4.2 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section addresses the 2010 Plan Update buildout’s potential to result in impacts on archaeological and historical (architectural) resources.

4.2.1 Setting

Archaeological Resources

Archaeological resources are characterized by the cultural materials or artifacts left by people who lived or utilized natural resources within the Plan Area. These include prehistoric Chumash populations as well as subsequent settlers in the 19th and 20th century who may have left buried trash pits or foundations of structures.

A systematic review of all archaeological resource records and reports was undertaken for the 1992 Los Alamos Community Plan EIR (Santa Barbara County P&D 1992). A records search of all investigations completed within the Plan Area was undertaken, and an intensive archaeological survey of the 1.8-mile stretch of San Antonio Creek including all streambed and cut bank areas was completed by Larry Spanne, County-qualified archaeologist (Santa Barbara County P&D 1992). An updated records search was undertaken at the Central Coast Information Center, University of California (Gusick 2008), that updated the number of cultural resource investigations and sites potentially recorded in the Plan Area. The EIR investigation (Santa Barbara County P&D 1992) identified the following.

The Los Alamos Valley, similar to the rest of Santa Barbara County, was occupied by Native Americans as early as approximately 9,500 years ago (B.P., before present) up to the establishment of La Purisima Mission in 1787. Only thirteen systematic archaeological investigations covering approximately 5 percent of the entire Plan Area have been completed for the presence of archaeological remains. One recorded archaeological site, CA-SBA-234, is identified within the Plan Area near Canada de Calaveras. According to Mission Period Native American baptism records, several historic villages occupied by Purisimeño Chumash were within the watershed of San Antonio Creek. The nearest, Sacciol, is thought to have probably been located west of the town of Los Alamos (Santa Barbara County P&D 1992). The potential for unknown, buried prehistoric archaeological sites within the Plan Area is high, given that: 1) Chumash populations tended to establish campsites adjacent to sources of fresh water such as San Antonio Creek, Cañada de Calaveras, and Cañada de Santa Ynez; and, 2) much of Plan Area is within the floodplains of these tributaries. The alluviation from flooding has the potential for covering up prehistoric
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Campsites that could have existed previously along the banks of the water courses. European settlement in the Los Alamos area dates from the founding in 1787 of Mission La Purisima, near present-day Lompoc. The Franciscan missionaries from La Purisima established an outpost at Los Alamos for livestock operations. The unincorporated town of Los Alamos was originally part of two, 48,000 acre ranches that were part of Mexican land grants. The Los Alamos Rancho, or west half of the valley, was granted to Jose Antonio De La Guerra y Carrillo in 1839; and La Laguna Rancho, or the eastern half, was granted to Octaviano Gutierrez in 1845. Based on this land use history, the potential for historic archaeological sites dating to the Spanish Mission and Rancho periods is considered high (Santa Barbara County P&D 1992).

Historical Resources

Extensive historical research was conducted during preparation of the 1992 Los Alamos Community Plan EIR (Santa Barbara County P&D 1992). In 1875, John Bell purchased a 14,000-acre portion of the valley from Los Alamos Rancho, and his partner, Dr. J.B. Shaw purchased a 14,000-acre portion of the La Laguna Rancho. In 1878, Bell and Shaw jointly decided to establish the town of Los Alamos. Each man gave approximately one half square mile in area. The mapping and surveying of the town site was completed in 1876 and officially recorded on February 1, 1879. The town was laid out in a typical frontier orthogonal pattern with twenty-four blocks and twenty-four lots each.

Over subsequent decades, Los Alamos became a commercial center for the surrounding valley. The arrival of the stagecoach and the establishment of Los Alamos as an important layover stop along the coastal stage route between Los Angeles and San Francisco occurred in 1873. In 1882, the Pacific Coast Railroad came to Los Alamos from the San Luis Obispo area. The railroad made it easier to transport agricultural goods from the valley, and boosted the area’s agricultural value. The stagecoach also played a major role in the commercial and economic growth and success of Los Alamos between the 1880’s and 1930s. This period of time marks the commencement of the town’s historic significance. Bell Street became the town’s main commercial corridor during this time (Santa Barbara County P&D 1992).

The second major period of Los Alamos’ history is associated with the impacts of the automobile and the discovery of oil in Los Alamos Valley between 1915 and 1945. Although railroad-oriented trade declined during this time, construction of the main north-south route (later Highway 101) established Los Alamos as an overnight stop for travelers. The town has changed little since it was originally laid out, and as described above has a relatively rich history (Santa Barbara County P&D 1992).
An intensive windshield survey of the Plan Area was completed by Judy Triem, a County-qualified architectural historian, who identified several structures that were considered potentially significant buildings and structures. Their historical importance was defined primarily by professional visual assessment of the structure’s age. Local lay historians and interested community members identified additional structures using the following criteria: 1) any structure dating to the 19th century; and, 2) any structure dating between 1900 and 1920 with recognized historical/architectural appeal.

The structures identified in the 1992 Los Alamos Community Plan (LACP) assessment were revisited during the 2010 Plan Update EIR Initial Study (IS) preparation (County of Santa Barbara Long Range Planning 2008d). The IS used information provided by the Los Alamos Valley Visitors Association that identified 22 structures as potential historical resources. These structures are listed in Table 4.2-1 and shown in Figure 4.2-1 (see page 4.2-5). Of these, only the General Store is designated a State Historical Monument, while the Union Hotel at 346 Bell Street and the California Garage at 362 Bell Street are designated County Historic Landmarks. The significance of the remaining structures has not been assessed. Several of these structures are illustrated in Figures 4.2-2 (page 4.2-7) and 4.2-3 (page 4.2-9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Ferrini Park</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>13. B.F. Whitney</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Depot Motel</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>15. Perkins House</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Railroad Depot</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>16. Community Church</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Union Hotel</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>20. Bell School Site</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Wm. Gewe House</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>22. F. Foxen House</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County of Santa Barbara Long Range Planning 2008d.
In addition to the 22 structures listed above, the 1992 EIR potential historic resources include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Estimated Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>363 Augusta Street</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Ernest A. Robbins residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346 Bell Street</td>
<td>circa 1910</td>
<td>California Bungalow and Water tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349 Bell Street</td>
<td>circa 1880</td>
<td>California Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 Bell Street</td>
<td>circa 1885</td>
<td>Queen Anne residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363 Bell Street</td>
<td>circa 1912</td>
<td>Los Alamos Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380 Bell Street</td>
<td>circa 1910</td>
<td>Javy’s Bell Street Cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448 Bell Street</td>
<td>circa 1930</td>
<td>Commercial building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506 Bell Street</td>
<td>circa 1928</td>
<td>Commercial building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 Bell Street</td>
<td>circa 1920</td>
<td>Commercial building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550 Bell Street</td>
<td>circa 1916</td>
<td>Commercial building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814 Bell Street</td>
<td>circa 1910</td>
<td>California Bungalow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Centennial Street</td>
<td>circa 1890</td>
<td>Vernacular Victorian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253 Centennial Street</td>
<td>circa 1890</td>
<td>Vernacular Victorian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 Centennial Street</td>
<td>circa 1878</td>
<td>C. H. Pearson House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 Centennial Street</td>
<td>circa 1880</td>
<td>Vernacular Victorian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385 Centennial Street</td>
<td>circa 1880</td>
<td>Vernacular Victorian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 Drum Canyon Road</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Los Alamos Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The historical significance of these structures has not been assessed; they are all over 50 years of age.

**Regulatory Setting**

*State*

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 provides criteria for characterizing a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or architectural historic structure, as a “historical resource” (see section 4.2.2 for this list). Section 15064.5 also provides the following criteria for determining a substantial adverse change to the significance of a cultural resource, and the procedures to follow as mandated by Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98 in the event that potential human remains are identified during ground disturbances. It also summarizes direction provided in PRC Section 21082 recommending lead agencies to allow for provisions in the event that historical or unique archaeological resources are accidently discovered during construction.
FIGURE 4.2-1
Historical Resources

Map # | Historical Resource
--- | ---
1 | Leslie House
2 | Ferrini Park
3 | L.A. Men's Club
4 | Depot Motel
5 | Railroad Depot
6 | General Store
7 | Bank/Lariat Bar Flagpole
8 | C.H. Pearson's "Cheap Cash" Store
9 | Union Hotel and California Garage
10 | Victorian House
11 | Wm. Gewe House
12 | Perkins House
13 | B.F. Whitney
14 | Blue Cottage
15 | Perkins House
16 | Community Church
17 | C.H. Pearson House
18 | De La Guerra House
19 | Henry Gewe House
20 | Bell School Site
21 | Crowell House
22 | F. Foxen House

SOURCE: County of Santa Barbara Planning & Development, DigitalGlobe 2008
Photo 1: Union Hotel, 346 Bell Street, Looking Southwest

Photo 2: Los Alamos Market, 405 Bell Street, Looking Northeast
Photo 3: Antique Shop, 363 Bell Street, Looking Northwest

Photo 4: General Store, 458 Bell Street, Looking Southwest
CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 addresses development of mitigation measures related to impacts on significant “historical resources.” This discussion stresses the need to avoid damage to archaeological sites by methods such as project redesign, and/or use of capping soils on top of the resource. Guidance is provided that states mitigation for impacts on architectural historical resources shall be consistent with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings.

County of Santa Barbara

County of Santa Barbara Regulations Governing Archaeological and Historical Projects undertaken in Conformance with CEQA: Cultural Resources Guidelines

The Cultural Resource Guidelines provide a framework for assessing potential impacts on archaeological and historical resources, including acceptable techniques and standards for: Phase 1 Investigations directing at identifying the presence/absence of cultural resources; 2) Phase 2 Investigations directed at assessing the potential significance of cultural resources identified during Phase 1 Investigations; and 3) Phase 3 Investigations directed at mitigating unavoidable impacts on cultural resources. The Guidelines also include an Archaeological Element that outlines a variety of research questions to be applied to the development of Phase 2 and Phase 3 Investigations to assess whether an archaeological resource has the potential to “yield, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.” In addition, an Historic Element provides a context for placing resources within the development of Santa Barbara County history, including “the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military” developments, and provides a series of variables and associated attributes to be evaluated quantitatively to determine the potential importance of the resource identified during a Phase I investigation based on its integrity, age, and association (with historical events, designer, architectural style, construction/materials, traditional lifeways, historical themes, an urban or rural landscape, or the ability to yield important information). To evaluate a resource, each of the above elements is assessed and given a ranking, from ‘l’ through ‘E’, corresponding to the terms little, good, high, and exceptional. Each element is ranked separately. The overall level or threshold of significance is determined by the sum of its individual rankings.
Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (SB County P&D 2008)

The County Thresholds and Guidelines Manual incorporates mandates specified in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4. It also includes significance criteria for evaluating historic architectural resources identified in the County Cultural Resources Guidelines.

Historical Landmarks Advisory Commission

Santa Barbara County Code Chapter 18 establishes the Historical Landmarks Advisory Commission. The purpose of the Historical Landmarks Advisory Commission is to advise the Board of Supervisors regarding the designation of historic sites. The Commission also receives applications for preserving and protecting those places, sites, buildings, structures, works of art and other objects having a special historic or aesthetic character or interest, for the use, education and view of the public and to remind the residents and visitors of the County’s history. The Commission receives applications to investigate and makes subsequent recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on the designation of places, sites, buildings, structures, works of art and other objects within the unincorporated territory of the County as having historic, aesthetic or other special character or interest and being worthy of consideration for protection or enhancement.

4.2.2 Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures

Methodology and Thresholds of Significance

Potential programmatic effects of 2010 Plan Update buildout were assessed relative to the recorded distribution and likelihood for unknown but potentially important historical resources within the Plan Area. This approach considers the understanding of prehistoric archaeological sites that are known to be recorded in close proximity to fresh water drainages, and historic archaeological resources that could be located within the Los Alamos Town core developed between the 1880’s and 1930s.

Significance Criteria

CEQA Guidelines

As defined in CEQA Section 15064.5, the following resources may be considered significant and an “historical resource:”
• A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).

• A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

• Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:

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

The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in a historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.
Santa Barbara County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (SB County P&D 2008) and County Cultural Resources Guidelines

In addition to the significance criteria identified in CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 identified above, the following thresholds are defined for historic architectural resources.

- A significant historical resource must possess integrity of location, design, workmanship, material, and/or setting, and be at least 50 years old or if not, be unique and in possession of extraordinary elements of integrity, design, construction or association.

In addition it must demonstrate 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, 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 important to the community, state, or nation;

4. Embodies elements demonstrating (a) outstanding attention to design, detail, or 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 conveys 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 scholarly studies in the humanities and social sciences.
Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, *Determining the Significance of Impacts to Historical Resources and Unique Archaeological Resources*, has been applied to the 2010 Plan Update to determine whether the associated buildout would have any significant effect on historical resources. According to these criteria, the 2010 Plan Update would result in a significant impact on cultural resources if it causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of a “historical resource” based on the following criteria:

- A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

1. Substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration in the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historic resource would be materially impaired.

2. The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

   (A) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register of Historical Resources; or

   (B) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics [of a historical resource] that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5021.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or its identification in a historical resources survey meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or (C) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

3. Generally, a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the
Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer, shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historical resource.

2010 Plan Update Programs and Policies

Programs

The 2010 Plan Update includes revisions to the Los Alamos Bell Street Design Guidelines. The Design Guidelines would guide projects subject to Design Review by: a) identifying the components that define the character of Bell Street commercial corridor, and b) designing new or remodeled buildings to be compatible with the Town’s western architectural theme. Based on the Bell Street Design Guidelines, specific guidelines were recommended and have been incorporated into the 2010 Plan Update as specific development standards to ensure preservation and protection of historical resources to the maximum extent feasible. (The Bell Street Design Guidelines can be found in Volume II of this document as Appendix C-2).

Policies

The 2010 Plan Update includes new Policy HA-LA-1.1 and incorporates Policy HA-LA-1.2 and revised Action HA-LA-1.2.1 from the 1994 Existing Plan related to Historical Resources. The 2010 Plan Update’s specific policies and action item are listed below and are guided by the Community Plan goal to preserve and protect those historic resources deemed of special significance to the maximum extent feasible.

Policy HA-LA-1.1 Promote historic tourism by identifying and preserving local historic resources.

Policy HA-LA-1.2 Significant cultural, archaeological and historic resources in the Los Alamos Planning Area shall be protected and preserved. Efforts to preserve and enhance historic structures shall be encouraged.

Action HA-LA-1.2.1 The County in cooperation with the County Historical Landmarks Advisory Commission and property owners, shall evaluate existing historic resources within Los Alamos for potential listing as Historic Landmarks or Places of Historic Merit. In considering a potential site, building, place or structure for designation as a Historic Landmark or Place of Historic Merit, the
following criteria shall be considered:

a. It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the County’s cultural, social, economic, political, archaeological, aesthetic, engineering, architectural or natural history;
b. It is identified with persons or events significant in local, state or national history;
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;
d. It is representative of the work of a notable builder, designer, or architect;
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;
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;
g. It embodies element of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation;
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;
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.

Project Impacts

Impact CR-1: Construction in the Plan Area would potentially encroach within unknown buried prehistoric and historic archaeological materials.

The 1992 Los Alamos Community Plan EIR determined the potential for buildout of the Plan Area to impact soils that could contain prehistoric archaeological sites that have been buried by alluvial activity within the San Antonio Creek, Cañada de Calaveras, and Cañada
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de Santa Ynez floodplains. In addition, only approximately 5 percent of the Plan Area has been systematically surveyed by professional archaeologists. Historic-era deposits (trash pits and foundations) related to late 19th and early 20th century development in Los Alamos could also be disturbed. These impacts were considered significant and unavoidable (Class I), as no economically feasible mitigation was available to consistently ensure the professional assessment and, if necessary, mitigation, of unknown prehistoric and historic resources during incremental ministerial buildout. This would be economically infeasible because intensive archaeological surveys would be required on all properties located in areas of high archaeologically sensitivity, and if necessary, subsurface excavations to determine the likelihood of buried prehistoric or historic-era cultural deposits (Extended Phase 1 investigations).

2010 Plan Update buildout would have similar potential effects on archaeological resources, as the area of systematic archaeological survey coverage has not appreciably increased since the completion of the 1994 Existing Plan. Impacts on unknown prehistoric and historic archaeological resources would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures

Existing general environmental review of discretionary projects within the Plan Area includes the provision for a systematic archaeological investigation (both intensive surface survey and potentially subsurface excavations) of areas considered to have the potential to include unknown archaeological resources, such as the San Antonio Creek, Cañada de Calaveras, and Cañada de Santa Ynez floodplains. The application of this intensive review on all potential 2010 Plan Update development, including ministerial permits that would apply to all development less than 15,000 sq. ft in the CM-LA Bell Street Corridor, is procedurally infeasible. Therefore, no additional feasible mitigation to address the potential impact on unknown, subsurface archaeological resources is available.

Residual Impact

The residual impact on archaeological resources from 2010 Plan Update buildout would remain significant and unavoidable (Class I), as no procedurally feasible mitigation to address the potential impact on unknown, subsurface archaeological resources is available.

Impact CR-2: 2010 Plan Update buildout would potentially impact existing residential and commercial structures of historical importance over 50 years old located along the Bell Street corridor and within the remaining areas of the Plan Area.
Buildout under the 2010 Plan Update would allow up to an additional 685 new residential units and 549,515 square feet of new commercial/industrial and public/institutional space, of which 288 residential units and 188,750 square feet of new commercial space would be located within the Bell Street corridor. The proposed CM-LA zone district would lead to increased building density, heights, and increased intensity of use along the Bell Street corridor as part of the infill development proposed under this zoning. As shown on Figure 4.2-1, there are at least thirty-nine (39) structures or public places over 50 years old within the Plan Area, of which more than half are located within the Bell Street corridor.

The 2010 Plan Update includes the advisory *Los Alamos Bell Street Design Guidelines* and *Design Control Overlay* that would encourage all new development within the Bell Street corridor to be consistent with the community’s existing and preferred rural western architectural style. Some design flexibility is included in the Guidelines to encourage innovative designs that would still achieve compatibility with the Western Town Theme. Consistency with the recommended Design Guidelines 2010 Plan Update development standards to preserve, protect, and enhance the historic resources in the Plan Area wherever possible would be addressed during future individual project design review before the Central Board of Architectural Review (CBAR). County permit review processes currently involve the assessment of potential structures over 50 years of age for their significance by a County-qualified historian.

Implementation of the 2010 Plan Update’s Historical Resources Goals, Policies, and Actions, and compliance with the County’s existing and proposed amendments to the County of Santa Barbara Land Use and Development Code (LUDC), including the revised Bell Street Design Guidelines and incorporation of the following measures and measures included in Section 4.1 Land Use and Planning, would further minimize potential impacts to historical resources through continued preservation and protection of the historical resources in the Town of Los Alamos.

Though 2010 Plan Update polices recommend and encourage preservation of the Town’s historic character, the 2010 Plan Update buildout’s change in commercial intensity could result in the demolition or alteration of structures of potential historical importance over 50 years old, resulting in the loss of their historic integrity. This could happen through demolition or alteration of existing structures, or during construction of new structures, roads, paths, and public infrastructure such as utility pipelines. Depending on their location, historic resources could be altered or demolished in order to accommodate new development under the 2010 Plan Update. In other cases, if potentially significant structures would be preserved, the intensification of new commercial development in and
around the older structures exceeding 50 years of age would potentially impair the visual context of the historic Town character along the Bell Street corridor. These potential impacts would represent a significant impact on historical resources.

In addition, new development allowed under the 2010 Plan Update within areas of the community not subject to the Bell Street Design Guidelines and Design Control Overlay would potentially result in significant impacts on known or unknown historical resources in the Plan Area.

**Mitigation Measures**

The 2010 Plan Update Policy HA-LA-1.2 shall be revised as follows (underlined text) to reduce potentially significant impacts on historic resources.

**MM CR-1**  
*Policy HA-LA-1.2* Significant cultural, archaeological and historic resources in the Los Alamos Planning Area shall be protected and preserved. Efforts to preserve and enhance historic structures shall be encouraged.

a. New development shall preserve and or restore the character-defining features of significant historic resources, in particular, the façade of significant historic structures visible from Bell Street, unless shown to be technically infeasible. The project applicant shall retain a County-qualified architectural historian to collaborate in designing the proposed adaptive reuse of structures that are to be renovated to maximize the integration of new architectural elements with those historical character-defining features.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** An assessment of historic structure proposed architectural design shall be prepared by a County-qualified architectural historian, and provided with the project application for CBAR consideration. The assessment shall be reviewed and approved prior to issuance of zoning clearance for development.

**MONITORING:** County Permit Compliance shall ensure compliance with approved plans in the field.
Residual Impacts

Implementation of existing County procedures for evaluating potential impacts on structures over 50 years of age, the Bell Street Design Guidelines, and 2010 Plan Update Plan Historical Resources Goals and Policies as revised in MM CR-1 would reduce the potential for 2010 Plan Update buildout to alter the historic character of Los Alamos. The intent of the 2010 Plan Update Policy HA-LA-1.2 is to encourage preservation of historic structures. It is reasonable to assume, however, that economic and technological factors would not always allow for the potentially costly preservation and/or rehabilitation of historic structures within the Plan Area, particularly in the CM-LA overlay corridor. These actions commonly require structural stabilization and upgrades to current building code requirements that can financially discourage their implementation. This could particularly result where considerations of economies of scale relative to CM-LA mixed use residential/commercial development would apply. Therefore, the demolition and or removal of character-defining features from a number of historic structures along the Bell Street Corridor resulting from 2010 Plan Update buildout is reasonably foreseeable. The 2010 Plan Update buildout adjacent to the historic resources would also affect the overall character of the existing historic Town streetscape in the CM-LA overlay corridor. Therefore, the 2010 Plan Update buildout’s residual impact on historic resources would be potentially significant and unavoidable (Class I).

4.2.3 Cumulative Impacts

Archaeological Resources

Area of Influence: The area of influence for evaluating cumulative impacts on archaeological resources extends throughout the area that was prehistorically occupied by the Purisimeño Chumash. This area identified in the 1992 Los Alamos Community Plan EIR (Santa Barbara County P&D 1992) extended from near Point Conception in the south to Santa Maria Valley in the north, and inland from the coastline to a boundary just east of Los Alamos. Archaeological sites in this Area of Influence potentially share similar characteristics of populations who were last to inhabit the land before Missionization in the late 18th century. It is important to recognize, however, that prehistoric archaeological sites in the Area of Influence are components of a larger cultural interaction sphere that extended throughout northern Santa Barbara County, north of the Santa Ynez Mountains.

Development in the Area of Influence, like that in Santa Barbara County, is considered to have resulted in the destruction of over 90 percent of all prehistoric and historic archaeological sites in the area. Within the Area of Influence, this has resulted from
urbanization in Orcutt, Santa Maria, military installations on Vandenberg Air Force Base, and agricultural land modifications. This has resulted from the simple fact that desirable locations for modern development are based on similar environmental factors that prehistoric populations favored. These past related projects within the Area of Influence have resulted in significant cumulative impacts on archaeological resources.

Development within the Los Alamos Valley outside of the Plan Area is anticipated to grow at an approximate 3 percent annual rate (SBCAG 2007). This suggests that additional disturbance to archaeological resources would potentially occur. Examples of this type of development, including agricultural-dependent manufacturing (i.e., wineries, greenhouses, etc.) and residential land divisions are identified in Appendix D and Figure D-1 (Projects 4, 5, and 9) along drainages and landforms that have a high likelihood to include unknown archaeological sites. County and Federal (on Vandenberg Air Force Base) permit review processes would be applied to minimize the potential effects on important archaeological resources within the Area of Influence. The ability to completely avoid impacts on all archaeological sites through project redesign or specifications is unlikely, given competing objectives for achieving return of investments on undeveloped properties and potential constraints on site size. Therefore, related future development in the Area of Influence is considered to have a potentially significant cumulative impact on archaeological resources.

The 2010 Plan Update buildout includes 685 residential units and 549,515 square feet of non-residential development. Future development close to San Antonio Creek, Cañada de Calaveras, and Cañada de Santa Ynez would have the highest potential for impacting unknown, buried prehistoric archaeological sites. Buildout within the CMLA corridor, in the historic Los Alamos town core, would have the highest potential to impact unknown historic archaeological resources dating from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Given the relatively small area within the Plan Area that has been systematically investigated for archaeological resources (approximately 5 percent), the potential for 2010 Plan Update buildout to impact unknown subsurface archaeological resources is considered potentially significant. The cumulative impact on archaeological resources resulting from related projects outside of the Plan Area along with 2010 Plan Update buildout is therefore considered potentially significant, and the 2010 Plan Update’s potential contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.

**Mitigation Measures**

The 2010 Plan Update Policy HA-LA-1.2 as revised by measure MM CR-1, requires that significant cultural, archaeological, and historic resources in the Los Alamos Planning Area be protected. Existing County permitting standards ensure that discretionary projects
located within areas where there is a high likelihood of archaeological site location be systematically evaluated. This would not, however, apply to ministerial projects including proposed development less than 15,000 sq. ft. in the CM-LA Bell Street Corridor.

**Residual Impacts**

2010 Plan Update buildout would include a substantial number of ministerial projects that would be located throughout the Plan Area in proximity to San Antonio Creek, Cañada de Calaveras, Cañada de Santa Ynez, and within the historic Los Alamos town core. It is reasonable to assume that a number of these projects would have the potential to impact unknown prehistoric and historic archaeological resources. These unknown resources would not be subject to the provisions of Policy HA-LA-1.2. Therefore, the residual 2010 Plan Update buildout’s residual contribution to cumulative impacts on archaeological resources would be *cumulatively considerable* (Class I).

**Historical Resources**

**Area of Influence:** The Area of Influence for considering cumulative impacts on historic architectural resources is the historic landscape within which the town of Los Alamos was established and developed: Rancho Los Alamos, the 48,000 acre rancho occupying the western half of the Los Alamos Valley. This area contains the urbanized town of Los Alamos, along with the rural historic landscapes that reflect the agricultural development of the area subsequent to American settlement.

Development in the Area of Influence outside of the Plan Area has resulted in changes and or removal of many vernacular ranch structures including barns, stables, and outbuildings that reflect the agricultural activities in the area. Increasing development of rangeland and row crops to wine grapes has reduced the need for these often antiquated structures, resulting in their incremental removal. These past related projects within the Area of Influence have resulted in *significant cumulative impacts on historical resources*.

Development within the Los Alamos Valley outside of the Plan Area is anticipated to grow at an approximate 3 percent annual rate (SBCAG 2007). This suggests that additional potential for removal of historic resources would potentially occur. County permit review processes that involve the assessment of potential structures over 50 years of age for their significance by a County-qualified historian would be applied to minimize the potential effects on potentially important historical resources. The ability to completely avoid impacts on all historic architectural sites through project redesign is unlikely, given competing objectives for achieving return of investments on undeveloped properties and
potential constraints on site size. Therefore, related future development in the Area of Influence is considered to have a potentially significant cumulative impact on historical resources.

The 2010 Plan Update buildout includes 685 residential units and 549,515 square feet of non-residential development. Development within the CMLA corridor, within the historic Los Alamos town core, would have the highest potential to impact important historic architectural resources dating from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. As stated in Impact CR-2, the demolition and/or removal of character-defining features from a number of historic structures along the Bell Street Corridor (and those that may become potentially significant as they increase over 50 years of age) resulting from 2010 Plan Update buildout is reasonably foreseeable. Potential impacts associated with discretionary projects would be addressed on a case-by-case basis, and implementation of existing County historical review procedures would strive to ensure that the significance of historic resources would be properly assessed and addressed as development occurs. As stated in Impact CR-2, it is reasonable to assume that economic and technological factors would not always allow for the preservation and/or rehabilitation of historic structures within the Plan Area, particularly in the CMLA overlay corridor. Therefore, the potential for 2010 Plan Update buildout to impact important historical resources is considered potentially significant.

The combination of related projects outside of the Plan Area along with 2010 Plan Update buildout cumulative impact important historic architectural resources is therefore considered potentially significant, and the 2010 Plan Update’s potential contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measures

The 2010 Plan Update’s contribution to cumulative impacts on historic resources would be minimized by the Bell Street Design Guidelines and the 2010 Plan Update Historical Resources Goals, as revised in measure MM CR-1.

Residual Impacts

As explained in Impact CR-2, it is reasonable to assume that economic and technological factors would not always allow for the potentially costly preservation and/or rehabilitation of historic structures within the Plan Area, particularly in the CMLA overlay corridor. Therefore, the residual Plan Area buildout contribution to cumulative impact on historic resources would be cumulatively considerable (Class I).
4.2.4 Residual Impacts

Implementation of the Plan Area policies, development standards, and measure MM CR-1 would reduce the 2010 Plan Update’s project-specific impact on historical resources, but impacts on prehistoric and historic resources would remain significant and unavoidable (Class I). Implementation of the 2010 Plan Update’s policies and development standards as revised and augmented by measure MM CR-1 would minimize the 2010 Plan Update’s contribution to cumulative impacts on prehistoric and historic resources, but residual contributions would remain cumulatively considerable (Class I).