackson, was the subject of much controversy in her youth. Born in 1906, Marcia Ann Gavit was the only child of Erastus Palmer and Flora Myers Brady Gavit. When she was only five years old, her mother was killed in a tragic train accident in Westport, Connecticut. An article appearing in The Pittsburg Press in July 1914 entitled “The Richest Little Rich Girl” reported on Marcia Ann Gavit’s income of $3,500 a day, making her the wealthiest girl in the United States with an estate of approximately $14,000,000 inherited from her grandfather Anthony N. Brady after his death in 1913. Her father, according to the will,
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34 Barnaby Conrad and Marc Muench, Santa Barbara, (Graphic Arts Books, 2004), 52. Christian Holmes purchased Feather Hill Ranch in 1920 and collected exotic birds and wild animals. In 1932, a tiger got loose from his cage and killed his young son.
35 Myrick, 275.
36 “Albany’s Richest Girl to be a Bride,” Watertown Daily Times, June 16, 1926.
37 “Wealthy Albany Girl to Marry California Man,” New Castle News, June 30, 1926. Established in 1904 by Amadeo Peter Giannini (1870-1949) in the North Beach neighborhood of San Francisco, Bank of Italy became the largest commercial bank in the world by serving members of the community such as the working class, immigrant populations, and small businesses that had not previously had access to financial institutions. Bank of Italy became known as where “the little fellow was welcomed and respected, given the same service as the big fellow, and granted financial aid on easy terms.” In 1909, Bank of Italy opened a branch in San Jose, its first outside of San Francisco, by purchasing a small, struggling bank. This pattern of opening bank branches repeated in other cities. By the end of 1918, Bank of Italy had 24 branches throughout California and total resources of more than $93 million. In the 1920s, Giannini formed holding companies, the largest of which was Transamerica Company and the name of the umbrella organization changed to Bank of America in 1930. (Ralph J. Christian, Historic Landmarks Project, “Bank of Italy Building,” National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form, June 1977.)
38 Myrick, 275.
39 Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Santa Barbara County, Enumeration District 42-2, Sheet 19A.
would receive half of the $3,500 a day allowance not spent on Marcia Ann when she reached maturity. Anthony Brady made his fortune in numerous business interests, serving as a major stockholder in over fifty corporations, including transportation systems in several East Coast cities, utilities, and tobacco. By 1900, he was one of the 100 wealthiest men in the United States. Inheriting one sixth of the Brady estate, her fortune was controlled by her uncles, Nicholas F. and James C. Brady, as trustees. “The expenses of bringing up the child are paid from the income, and one-half the remainder goes to the father.”

Marcia Ann Gavit’s father, E. Palmer Gavit, remarried Marie Turner Cooke of Colorado Springs, who was divorced from Edward Marsden Cooke. In 1914, E. Palmer Gavit and his new wife planned to move to Denver. However, Marcia Ann’s grandmother, Mrs. Anthony Brady, did not want her to move and filed a temporary injunction restraining E. Palmer Gavit from removing his daughter from New York state, putting a very personal matter into the public eye. Once the family feud was resolved, E. Palmer and Marie Gavit purchased Cuesta Linda in Montecito in 1916, approximately five miles from Rancho San Carlos. Beginning in 1919, Reginald Johnson designed the Mediterranean Revival style Main house at Cuesta Linda, which was completed in 1920. In 1925, the Gavits hired prominent Santa Barbara architect, George Washington Smith, to construct a perimeter wall, pavilion, stable, swimming pool, bathhouse, and several other buildings. The Gavits hosted many visitors, including Presidential candidate Herbert Hoover in 1928. The 37-acre property was later purchased by Madame Walska and renamed Lotusland. While living in Albany, Marcia Ann Gavit had been educated by private tutors, but attended school in Montecito and graduated from the private Santa Barbara Girls School in June 1926.

In 1928, Pete Jackson, Jr. joined ten other trustees to found the prestigious Valley Club, along with Dwight Murphy, Kirk B. Johnson, Francis Price, James B. Canby, and Harold Chase of Santa Barbara. Other trustees included C.B. Raymond (a prior owner of Rancho San Carlos), Max C. Fleischmann, and Jackson’s father-in-law, E. Palmer Gavit. Memberships in the exclusive club were limited to 225, with an individual initiation fee of $2,000. By the middle of August 1928, 80% of the membership goal was reached, and in 1928, the Valley Club acquired the land on both sides of Sheffield Road. In August of 1929, a year later, Max Fleischmann was
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44 Supreme Court of the United States, Irwin, Former Collector of Internal Revenue, v. Gavit, Argued April 15, 1925, Decided April 27, 1925.
51 “Daily Round of Society,” The Morning Press (Santa Barbara, CA), September 5, 1926.
elected President of the club and E. Palmer Gavit was elected one of the vice-presidents. The club officially opened on December 29, 1929, two months after the disastrous 1929 stock market crash.

By the 1930 U.S. Census, the Jacksons were living at Rancho San Carlos with their daughter, Flora, and infant son Palmer G., who was born earlier that year, along with 14 servants. As the Main house was not completed until 1931, it is unclear where the Jackson family was residing on the property. An aerial photograph from 1938 clearly shows the Main house, main office, and arena. By the 1940 census, the Jacksons had another son, Peter. The census records show Pete Jackson had retired as a banker and was now the owner of a ranch and Ann Jackson was listed as a “housewife.” In addition to the Jackson family, five maids lived in the Main house, while others living on the property included a manager, a trainer for the polo horses, a butler and an additional maid, chauffeur, housekeeper, horsemanship, foreman, and a gardener. Perhaps due to her young experiences or to security concerns, the Jacksons shunned publicity and led a relatively private life. There are very few newspaper articles describing their social activities. One of their few guests noted in the society pages of the *Los Angeles Times* was the novelist Charles Agnew Chamberlain, who visited the Jacksons shortly after his return from China in 1937. The Jacksons had a security system in the basement, reportedly manned 24 hours a day, possibly in response to the kidnapping of the Lindbergh baby in 1932. In addition to Rancho San Carlos, the Jacksons also owned Silver Creek Ranch in Elko County, Nevada, where they would visit for winter skiing, and the Alisal Guest Ranch near Solvang, CA. Based on their other properties; it appears the Jacksons traveled frequently.

The Alisal Ranch was purchased by Pete Jackson in 1943, and he quickly transformed the working cattle ranch into a resort. On July 16, 1946, the Alisal Guest Ranch opened for the summer season with a maximum capacity of 30 guests. Today, the Jackson family still owns the private guest ranch, which includes a private 18-hole golf club and private tennis club. During the 1970s and 1980s, the Jackson family developed a unique residential component of the property, which includes 63 homes on 75-year land leases that provide quarterly or yearly payments while allowing the Jacksons to retain ownership of the intact ranch land.

In 1958, Pete Jackson turned to real estate development, purchasing the 46-acre Bonnymede
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52 Myrick, 226.
53 Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Santa Barbara County, Enumeration District 42-2, Sheet 19A.
54 Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940, Santa Barbara County, Enumeration District 42-1, Sheet 5B.
estate near the present day Santa Barbara Biltmore for $1.2 million with two friends from San Mateo. The main house was demolished and the western portion was given over to two condominium developments. Bonnymede was opened in 1965-66 and was followed by Montecito Shores nine years later.59

Like many large estates with palatial homes in Montecito, as well as other enclaves of the wealthy during the Gilded Age, the lifestyle was made possible by a staff of servants. The Main house at Rancho San Carlos has clear distinctions between public and private space, with the north and much of the east wings devoted to private space inhabited by servants, and the south and west wings the purview of the Jackson family. Servants had separate corridors and stairways so that they could more discreetly go about their work. Seven bedrooms are provided for staff within the Main house, with eleven other cottages on the property that were rented out to staff.

There is a complicated relationship with domestic service in the United States as it is often linked with the history of African slaves and European indentured servants. It is no surprise, then, that many domestic servants in wealthy households were immigrants from England, where there had been a long tradition of service and where the profession did not have the same connotations. For the affluent employers, the number of servants was often a status symbol, and European employees were more desirable as they were more accepting of the lifestyle and better trained. Interestingly, the demand for domestic service peaked in the late nineteenth century at the same time the industrial revolution was creating a rising middle class, thereby diminishing the pool of potential servants.60

Servants at Rancho San Carlos followed the national trend of hiring European servants. In 1930, there were fourteen additional staff living at Rancho San Carlos, some with their families who were not in service. In-house servants included a Swedish cook, a German nurse, a French lady’s maid, and an Italian butler. Those working outside the house and renting a cottage on the grounds tended to be American-born, with the exception of the Dutch dairyman. Rents for the eight cottages ranged from $20 (for the dairyman) to $100 (for the horse trainer).61 In 1940, there was only five in-house staff, four of whom were European-born. Eleven additional staff

59 Myrick, 416.
60 Scholarly research into domestic servants includes The Domesticated Americans by Russell Lynes (1957); The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Servant by Pamela Horn (1975); Americans and Their Servants: Domestic Service in the United States from 1800 to 1920 by Daniel E. Sutherland (1981). The Preservation Society of Newport County has done quite a bit of research into domestic servants at the summer “cottages” in Newport, Rhode Island, including “Servant Life at the Breakers; A Room with a View” by Holly Collins in 2001 (see http://www.newportmansions.org/documents/servant_life_at_the_breakers.pdf), and an oral history project, "Keeping House." The National Park Service also created a lesson plan around servant life at the National Register-listed estate Brucemore in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, owned by the National Trust for Historic Preservation (see http://www.nps.gov/nr/twhp/www/lps/lessons/105brucemore/105brucemore.htm).
61 Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Santa Barbara County, Enumeration District 42-2, Sheet 19A.
lived outside the Main house in six cottages, where monthly rent ranged from $15 to $40. Of those living outside the Main house, only the English butler was not American-born.

Pete and Ann Jackson shared a love of horses and polo, which may have induced them to purchase Rancho San Carlos to pursue their passion. In addition to the large tract of land, incomparable views, and available water, the still-extant octagonal barn and training track were some of the first improvements the couple undertook, even before construction of the Main house. As early as 1930, the Jacksons hired a horse trainer, Frank J. Holtzbauer, who rented a cottage on the property. Along with the octagonal barn, there are additional stables immediately to the east that lead to an arena for exercising the horses. It is reported that up to 30 horses at a time were bred at the property. The large stalls of the stables to the east of the octagonal barn are said to have been used as a foaling barn and a room in the Main house was devoted to horse ribbons and trophies. Horses were kept and raised on the property until Ann Jackson’s death in 1990.

Both Pete and Ann Jackson were on polo teams at the Santa Barbara Polo Club. In 1932, Pete Jackson played in a polo tournament at Santa Barbara Polo Club for the Santa Barbara Greens, and the following year, the “poloist and sportsman” was elected president of Santa Barbara County Polo Association. Ann Jackson was a prominent woman polo player at a time when polo playing was only beginning to be acceptable for women, and she devoted herself to playing and developing the sport for women. Polo games took her throughout California and across the United States. In 1935, Ann Jackson was the captain of the newly organized women’s polo team at the Santa Barbara Polo Club. She traveled extensively with the team, including to the East Coast in 1937. She was one of the players who competed with the Santa Barbara team in the first US Women’s Open Championship in 1937. She was also one of the main supporters of the West Coast Women’s Polo Association, which organized in 1934, becoming the United States Women’s Polo Association two years later. Ann Jackson purchased the Santa Barbara Polo Club in 1941, although polo playing was suspended a year later during World War II.
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62 Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940, Santa Barbara County, Enumeration District 42-1, Sheet 5B.
63 Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Santa Barbara County, Enumeration District 42-2, Sheet 19A.
66 “Jackson Elected to Head Santa Barbara Polo Club,” Los Angeles Times, June 24, 1933, A10.
70 Colleen McInerney Meagher, Comin’ Thru: The Golden Age of Women's Polo 1934-1941, (M.T. Publishing Company, Inc.).
71 “A Century of Polo in Santa Barbara,” Polo Players’ Edition, October 2011, 63. Little information could be found on Ann Jackson’s ownership of the Santa Barbara Polo Club; the Santa Barbara Polo Club’s website does not
Perhaps because of the expense involved, polo is a sport associated with wealth and has become “synonymous with European royalty.” Perpetuation of this image is reinforced by a famous stone tablet next to a polo ground in Gilgit, Pakistan that reads: “Let other people play at other things. The king of games is still the game of kings.” In the United States, polo has generally been the domain of the wealthy, leisured class. The sport of polo arrived in England via India in the mid-1800s and was billed as “Hockey on Horseback.” James Gordon Bennett brought the sport to America in 1876. Founded in New York City in 1890, the Polo Association standardized rules, set pony size limits, and established material of balls. Polo was played at the Olympics between 1900 and 1936. By the 1910s, the epicenter of polo in the United States was at Long Island’s Meadowbrook Polo Club. California joined the Polo Association in 1909 under the California Polo Pony and Racing Association. The sport was also adopted by some Hollywood luminaries, including Spencer Tracy, Walt Disney, and Will Rogers, the latter building a polo field on his Pacific Palisades estate. The 1930s are considered the “Golden Age” of polo, when it reached its height of popularity. Possibly due to the military’s reliance on horses until World War II, the game was played by those in the armed forces “in order to obtain poise in the saddle.” Polo playing in the United States declined after World War II.

The Main house also displayed ribbons and trophies for the show dogs that Ann Jackson bred in the kennels north of the Main house, specifically Kerry Blue Terriers and English Springer Spaniels. The Jackson facility was regarded as a “major” kennel and known as Blue Leader Kennels; dogs raised at the property were entered into shows throughout the country. Among their best known dogs was an English Springer Spaniel named Ch. Norman of Hamsey, who won many awards in the 1930s and 1940s, including first in its breed and best sports dog in the prestigious Westminster Kennel Club show in 1932. They also housed the first Kerry Blue Terrier to win Best in Show in an American all-breed show, Leinster Leader. Ann Jackson also served as president of the Santa Barbara Kennel Club in the mid-1930s and in the 1950s, the Jacksons sponsored a trophy in their name at the Santa Barbara Kennel Club for the mention it, although several other articles do. It is not known how long she owned it or when she sold it. However, as she purchased the club in 1941, she held the property during a wartime suspension of polo, that started in 1942, when the club was used to station and train soldiers, and extended until 1946. Ann Jackson may have owned the Santa Barbara Polo Club until the early 1960s. (Santa Barbara Polo Club, “About Us: Club History,” <http://www.sbpolo.com/Default.aspx?p=dynamicmodule&pageid=394312&ssid=316538&vnf=1>.)

74 http://www.aramcoworld.com/issue/201304/polo.game.of.kings.htm#stash
first terrier group.\textsuperscript{79}

Pete and Ann Jackson purchased Rancho San Carlos shortly after their marriage as a young couple, constructed their dream house, and pursued their passions there together until their deaths in 1978 and 1990, respectively. After Pete’s death, Ann Jackson established the Ann Jackson Family Foundation, which offers grants to non-profits in Santa Barbara County and has become one of the most important foundations for local philanthropy.\textsuperscript{80}

\textbf{Reginald Johnson}

\textbf{Reginald Johnson’s work at Rancho San Carlos dates from at least to 1928, when he drew plans for the office at the estate. Although the Jackson house was never published, perhaps in response to the clients’ concerns for privacy and security, the Jackson office did appear in print (“Office for Mr. C. H. Jackson, Jr., on the Rancho San Carlos near Montecito” in \textit{California Arts and Architecture} 37, May 1930). Given the dates and style of many of the cottages, it is likely they were designed by Johnson as part of the same building campaign as the major structures including the Main house.}

Reginald Johnson (1882-1952) was a master architect, respected and admired by his peers and clients, whose buildings and designs have withstood the test of time. Elected a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects (F.A.I.A.) in 1926, Johnson was the recipient of several architectural awards in his life; his work was extensively published in both the professional and popular press; and several young architects who later achieved prominence in the field apprenticed in his office.\textsuperscript{81} From his base in Pasadena, California, Johnson practiced architecture for four decades, mostly in the Los Angeles/Pasadena and Santa Barbara/Montecito areas. While the first half of his career was notable for its commissions from the more established and well-to-do segments of society, the last two decades saw Johnson shift his focus to affordable and mass housing projects. Rancho San Carlos represents the pinnacle of the first and highly influential period of Johnson’s architectural career.

Born in 1882 in Westchester, New York, Johnson came from a privileged background. When he was a child, his father was appointed Episcopal Bishop of the Southern California Diocese and the family moved to Pasadena. Johnson returned to the east coast for his education, attending the Morristown School in New Jersey, obtaining an A. B. from Williams College in 1907, and graduating from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology with a B. S. in

\textsuperscript{79} “Channel City Prepares for All-Breed Dog Show,” Los Angeles Times, July 19, 1953, C5.
\textsuperscript{80} The Ann Jackson Family Foundation was the subject of a United States Court of Appeals case, involving how a loan to the foundation should be taxed.
\textsuperscript{81} A veritable “Who’s who” of architecture in Southern California passed through his office, including Roland Coate, Robert Alexander, Fitch Haskell, Lawrence Test, David Ogilvie, Paul Williams, Palmer Sabin, Edgar Maybury, and George Vernon Russell, among many others.
architecture in 1910. In 1907-1908 he apprenticed in the Pasadena office of respected architects Myron Hunt and Elmer Grey. Following graduation from M.I.T., he gained additional experience in the Los Angeles office of architect Robert Farquhar. Johnson began his own architectural practice in 1912, and, buoyed by his family contacts, was a success from the outset. Over the next decade, Johnson’s many commissions were primarily large homes for the wealthy in and around Pasadena. His first major work in the Santa Barbara area, where he also found favor, was “Mira Flores,” a residence for J. Percival Jefferson in Montecito (1915). Johnson’s homes reflected the eclectic taste of the period, but always with his particular blend of architectural restraint and sensitivity towards the relationship of building to site. By 1920, Johnson was one of the leading architects of the region. That year, Mira Flores was awarded an A.I.A. Gold Medal as one of the outstanding residential designs in the nation, the first time a Southern California project had received that honor.82

The 1920s were a highly productive period for Johnson. From 1922 until the end of 1924, Johnson operated within a loosely structured partnership with Gordon Kaufmann and Roland Coate, two equally skilled architects. Johnson, in combination with Kaufmann and Coate, and subsequently, as an independent practitioner, designed dozens of homes, as well as churches, hospitals, schools, commercial buildings, and clubhouses during this period.

The 1925 Santa Barbara earthquake nearly leveled the commercial district in Santa Barbara along State Street. Prior to the earthquake, Santa Barbara’s downtown commercial core featured mostly Victorian-era brick-faced buildings. In the years immediately prior to the earthquake, the City had hired Bertram Goodhue to plan a new commercial streetscape of “Hispanic” design. As noted below, Bertram Goodhue had gained fame for his work at the 1915 Pan Pacific Exposition in San Diego, which popularized Spanish Colonial Revival style. Leveling of the commercial district allowed for the downtown commercial core to rebuild based on the Goodhue plan, and the City of Santa Barbara established its first Architectural Review Board to enforce the uniform architectural and stylistic program of “Spanish type” buildings.83

Coinciding with these events, a commission for which Johnson received national attention as well as an award from the Architectural League of New York (1928) was the Santa Barbara Biltmore Hotel (hotel, 1926, and cottages, 1927). Completed within two years of the earthquake, the hotel complex showcased many of Johnson’s signatures including a floor plan organized around a courtyard and a fluid, yet tasteful, interpretation of the Spanish Colonial Revival style,

83 Herb Andree, Noel Young & Patricia Halloran, Santa Barbara Architecture: From Spanish Colonial to Modern, (Santa Barbara: Capra Press, 1995), 9
or “Spanish” style, as required by the newly established Architectural Review Board. By this time, Johnson’s practice was nearly as busy with projects in Santa Barbara County as with ones in Los Angeles County. Many of his Santa Barbara projects were designed in a “Mediterranean” style, which loosely borrowed from Spanish Colonial Revival and Italian Revival styles, among other styles. Johnson was one of several architects who worked with Harold S. Chase on the development of Hope Ranch, winning another A.I.A. award for “Las Terrasas” in 1927. Johnson’s last major commission in the county was the Santa Barbara Post Office (1936).

The 1890s – 1930s was a period in which historic eclecticism was the dominant mode of architectural expression. A discussion of what historic eclecticism was most suited to California architecture in general and domestic architecture specifically was the subject of lively discussions, to which Reginald Johnson contributed through his architectural designs. Education of high style architects in the late nineteenth century shifted from training as apprentices to attendance at the École de Beaux Arts in Paris. This academic training resulted in more faithful representations of historical styles. Use of historic eclectic styles reached broad attention and widespread use after the Chicago Columbian Exposition of 1893. With the emphasis on faithful replication, specific historic styles were used to convey particular meanings.

Herbert Croly, editor of Architectural Record, devoted a lengthy article in the December 1913 issue to discussion of an appropriate Californian style for domestic architecture. He argued that Mission style, which had been popular at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, was not appropriate because it was “ecclesiastical rather than domestic.” However, what was “valuable” of Mission style architecture was that it “stamp[ed] the Spanish tradition upon Californian architecture; and the Spanish tradition is only…a picturesque version of what may in general be described as the Latin or Italian tradition.”

The academic, high-style expression of Spanish Colonial Revival style was popularized by the Panama-California Exposition of 1915 in San Diego. By commemorating the opening of the Panama Canal a year earlier, the exposition served to boost San Diego as the closest American port to the canal. The Exposition, with Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue as chief architect, was a public and cultural event that showcased the new architectural styles emerging in California. Goodhue’s work on the Exposition was notable for its use of Spanish Colonial Revival style, which he developed through his study of Spanish Colonial architecture in Mexico.
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86 Like many architects working at that time, Bertram Goodhue (1869-1924) worked in a myriad of historic revival styles. Prior to working on the Panama-California Exposition, much of his work was executed in the Gothic Revival style as a partner of Ralph Adams Cram in New York City from 1891 until 1914. Bertram Goodhue’s work on the Episcopal Cathedral, Le Santissima Trinidad, in Havana, Cuba in 1905 and a later trip to Mexico influenced him to such a degree that he wrote a detailed study of Spanish Colonial architecture in Mexico, the principles of which he adapted to his work at the Panama-California Exposition.
“statement of local industry clothed in a Southern California architecture” and had as much influence on subsequent use of Spanish Colonial Revival style as the Chicago Columbian Exposition did for historic revival styles in general and Classical Revival style in particular. Use of the Spanish Colonial Revival style at the Panama-California Exposition represented Spanish historical antecedents more faithfully than the Mission Revival style and “emphasize[d] the richness of Spanish precedents found throughout Latin America.”

Johnson did not adhere to strict academic styles and designed in a variety of genres, sometimes combining more than one style in one composition, as seen at Rancho San Carlos. While many of his designs employed variations of Spanish Colonial Revival style, such as the Biltmore Hotel, by the mid-1920s, Johnson had become interested in Monterey Revival style. His 1925 design for the Bixby House in South Pasadena in the Monterey Revival style was widely published and helped to popularize the style. Monterey Revival style is a loose interpretation of “Anglo-influenced Spanish Colonial houses built in the mid-nineteenth century in Monterey in Northern California.” In other words, it combines Spanish Colonial Revival style with the ever-popular, more Eastern Colonial Revival style. It is generally characterized by two-story buildings with low-pitched gable roofs and overhangs, and second-story balconies. Unlike the Colonial Revival style, it does not necessarily have a symmetrical composition. And unlike Spanish Colonial Revival style, the style often mixes exterior cladding materials.

What really distinguished Reginald Johnson was his effort to push the boundaries of defining a “California” architectural style. He accomplished this by emphasizing indoor-outdoor living in his plans through extensive use of patios and French doors. His designs were responsive to the site, creating a picturesque massing as seen from the approach, as well as defining views seen from the interior. Many of Johnson’s compositions break up strict symmetry to allow for maximum light and air penetration, as well as to create a sense of enclosure to outdoor living spaces. Johnson worked with a variety of local, Santa Barbara landscape architects for his commissions in that county, including Paul G. Thiene at Mira Flores, Peter Riedel and Ralph T. Stevens at Cuesta Linda, as well as Lockwood de Forest, Jr. Because he was not always constrained by strict symmetry, Reginald Johnson’s domestic architecture appeared relatively informal compared with other large homes from the same period. It can be argued that his emphasis on indoor-outdoor living and pushing out wings to maximize light and air, was an antecedent to mid-century Ranch style houses.

In the first phase of his career, Johnson worked prolifically in the Santa Barbara and Montecito area. He designed over twenty homes beginning in 1916, including “Hillside House” for G.C.
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Kendall (1917), “Riven Rock” for Stanley McCormick (1918, demolished), and “El Elisio” for Edward Lowe (1922), and Cuesta Linda (later Lotusland) for Ann Jackson’s father E. Palmer Gavit (1920) in addition to Mira Flores, Las Terrasas, the Biltmore Hotel, and the Santa Barbara Post Office. These buildings all illustrate Johnson’s unmistakable, informal, “California” style, which combined a variety of precedents to embrace indoor-outdoor living.

Beginning in the early 1930s, Johnson’s architectural focus began shifting from homes for the elite to housing for the less privileged and to the issue of mass housing, both publicly and privately financed. From mid-decade until he retired in 1947, Johnson devoted himself to this cause, becoming a consultant to the Los Angeles Housing Authority and serving on the boards of several citizens’ organizations. He became increasingly “modern” in his architectural style, as well, stating in 1934: “The rambling house of rugged individualism and the house with its many tricks of architectural detail will, for economic reasons alone, be discarded. What has been very aptly called the monotony of variety will then be a thing of the past.”

Johnson was chief architect for Harbor Hills and coordinating architect for Rancho San Pedro, two public housing projects in Los Angeles. His crowning achievement, however, was the privately developed Baldwin Hills Village (1940), for which Johnson was the managing architect, collaborating with the firm of Wilson, Merrill and Alexander and planning consultant Clarence Stein. This 627-unit housing estate set on 88 acres earned national acclaim from eminent critic Lewis Mumford among others.

Johnson passed away in 1952, and although retired at the time, was praised by his colleagues for his position at the forefront of his profession during both phases of his career.

Because Johnson worked extensively throughout Santa Barbara and Montecito, it is likely the Jacksons were well aware of his designs, but they may have become personally acquainted through Johnson’s work at Cuesta Linda, which he worked on for Ann Jackson’s father and stepmother beginning in 1919, when she was a schoolgirl of 13. Johnson’s work at Rancho San Carlos dates at least to 1928, when he drew plans for the office at the estate. Although the Jackson house was never published, perhaps in response to the clients’ concerns for privacy and security, the Jackson office did appear in print (“Office for Mr. C. H. Jackson, Jr., on the Rancho San Carlos near Montecito” in California Arts and Architecture 37, May 1930). Given the dates of many of the cottages and stables, it is likely they were designed by Johnson as part of the same building campaign. Regarding the Jackson house, Architecture editor Henry H. Saylor noted in his column dated July 3, 1931 that “Reginald Johnson dropped in on his way from the Pacific Coast before sailing tonight for England. He is going over mainly to seek out some fine old paneling to use in a large country house [the Jackson House] in Montecito.”
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The Jackson House on Rancho San Carlos has been characterized as among Johnson’s “finest” designs. It incorporates most of the features that distinguished Johnson’s mature work during the first phase of his career. The floor plan is asymmetrical and organized to maximize lighting and ventilation. It incorporates an enclosed patio while wings stretch out to embrace courts, terraces, and gardens and providing interior spaces with optimum light and ventilation. It is functionally organized, with a discrete service wing. The sloping site has been enhanced by a retaining wall, so that the upper story appears to be built naturally atop the hillside. The styling is Johnson’s own interpretation of early California rather than a historically authentic replica, harmoniously blending Spanish and Colonial elements typical of the Monterey Revival with Regency railings and Georgian interiors. While the “California” plan, emphasizing indoor-outdoor living was not unique to Johnson’s design of Rancho San Carlos, it reached an expression in this design not fully realized in his earlier residential architecture.

**Lockwood de Forest, Jr.**

Landscape architect Lockwood de Forest III, known as Lockwood de Forest, Jr. (1896-1949), is credited with the landscaping of Rancho San Carlos. As noted previously, de Forest was known to both architect Reginald Johnson and the family of Ann Jackson through collaborations on other projects. According to historian Ronald L. Nye, Ph.D., Lockwood de Forest, Jr. was “one of a small group of California designers known as ‘Regionalists’ who are recognized primarily for their work on behalf of wealthy estate owners during the 1920s.”

The landscape design at Rancho San Carlos has been attributed to three of the most notable landscape designers of the period working in southern California: Lockwood de Forest, Jr., Ralph Stevens, and Florence Yoch. De Forest and Stevens appear to be responsible for the main entrance off East Valley Road, enhancing the experience of the circulation system, integrating the orchards and pastures into view sheds, and the informal gardens surrounding the cottages, while Florence Yoch focused her work around the main house at the entrance, patio, courtyard, and formal east garden. Rancho San Carlos exemplifies what Ronald L. Nye, Ph.D. describes as “regionalist landscape design,” which considers formal designed gardens with the topography while incorporating native California plants. The seeds of Regionalist landscape design are found as early as the 1860s when Fredrick Law Olmstead identified the lack of abundant water in
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California and found it unsuitable for pastoral and picturesque English landscapes. Both large, formal Mediterranean Revival gardens as well as the less formal “regionalist response to California’s unique landscape and climate” are particularly well represented in Santa Barbara and Montecito, including the landscape at Val Verde designed by de Forest (1926-1949).

Nye characterizes Regionalist landscapes by “Regionalist landscape design is characterized by the integration of three elements: formal components, such as those found in the traditional gardens of the Mediterranean Basin and favored by estate builders at the time; newly-available exotic and tropical plant materials; and the natural palette of plants and trees unique to California.” All three elements of Regionalism can be found on the Rancho San Carlos property: from the formal gardens on the terraces and near the Main House, to the exotic palms that line the main driveway in a conscious transition to the natural landscape of oaks and native plants, and the relatively informal gardens adjacent to the various buildings around the property.

In keeping with the agricultural heritage and ambiance of Montecito, existing orchards were retained, and expanded with the purchase of a portion of the adjacent Featherhill Ranch. The orchards are evident in historic aerial photos as early as 1928 and are represented in a painted mural within the Main house. The presence of the orchards created an image of Rancho San Carlos as a “gentleman’s farm,” an ideal described by Andrew Jackson Downing Jr.’s *A Treatise in the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening* (first published in 1841 and revised twenty times between 1847 and 1900). According to Downing, “the orchard was regarded as a highly aesthetic, ornamental landscape feature or space that decorated the landscape with beautiful blossoms, fine fruit, and shady walks or rides within allées of green boughs. A well tended orchard of choice fruit varieties was a hallmark of the owner’s sophistication.” The orchards are an integral component of the landscape at Rancho San Carlos, providing an agricultural ambiance along the drive to the main house, as well as views to the orchards from the main house.

Landscape architect Lockwood de Forest III, known as Lockwood de Forest, Jr. (1896-1949), is...

---

credited with shaping some of the landscaping of Rancho San Carlos. As noted previously, de Forest was known to both architect Reginald Johnson and the family of Ann Jackson through collaborations on other projects. According to historian Ronald L. Nye, Ph.D., Lockwood de Forest, Jr. was “one of a small group of California designers known as ‘Regionalists’ who are recognized primarily for their work on behalf of wealthy estate owners during the 1920s.”

Lockwood de Forest Jr. was born in New York City, and as the son of Lockwood de Forest II, a landscape painter, designer, and one-time partner of Louis C. Tiffany, was exposed to architecture, landscape, and aesthetics from an early age. His landscape training consisted of courses taken at Williams College, Harvard University, and the University of California at Berkeley, and brief employment in the offices of two landscape architects, most notably that of acclaimed Santa Barbara practitioner Ralph Stevens. He established his own practice in Santa Barbara in 1922.

A knowledgeable horticulturalist, de Forest was the editor with his wife, fellow landscape architect Elizabeth Kellam, of the magazine *The Santa Barbara Gardener* between 1925 and 1942. He was especially interested in South African plants and, as advisor to the Santa Barbara Botanic Garden, native plants. His gardens exhibit both a disciplined architectural quality and a respect for the regional landscape. In the words of landscape historian David Streatfield, de Forest “rejected stylistic eclecticism; his designs are notable for simple detailing and bold, almost theatrical effects achieved entirely with plants. He was one of the first landscape architects in California to question the ubiquitous and excessively generous use of lawn irrigation.” Other distinguishing characteristics of his gardens were the careful integration of distant views into his design and the use of stonework.

De Forest’s oeuvre was primarily residential. Perhaps his most published and acclaimed work was at Val Verde (1926-1949), the Montecito estate of Wright Ludington that boasted a 1915 house designed by Bertram Goodhue. There, de Forest’s flair for the dramatic was in full view, with water features, columns, statuary and plant forms that transformed the grounds into an abstract and atmospheric classical villa. Other de Forest projects, in addition to his aforementioned work at Casa del Herrero and Lotusland, include the William Dickenson estate, Hope Ranch (1929-1932), and the Meeker estate, Constantia (1930). Following the Depression and World War II, de Forest’s projects were smaller scale gardens and the architectural design of several modestly sized homes, one of which was featured in *Sunset* magazine in 1948. His embrace of modernist ideas, such as minimalism, axial geometry, and integration with the
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surrounding landscape, has been said to foreshadow the work of renowned post-war landscape architect Thomas Church.\textsuperscript{103} Lockwood de Forest, Jr. died unexpectedly in 1949.

Ralph Stevens

Ralph Stevens’ involvement with shaping the landscape at Rancho San Carlos was suggested by Mrs. Palmer Jackson, Ann Jackson’s daughter-in-law. Because Stevens’ papers are not collected in a single archive and most drawings are believed to be lost, Stevens’ contributions to the Rancho San Carlos landscape cannot be clearly identified. However, it is possible Stevens and Lockwood de Forest, Jr. collaborated at Rancho San Carlos. In addition to de Forest working for Stevens in 1921 and 1922, the two collaborated on a number of important projects in Montecito, including Casa del Herrero and Lotusland. Furthermore, it is likely Ann Jackson was well acquainted with Ralph Stevens, as her father purchased Stevens’ childhood home, Tanglewood, in 1916, constructing a new main house on the property and renaming it Cuesta Linda. Interestingly, Stevens and de Forest also worked on the landscape at Cuesta Linda, which later became Lotusland.\textsuperscript{104}

Ralph Stevens (1882-1958) was born in Montecito and grew up at his family’s aforementioned property, Tanglewood. Stevens’ father, R. Kinton Stevens, was a “pioneering” nurseryman, specializing in exotic, subtropical vegetation.\textsuperscript{105} After his father’s death in 1896, Stevens’ mother stayed on at Tanglewood until 1913, renting out the main house to winter visitors.\textsuperscript{106} Stevens received his formal education from Michigan State College (now Michigan State University), graduating with a BS in 1905. After working for a short time for a landscape designer in Chicago, as well as a nursery in California and a landscape architect for the Southern California Acclimatizing Association, Stevens became an assistant professor in the newly established Landscape Gardening department of the University of California Berkeley between 1913 and 1917. Stevens returned to Santa Barbara in 1917 and opened a landscape architecture practice. In the 1920s, he taught landscape architecture at the Santa Barbara School of the Arts. It was during this time that Lockwood de Forest Jr. worked for him.

Stevens worked in a variety of styles throughout his career. His projects “synthesized International and Californian design ideals, integrating formal ideas gleaned from the Mediterranean, Islamic, Spanish Colonial Revival and Hawaiian traditions with a more laid-back

\textsuperscript{103} Online Archive of California. Lockwood de Forest, Jr. landscape drawings, Architecture and Design Collection. Art, Design & Architecture Museum; University of California, Santa Barbara. Biographical / historical note. http://www.oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/c80869vg/admin/#ref101
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California style.” He is best known for the richness of his plant palette, utilizing palms and giant birds of paradise. “Many important Stevens commissions in the 1920s had gardens that (like the associated buildings) adapted formal Mediterranean ideas in the California context.” Stevens worked on several projects with Reginald Johnson in Montecito, including the Santa Barbara Biltmore Hotel (1926-1927), the Chase House called Las Terrasas, (1925), and the Jefferson House called Mira Flores (1915). One of his most important works, Stevens “gave form to” Ganna Walska’s ideas at Lotusland (1944-1957), which had been adapted from his childhood home Tanglewood. In the post-war period, Stevens created the Succulent Garden for the Tremaine house in Montecito, which was designed by Modernist architect Richard Neutra. The garden was included in Elizabeth Kassler’s 1964 book Modern Gardens and Landscape, establishing the garden as “a landmark of mid-twentieth-century modernism.”

Florence Yoch

Landscape architect Florence Yoch (1890-1972) designed the landscapes immediately adjacent to the main house at Rancho San Carlos. Her formal designs were based on European precedents including the Renaissance Farnese Palace in Rome and the carmens of the Spanish town of El Albaicin. Florence Theresa Yoch (1890-1972) grew up both in Laguna Beach and Santa Ana. Her interest in landscape design possibly stemmed from her visits to Arden, the Orange County estate of Helena Modjeska where Theodore Payne served as gardener from 1893-1896. Although Arden was Payne’s first job in southern California, he went on to become a pioneer in cultivating California native plants. Yoch began her formal education at University of California Berkeley in 1910, transferred to College of Agriculture at Cornell University in 1912, and completed a BS in Landscape Gardening at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1915.

In 1917, she founded her own landscape design firm. Lucile Council (1898-1964) joined the firm in 1921. In 1925, they formed the partnership of Yoch and Council and worked together until Council’s death in 1964. Yoch served as primary landscape and garden feature designer while Council was the firm’s office manager and planting specialist. Their practice centered in
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Pasadena, San Marino, Beverly Hills, and Montecito, as well as other areas of Santa Barbara County, Monterey, and Carmel. Yoch’s first designed landscape in Montecito was in 1922 at Il Brolino. It is possible Ann Jackson became aware of Yoch through this project as “the six acres of gardens delighted countless visitors who come to Montecito on the regular Garden Tours.”

The firm worked mostly on private residences, including movie moguls’ estates and movie sets, but also worked on other projects as diverse as the Wilshire Country Club (1920), Vroman’s Bookstore in Pasadena (1921), The Eubell Club of Los Angeles (1927), California Institute of Technology: The Athenaeum (1930), and Robinson’s Department Store in Beverly Hills (1955). Movie sets included Romeo and Juliet (1936), The Garden of Allah (1936), Gone with the Wind (1939), How Green Was My Valley (1941), and The Good Earth (1937).

Yoch “designs were noted for the juxtaposition of informal, wild plantings and formal geometry, as well as the theatrical and unexpected.” Extensive travel, including annual trips to Europe, as well as to Mexico and North Africa, provided inspiration for her landscapes, including the one at Rancho San Carlos. One of her signature designs consisted of trees leaning over walkways and garden paths, departing from rigid structures. She also often used native plants. “Adapting European formal garden designs to the California landscape, Yoch created gardens rich in architectural detail and in varieties of plants, yet intimate and casual in style.” Gardens were often designed as outdoor rooms. Yoch also designed features such as pebble pavements, benches, and ornate drains, all of which she included at Rancho San Carlos (see Additional Historic Photos 21-22).

Rancho San Carlos is an excellent example of one of Yoch’s “patrician gardens.” James Yoch, Florence Yoch’s cousin and biographer, describes “one of the main goals of Florence Yoch’s earliest gardens was to bring admired pieces of Europe home to America for wealthy clients who wanted to recollect scenes from their travels.” Given the size of Rancho San Carlos, Yoch worked to create more intimate spaces close to the main house by clearly delineating plant spaces with more than 1,500 tiles in various forms (leaf, double arch, shell, and single arch). Rancho San Carlos was one of the few landscapes that Yoch agreed to the client’s wishes to import mature trees and shrubs to create an instant effect rather than allow plants and landscapes to grow and mature. Cost for the central courtyard was $8,799. The central courtyard is highly visible as a central design element around which the public rooms are organized; Yoch’s design defines the mix of formal and casual architecture that characterized the House. The central
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courtyard features three different species of palms to “suggest harmony” while “walks lead sensibly but not always straightforwardly to the doors, the open gallery, and stairs along the patio.” The east garden cost $34,652 and included a parterre consisting entirely of geometrically clipped beds of lawn as well as a more traditional parterre of hedges enclosing plant beds. Although not detailed in a price list, her work also appears to include landscaping along the north elevation, which included one of her most well-known pebble pavements of two dogs (see Additional Historic Photo 21 and 57).

James Yoch, Florence Yoch’s cousin and biographer, wrote of her involvement at Rancho San Carlos, “All major Florence Yoch gardens have been much-modified or perished…except for your [Mrs. Palmer Jackson] ranch. If but one was fated to survive intact into the 21st century, I’m glad it’s yours, among the best she created.”
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122 Yoch, 42.
123 James Yoch to Mrs. Palmer (Joan) Jackson, personal correspondence, June 5, 2013, Huntington Library.
12. WHY THE NOMINATED PROPERTY MEETS THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR A COUNTY LANDMARK

Rancho San Carlos is significant under multiple Santa Barbara County Landmark criteria:

A) *It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the County's cultural, social, economic, political, archaeological, aesthetic, engineering, architectural or natural history*

As one of the last surviving and largest, intact estates from the first half of the twentieth century, Rancho San Carlos reflects the development of Montecito as the final expression of the Gilded Age wealth and style under this criterion. Montecito has been defined by large estates of wealthy residents and Rancho San Carlos epitomizes this pattern of development. **Rancho San Carlos is a remarkably intact grouping of buildings, including prominent a main house, cottages, barns, and other support buildings within both a designed and agricultural landscape. While once more prevalent in Santa Barbara County, the orchards at Rancho San Carlos, dating from before World War II, are increasingly rare.**

B) *It is identified with persons or events significant in local, state or national history*

Rancho San Carlos may also be considered significant under criterion B for its association with Pete and Ann Jackson, pillars of the community in Montecito, noted philanthropists, and very influential in the world of polo. Pete Jackson became a developer in Montecito. Ann Jackson was a major women’s polo player, traveling throughout California and the United States for games. In addition, Pete Jackson was a founding trustee of the Santa Barbara Polo Club and Ann Jackson owned the Polo Club for approximately 20 years. This passion for polo is closely tied to Rancho San Carlos, where they bred and trained polo ponies. Pete and Ann Jackson, as represented by their association with Rancho San Carlos, are a link to Montecito’s historic development.

C) *It embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship*

The Main house, office, octagonal barn, and most outbuildings of Rancho San Carlos embody the distinctive characteristics of their architectural styles and are significant under criterion C. The Main house is an elegant and sophisticated example of the Monterey Revival style that incorporates Georgian and Regency detailing in a rambling plan that appears to be a precursor to the post World War II Ranch style. The office, with its adobe-inspired heavy wooden lintels and deeply recessed windows and doors, represents a more rustic but equally adept interpretation of the Monterey Revival style. The octagonal barn, and other outbuildings are excellent showcases of the character-defining features of the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Both of these styles are emblematic of Santa Barbara County during the 1920s and 1930s.
Additionally, as a building type, the octagonal barn is a very rare example of this type, which originated in Europe and was not widely constructed in the United States. Round and polygonal barns are one of several barn types identified in the National Park Service publication Preservation Brief 20: The Preservation of Historic Barns (Michael J. Auer, (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, 1989), 3). Popular especially in the Midwest at the end of the eighteenth century through the 1920s, round and polygonal barns were thought to be a more efficient use of space and more structurally stable than rectangular barns. Round and polygonal barns were extremely rare in California, with only two other known historic examples extant in Santa Rosa and San Luis Obispo. It appears that aesthetics were the primary consideration for the distinctive octagonal plan of the barn at Rancho San Carlos. The buildings have had very few alterations over the years and retain a very high degree of integrity.

D) It is representative of the work of a notable builder, designer, or architect

Rancho San Carlos is eligible under this criterion for several associations. The Main house, round barn, wood/stucco barn and office, and likely other buildings on the estate, were designed by master architect Reginald Johnson. Johnson was highly acclaimed both during his lifetime and after his death and is widely recognized to have been one of the most influential architects of the 1920s and 1930s in Southern California. Although Johnson was based in Pasadena, his work in Santa Barbara County was widely respected, and the Rancho San Carlos is accounted to be an excellent example of his architectural accomplishments. The landscape design is attributed to Lockwood de Forest, Jr., Ralph Stevens, and Florence Yoch, all equally acclaimed as landscape architects with deep ties to Santa Barbara County. Both de Forest and Stevens' work at Rancho San Carlos is highly characteristic of the Regionalist approach to landscape design, while Yoch's design is considered one of her best and most intact. De Forest and Stevens received regional recognition during their lifetimes and de Forest's work was illustrated in national publications, including House Beautiful and Country Life in America. A major exhibit is planned showcasing the work of Florence Yoch at the Huntington Library, opening in the fall of 2018.

E) It contributes to the significance of a historic area, being a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic, prehistoric, archaeological, or scenic properties, or thematically related grouping of properties, which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan or physical development

Under criterion E, Rancho San Carlos is a geographically definable grouping of buildings,
structures, and landscape features that are unified by physical development. Rancho San Carlos clearly meets the National Register of Historic Places definition of a historic district: “a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development” having a “sense of time and place.”\(^{125}\) The buildings and landscape features of Rancho San Carlos relate to each other both visually and functionally. Contributing resources to this historic district include the Main house, its gardens, courts, terraces, and lawns; the main office; the octagonal barn, stables, arena, paddocks, and practice track; staff cottages and garages; shop, gas station, and other utilitarian buildings and structures such as barns and dog kennels; orchards; ornamental trees and plantings; internal circulation system; other hardscape features such as stone fences and iron gates; bridges, retaining walls, and low stone walls defining roadways; irrigation system features; natural topography; and vistas, both from the property to external landmarks such as the mountains and the ocean, and within the property, of the orchards and fields. The property has been operated as unified entity since 1927, with additional orchards added in the mid-1930s, is remarkably unchanged since that time, and its historic residential, agricultural, and equestrian functions are clearly conveyed by its physical character.

\(F\) **It has a location with unique physical characteristics or is a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the County of Santa Barbara**

Most of the extensive street frontage of Rancho San Carlos along East Valley Road is hidden by a dense row of trees and vegetation that allow only occasional glimpses into the interior of the property. However, the stone fence along part of the frontage and massive wrought iron gate at the main entry announce the presence of a large estate, and the unbroken frontage, devoid of buildings or other interruptions combined with the occasional views of the citrus groves on the property make its character as a large agricultural estate highly apparent. This lack of development is in itself a unique physical characteristic and a view that represents an established and familiar visual feature of this neighborhood of Montecito. Additionally, expansive views of the property are available from various points on Ortega Ridge Road and from public trails.

\(G\) **It embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation**

The Main house and office are outstanding examples of architectural design, skillfully using brick and stone, accented by iron and wood work at the former, and brick and wood at the latter. The interiors of the Main house, some of which were imported from England, are

\(^{125}\) Nye, 13.
especially notable for their period design and materials; the living room, dining room, and library are particularly noteworthy in this regard. Craftsmanship is evident throughout the house, in fireplaces, lighting fixtures, and the hand-painted tile murals along the first floor hallway walls. Additionally, the octagonal barn is highly noteworthy for its skillful display of an octagonal floor plan culminating in a cupola.

H) It reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth, particularly transportation modes or distinctive examples of park or community planning

Rancho San Carlos reflects the historical pattern of development of Montecito as a community of large estates, many of which incorporated, in addition to homes and gardens, agricultural and equestrian facilities. This pattern of development was particularly associated with the years between 1890 and the onset of World War II. With a period of significance of Developed from 1927-1945 to 1934, Rancho San Carlos is a very rare, an intact example from the period.

I) It is one of the few remaining examples in the County, region, state, or nation possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural or historical type or specimen

Very few other large estates from the first half of the twentieth century have survived subdivision and redevelopment, making Rancho San Carlos one of the few remaining examples to be significant as an example of this property type in the County, region, state and nation. In addition, the fruit orchards, once common in the area are increasingly rare. Even more unique is the presence of an orchard with accompanying features that dates from before World War II.
13. SUMMARY OF CASE FOR DESIGNATION AS COUNTY LANDMARK

The Rancho San Carlos Estate merits designation as a landmark of the County of Santa Barbara for its outstanding evocation of several historical themes important to the history of Montecito and the County. As one of the last, largest and most intact agricultural and equestrian estates in the County, Rancho San Carlos is a remarkable vestige of that earlier time when Montecito first gained international prominence as a home of the wealthy and powerful. The Estate exemplifies this aspect of the County’s cultural and social history and has been maintained by the same family with few modifications for over 90 years. While there have been some minor modifications, such as to the arena and loss of some landscape features, the property as a whole retains a high degree of integrity. A comparison of historic and contemporary photos reveals that Rancho San Carlos appears very much like it did during the period of significance – 1927-1945.

The property also showcases the accomplishments of two—prominent designers who impacted the physical character of the County in general and Montecito in particular during its most formative years, architect Reginald Johnson and landscape architects Lockwood de Forest, Jr., Ralph Stevens, and Florence Yoch. With its elegant and restrained design in Monterey Revival style, the Main house is an exceptional example of the style as it was interpreted by Johnson. The office and the rare octagonal barn, both also designed by Johnson, are aesthetically pleasing as well as contributors to a functional suite of outbuildings and equestrian facilities that together comprise a working horse ranch and citrus orchard. The landscape, which exemplifies the Regionalist approach to landscape design associated with de Forest, combines ornamental plantings with a respect for natural topography and the needs of a horse ranch and an orchard that dates from before World War II, are now rare historical features in Santa Barbara County. The sweeping views of orchards against a mountain backdrop is a prominent vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of the Montecito community, as well as a link to the area’s agricultural heritage that is significantly diminished past. It is one of the few remaining examples of this type of pre-war design “in the grand manner” in the County, region, state and nation.
16. NUMBER AND DESCRIPTION OF PHOTOS * ENCLOSED:

Map 1: Topographic map showing boundaries of Rancho San Carlos and extant buildings
Map 2: Current aerial photograph showing property outline in yellow
Map 3: Rancho San Carlos – Structures Location (Sotheby’s)
Map 4: Map showing locations of buildings and prominent features on aerial
Map 5: Assessor parcel maps showing property outline in yellow (Santa Barbara County Assessor)
Map 6: Historic map showing Montecito estates (Myrick, backpiece)
Map 7: Composite Map of Certificate of Compliance (www.suzanneperkins.com)
Map 8-17: Rancho San Carlos Certificate of Compliance Maps
Map 18: Main house, first floor plan
Map 19: Main house, second floor plan

Contemporary Photo 1: Panoramic view of orchards and mountains
Contemporary Photo 2: Site feature, entry gate from East Valley Road, view north
Contemporary Photo 3: Site feature, driveway to Main house
Contemporary Photo 4: Main house, entry courtyard, west façade
Contemporary Photo 5: Main house, central courtyard with water feature, elevated view
Contemporary Photo 6: Main house, central courtyard, view of octagonal tower office
Contemporary Photo 7: Main house, central courtyard, view of formal landscaping and octagonal tower office
Contemporary Photo 8: Main house, central courtyard, elevated southwest view of courtyard and tiled loggia
Contemporary Photo 9: Main house, staircase from central courtyard to tower office with landscaping
Contemporary Photo 10: Main house, loggia and central courtyard landscaping
Contemporary Photo 11: Main house, exterior, wing with lawn and mountain setting, showing shingled roof, green shutters, roofline and whitewashed red brick
Contemporary Photo 12: Main house, interior, central gallery
Contemporary Photo 13: Main house, interior, staircase to master bedroom wing
Contemporary Photo 14: Main house, interior, parquet-floored gallery with murals
Contemporary Photo 15: Main house, interior, mural detail
Contemporary Photo 16: Main house, interior, mural detail
Contemporary Photo 17: Main house, interior, mural detail
Contemporary Photo 18: Main house, interior, mural detail
Contemporary Photo 19: Main house, interior, wood-paneled living room with fireplace
Contemporary Photo 20: Main house, interior, wood-paneled living room
Contemporary Photo 21: Main house, interior, door detail
Contemporary Photo 22: Main house, interior, door detail
Contemporary Photo 23: Main house, interior, library
Contemporary Photo 24: Main house, interior, library
Contemporary Photo 25: Main house, interior, library
Contemporary Photo 26: Main house, interior, dining room
Contemporary Photo 27: Main house, interior, dining room
Contemporary Photo 28: Main house, interior, kitchen
Contemporary Photo 29: Main house, interior, butler’s pantry
Contemporary Photo 30: Main house, interior, master bedroom sitting room
Contemporary Photo 31: Main house, interior, bedroom
Contemporary Photo 32: Main house, interior, guest bedroom
Contemporary Photo 33: Main house, interior, guest bedroom
Contemporary Photo 34: Main house, interior, guest bedroom
Contemporary Photo 35: Main house, interior, guest bedroom
Contemporary Photo 36: Main house, interior, basement pub
Contemporary Photo 37: Main house, interior, basement pub
Contemporary Photo 38: Main house, basement, badminton court
Contemporary Photo 39: Main office, exterior
Contemporary Photo 40: Ranch cottage
Contemporary Photo 41: Ranch cottage
Contemporary Photo 42: Round barn, exterior
Contemporary Photo 43: Round barn, exterior, roof and vane detail
Contemporary Photo 44: Round barn, interior
Contemporary Photo 45: Wood frame and stucco barn and courtyard, exterior
Contemporary Photo 46: Fenced paddocks, exterior
Contemporary Photo 47: Corrals with mountain view, exterior
Contemporary Photo 48: Corrals with mountain view, exterior
Contemporary Photo 49: Corrals and pasture with ocean view, exterior
Contemporary Photo 50: Covered riding arena, interior
Contemporary Photo 51: Rancho San Carlos from Ortega Ridge Road
Contemporary Photo 52: Rancho San Carlos from Ortega Ridge Road
Contemporary Photo 53: Rancho San Carlos from Ortega Ridge Road
Contemporary Photo 54: Rancho San Carlos from Ortega Ridge Trail

Historic Photo 1: Historic aerial photo, approximately current boundary of property outlined in yellow, note extant octagonal barn, 1928
Historic Photo 2: Historic aerial photo, approximately current boundary of property outlined in yellow, 1938
Historic Photo 3: Historic aerial photo, approximately current boundary of property outlined in yellow, 1947
Historic Photo 4: Historic aerial photo, approximately current boundary of property outlined in yellow, 1956
Historic Photo 5: Historic aerial photo, approximately current boundary of property outlined in yellow, 1967

Historic Photo 6: Historic photo of model (Ryerson & Burnham Archives, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, circa 1930)

Historic Photo 7: Interior courtyard, view north (Ryerson & Burnham Archives, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, circa 1931)

Additional Contemporary Photo 1: Panoramic view of orchards and mountains with main office in foreground, view north

Additional Contemporary Photo 2: Panoramic view of pastures, orchards, and ocean, view southwest

Additional Contemporary Photo 3: Main house, note rambling plan, view northeast

Additional Contemporary Photo 4: Main house, south wing (left), east elevation overlooking the formal garden (center), and service wing (right), view northeast

Additional Contemporary Photo 5: Main house, east elevation overlooking formal garden (left) and north wing (right), view southwest

Additional Contemporary Photo 6: Road approaching main house, note grove of oak trees at left and stone wall lining drive, view east

Additional Contemporary Photo 7: Main house, south elevation of north wing facing entry court, note stone wall delineating change in grade, view north

Additional Contemporary Photo 8: Main house, central courtyard from stair, view southwest

Additional Contemporary Photo 9: Main house, east elevation (left) and service wing (right), note elevated terrace, view northwest

Additional Contemporary Photo 10: Ranch Cottage I

Additional Contemporary Photo 11: Ranch Cottage F

Additional Contemporary Photo 12: Ranch Cottage L, west elevation from Romero Canyon Road, view east (East Valley Preservation Association, 2018)

Additional Historic Drawing 1: Proposed landscape plan for main entrance, prepared by Lakewood de Forest, Jr. (In the Lockwood de Forest, Jr. landscape drawings, Architecture & Design Collection, Art Design & Architecture Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara, not dated)

Additional Historic Drawing 2: Proposed landscape plan for “Head Groom” cottage, prepared
by Lakewood de Forest, Jr. (In the Lockwood de Forest, Jr. landscape drawings, Architecture & Design Collection, Art, Design & Architecture Museum, University of California, Santa Barbara, not dated)

Additional Historic Photo 1: Photograph of model of Main House, south elevation, view northwest (Huntington Library, undated)

Additional Historic Photo 2: Main house under construction, south elevation, view north (Huntington Library, circa 1928)

Additional Historic Photo 3: Main house, entry court and west elevation, view east (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 4: Main house, entry court, west elevation, view east (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 5: Main house, entry court, west elevation (right) and south elevation of north wing (left), note retaining wall, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 6: Main house, south elevation terrace wall (left), view east toward orchards (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 7: Main house, south elevation terrace wall (left), view east toward orchards (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 8: Main house, east garden under construction, view northwest, note installation of mature trees (Huntington Library, circa 1930)

Additional Historic Photo 9: Main house, south elevation, view northwest (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 10: Main house, south elevation, view east toward orchards (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 11: Main house, east elevation, view northwest (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 12: Main house, terrace at east elevation, view north (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 13: Main house, north elevation of north wing, view southeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 14: Main house, north elevation of north wing (left) and east elevation of north wing (right), view southwest (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 15: Main house, north elevation of north wing, note shell tiles lining walkway, view east (Huntington Library, circa 1932)

Additional Historic Photo 16: Main house, garden north of north wing, view northwest (Huntington Library, circa 1932)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Historic Photo 17:</th>
<th>Main house, east elevation of north wing, view west (Huntington Library, circa 1932)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 18:</td>
<td>Main house, north (center) and east (right) elevation of north wing, note view west (Huntington Library, circa 1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 19:</td>
<td>Main house, north elevation of north wing, view southeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 20:</td>
<td>Main house, east elevation of north wing, view west (Huntington Library, circa 1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 21:</td>
<td>Main house, drawing by Florence Yoch showing detail of pebble paving (Huntington Library, dated May 11, 1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 22:</td>
<td>Main house, detail of custom bench (Huntington Library, circa 1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 23-24:</td>
<td>Main house, central courtyard, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 25:</td>
<td>Main house, central courtyard, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 26:</td>
<td>Main house, central courtyard, view north (Huntington Library, circa 1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 27:</td>
<td>Main house, central courtyard, view northeast (Huntington Library, circa 1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 28:</td>
<td>Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, circa 1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 29:</td>
<td>Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, circa 1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 30:</td>
<td>Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, circa 1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 31:</td>
<td>Entry gate from East Valley Road, view northeast (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 32:</td>
<td>Drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 33:</td>
<td>Drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 34:</td>
<td>Drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 35:</td>
<td>Drive to Main house through orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 36:</td>
<td>Drive to Main house, view north toward Main Office (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historic Photo 37:</td>
<td>Detail of stone curb and gutter along drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 38:</strong></td>
<td>Detail of stone wall along drive to Main house (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 39:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, entry court, view west (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 40:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, east elevation (left), view southwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 41:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, south elevation, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 42:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, south elevation, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 43:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, south elevation, note orchard, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 44:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, south elevation, note orchard, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 45:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, south elevation, note orchard, view north (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 46:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, south elevation, balcony off living room, view east (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 47:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, east parterre, view northeast toward orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 48:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, east parterre, view northeast toward orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 49:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, east parterre, view northeast toward orchards (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 50:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, north garden, view southeast (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 51:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, north garden, view northwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 52:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, north garden, view northwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 53:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, north garden detail (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 54:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, west elevation of north wing, view south (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 55:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, terrace above entry court view east (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 56:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, north wing, terrace above entry court view southwest (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Historic Photo 57:</strong></td>
<td>Main house, pebble paving (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Historic Photo 58: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 59: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 60: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 61: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 62: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 63: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 64: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 65: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 66: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 67: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)
Additional Historic Photo 68-69: Main house, central courtyard (Huntington Library, James Yoch, circa 1980s)

* All maps and photos from Sotheby’s International Realty, 2014, unless otherwise indicated.