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Executive Summary

The following summarizes the findings of the “Assessment of Historic Resources for the Community of Glen Ellen” study. Painter Preservation & Planning was commissioned to undertake this study in 2013 by the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department Historic Landmarks Commission. The scope of the study was to conduct a survey of the properties adjacent to Arnold Drive and develop a brief historic context for the town of Glen Ellen, in order to re-assess its potential as a historic district. The Arnold Drive corridor, which includes most of the identified historic properties in Glen Ellen, is a sub-set of the larger district that was adopted by the Commission in 1990 as a historic district, but never implemented. It is the corridor that is the subject of this study.

Of the approximately 560 properties in the Glen Ellen Historic District, about 114 properties are located along Arnold Drive, noted as Subarea I in the 1990 Glen Ellen Development and Design Guidelines. Of these properties, thirteen are vacant.1 Seventy-one (71) Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR 523) forms were prepared for the corridor, for 63 properties.2 The properties were considered Contributing if they were over 50 years of age and retained integrity. No attempt was made to establish Areas of Significance or a Period of Significance for the corridor, as this was beyond the scope of work for this project. Of these 63 properties, 38, or approximately 33%, are considered contributing, based solely on age and integrity.

The survey showed that roughly one-third (33%) of the properties were contributing to a potential district; that is, they were over 50 years of age and retained integrity. Roughly another third (33%) were “Out of Period” properties, meaning they were not over 50 years of age. And about one-third (33%) were non-contributing, meaning that they were over 50 years of age but lacked integrity, or were vacant. Discounting the vacant properties, the ratio of contributing to non-contributing properties are: Contributing 38%; Non-contributing 25%; and Out of Period 38%. This may also be seen in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLEN ELLEN SURVEY SUMMARY</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Properties in District</td>
<td>558+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties in Corridor</td>
<td>114+</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing properties</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contributing properties</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of period properties</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant properties</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A historic district is defined as an area that "possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development."3 A general rule of thumb is that an area must possess about 60% contributing properties to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Local registers, administered by local governments, may adopt historic districts based on their own ordinances or practices. Taking into consideration the fact that a number of properties in Glen

---

1 Note that two of these properties are parking lots associated with specific businesses.
2 Note that DPR forms were not prepared for the two bridges in the corridor, both of which are historic and are already listed as Sonoma County Landmarks. DPR forms were not prepared for vacant properties or properties that were not 50 years of age. Note that many properties have multiple structures on them. Separate DPR forms were used for recording some of these structures.
Ellen include several buildings, a decision on whether or not a historic district is present should not be made should be based on solely on the numbers, but on the presence of a concentration of properties that relate to the Area(s) of Significance and Period(s) of Significance adopted for the district. In other words, a decision should be made based on the presence of a concentration of properties that successfully tell Glen Ellen’s story.

Note that the numbers in the above table are slightly misleading, in that along this corridor several properties (a property being one parcel with one APN number) have multiple buildings on them, representing more than one period of development. For example, the property on which the Glen Ellen Inn is located also includes the Glen Ellen Grill, The Fig Café, a dentist’s office, a veterinary hospital, the Glen Ellen Grocery, the Glen Ellen Post Office, and Allen Real Estate, whose dates of development range from about 1880 to 1962. Note also that some of these buildings are co-joined, further challenging recordation and a determination of historic significance. For example, the ca 1930 veterinary hospital would be a contributing resource, but for the fact that it is attached to the non-contributing dentist’s office and The Fig Café.

Another challenge in Glen Ellen is that in the 1990 study, properties along Arnold Drive were treated equally, but in fact there are dramatic differences in the properties along the corridor from a physical point of view. There are topographical differences along the corridor, with some properties not accessible from Arnold Drive for that reason. Similarly, other properties are non-developable due to the presence of Sonoma and Calabazas Creeks.

Glen Ellen includes three separate and distinct areas of commercial development. This was true historically, and remains the case today. The two northerly centers would be contiguous but for their separation by Sonoma and Calabazas Creeks and the bridge over the creeks. The southerly center, which is about a half mile south of Glen Ellen proper, has developed around Jack London Village. It is historically connected to the town and considered here another commercial node within the town. Residential uses are still mixed in among the commercial businesses in Glen Ellen, and some residences having been converted to businesses over time. Note that the two land use designations that occur along the corridor are “Urban Residential” and “Limited Commercial,” which generally reflects the conditions on the ground. Again, the 1990 study treats the corridor as a uniform entity, but in fact it is made up of commercial centers, numerous residential properties, and disparate topographical and other physical conditions.

Next Steps
This study was not meant to be conclusive, as it was intended to be a small, pilot project that defined how the larger district should be approached, based on previously adopted boundaries and subareas. Accordingly, the following are recommendations from this first phase of assessing Glen Ellen’s potential as a historic district.

- If a historic district or another type of district is desired in Glen Ellen, a determination will have to be made as to what types of uses should be included in the district, and what the geographic boundaries will be. It makes sense to relate the geographic boundaries of the district to the uses that are to be regulated within it. For example, the Glen Ellen Community Church and Mayflower Hall are important historic buildings and an important part of public life in Glen Ellen, yet were not included in the Arnold Drive corridor (Subarea I). It makes sense for the boundaries of the corridor to be drawn considering viewsheds from Arnold Drive, as well as the commercial and institutional properties within it. So a first step would be to determine what types of uses should occur, or primarily occur, within the district, and draw the boundaries of the district taking into consideration uses, topography, viewsheds, developable land, the presence of historic structures, and related factors.

- A decision will have to be made as to whether it makes sense to include individual single family homes that are located in the hills surrounding Glen Ellen in the district, as they are now. And a decision will have to be made as to whether these uses would be regulated the same way that the commercial uses are.
• If a historic district is desirable, best practices are to develop historic district design guidelines that are consistent with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards and provide additional detail that is tailored to the character of the district. If a property is deemed historic under the auspices of the California Environmental Quality Act, changes to the building must be consistent with these standards, so it streamlines regulations to have historic district design guidelines that are consistent with these standards. A good example is the present historic district design guidelines for the town of Bodega.

• If a historic district is desirable, boundaries should be drawn the relate most closely to the Period(s) of Significance and Area(s) of Significance chosen for the district. This should relate to what is considered most valuable, historically and architecturally, in the district. For example, consideration should be made as to whether the Glen Ellen Grocery should be considered historic. It is over 50 years of age, having been constructed in 1962, in a style that is a good example of its type. It is a commercial building with Ranch style elements, which may have been chosen to fit in with the prevailing residential types in the village as a whole. It is also an important use in the area.

• Another possibility in Glen Ellen is to protect historically and architecturally significant historic buildings and structures by nominating them individually as Sonoma County Landmarks, and to govern the remainder of the corridor or district with general design guidelines, which is essentially how the district is regulated today. However, any design guidelines should, to the extent possible, speak to the desired character of the area. Even if the desired character is to not stipulate architectural design per se, but speak to the desired urban design qualities in the commercial center (which is essentially how the guidelines are currently crafted), this should be clear. The guidelines in place today are somewhat outdated.
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I. Introduction

Purpose of Study
In 1990, the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors adopted the Glen Ellen Development and Design Guidelines with Ordinance No. 4297. Although frequently referred to as a Historic District, Glen Ellen was never officially zoned as such. Nonetheless, for the sake of discussion, it is referred to as District in this document. The District encompasses development along all the major roads that radiate out from the center of Glen Ellen, where Arnold Drive crosses Sonoma Creek, for a total of about 560 properties (see Figure 3). The Design Guidelines built on previous work developed in conjunction with the Glen Ellen Town Plan of 1988, sponsored by the Glen Ellen Association and undertaken by Walter Hood and Matt Taecker of the University of California, Berkeley. The Glen Ellen: Development and Design Guidelines were prepared by J. Kapolchok & Associates, Land Use Planners.

Despite this promising beginning, the District has not been administered as a historic district. Most of the design guidelines pertain to the design and use of public space, and only two guidelines address historic preservation:

• Distinguishing architectural features presently covered or in disrepair should be restored as much as possible; and
• Buildings, features and artifacts that are reminiscent of Glen Ellen’s past should be retained where possible. Special attention should not be drawn to them; however they should remain as reminder’s of the community’s history.

These policies are ambiguous and do not give adequate direction for administering a historic district. Slightly more direction was given in the section, “Building Materials and Construction,” but again, the design guidelines are primarily oriented toward urban design, rather than the architectural design of buildings per se.

The purpose of this document is to evaluate the core of the Glen Ellen district, essentially the properties on either side of Arnold Drive south of Highway 12 to the southern boundary at Jack London Village, for their potential as a historic district today, and provide additional recommendations for future actions to more effectively manage Glen Ellen’s historic properties.

Survey Boundaries
The boundaries of the survey area were the same as those established in the 1990 Glen Ellen “Development and Design Guidelines,” which are the properties to either side of Arnold Drive from south of Highway 12 to Jack London Village. The survey area is referred to as Subarea I in this same report. See Figure 4 for a map of the survey area.

---

4 Note that in local government in general, there are many kinds of districts – design districts, historic districts, and conservation districts, among others.
Research Design
The properties within the survey area represent a sub-set of the approximately 560 properties in the Glen Ellen Historic District. They represent the properties along the Arnold Drive corridor that were identified in the 1990 study of Glen Ellen as “Subarea I.” Basic information on the properties, such as the address and Assessor Parcel Number, was provided by Sonoma County PRMD. A reconnaissance level survey was conducted in the field, and the properties checked against PRMD’s mapping program and permit history records. Development of the survey report included the results of this survey, primary and secondary research, and interviews with those knowledgeable about Glen Ellen history.

Field Methods
The properties in the survey area were surveyed on April 1 and 2, 2013. Photographs were taken of all properties in the survey area and basic data recorded on field forms, although properties were only recorded on Department of Parks and Recreation Forms (DPR 523 forms) if they were over 50 years of age. Seventy-one survey forms were prepared for the 114 properties in the survey area.

Previous Surveys
Numerous properties in Glen Ellen have been the subject of surveys and inventories in the past, including the 1973 survey of historic resources conducted by Sonoma County Parks and Recreation Department, and the 1978 survey of historic properties undertaken by the Sonoma League for Historic Preservation. The League conducted an additional survey in 1990, updated in 1998. Eight properties in the Glen Ellen survey area are listed as Sonoma County Landmarks. See Appendix A for more information.

Evaluator Qualifications
Diana J. Painter, principal of Painter Preservation & Planning, undertook this survey of historic resources along Arnold Drive in Glen Ellen and developed the historic context for the study. She was assisted by Rebecca Grossman-Kahn and Robin Fies, both of San Francisco. Painter’s qualifications meet the Secretary of Interior’s Standards professional standards as defined in the Code of Federal Regulations, 36 CFR Part 61 for architectural history and history. Painter Preservation & Planning has been undertaking reconnaissance level and intensive level surveys; drafting historic district design guidelines; and conducting design review of historic properties for compliance with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards in Sonoma County since she founded her firm in 2002. She holds a PhD in Architecture and a Masters Degree in Urban Planning/Urban Design and has 30 years of professional experience in historic preservation and urban design. Painter Preservation & Planning is based in Sonoma, California and Salem, Oregon and is listed in the roster of consultants on file with the State of California Office of Historic Preservation’s Eastern Information Center at the University of California, Riverside.
II. Historic Context

**Early Settlement – 1839-1880**

Settlement of the Sonoma Valley began when Mission San Francisco Solano, the last and furthest north of the missions, was established by Father Altamira in Sonoma, at the northeast corner of Sonoma Plaza. Shortly before secularization of the missions, which occurred in 1834, Mexican Governor Jose Figueroa chose Sonoma Valley for settlement and assigned the task to General Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo, who received vast grants of land in return for his services. Vallejo established the Pueblo de Sonoma next to the mission and proceeded to encourage settlement by awarding large land grants throughout what is now Marin and Sonoma Counties to prospective settlers.5

In 1839 General Vallejo established a sawmill at the confluence of Asbury and Calabazas Creeks about one half mile south of where Glen Ellen proper is today. This marked the beginning of Glen Ellen, but it would be several decades before the small town took the form that it exhibits today.

Glen Ellen is named after the wife of early Sonoma Valley settler Charles V. Stuart, who came to California in 1849 and settled in the Glen Ellen area about 1869, where he “began one of the earliest essays at viticulture in Sonoma County.”6 Glen Ellen in fact got its start in the vicinity of Stuart’s ranch (see Figure 5). Stuart named his ranch Glen Ellen, a name that was also given to the post office, which was originally just north of his ranch on Captain Justi’s property, also on Dunbar Road. The post office eventually moved south to what is now the Glen Ellen townsite and Stuart renamed his ranch Glen Oaks to avoid confusion. Both the town and the ranch still hold these names today.

One of earliest histories that mentions Glen Ellen and the surrounding countryside was written by Charles A. Menefee in 1873. At this time Menefee was writing a history of the four counties of Napa, Sonoma, Lake and Mendocino. He called Sonoma, “one of the most important and interesting counties in the State.”7 He recounted the history of the town of Sonoma, discussing its importance before California became a state, but noted that after the county seat moved to Santa Rosa, the town languished. He continues: “But this stagnation only belongs to the town, the valley [Sonoma Valley] is quite different. It is now probably one of the finest vineyard sections in the state.”8 At this time Sonoma Valley was additionally known for its wheat crops, as was the entire county. Sonoma Valley would continue to be the most important center in Sonoma County for wine production.

The 1874 *Hand-Book and Directory of Napa, Lake, Sonoma and Mendocino Counties* also provides insight into early Glen Ellen at the time. This directory lists just seventeen residents.

---

6 He had purchased property in Sonoma Valley about 1851, however (*An Illustrated History of Sonoma County, California*, 1889:431).
7 Menefee, 1873 (p. 163 in 1993 reprint).
8 Menefee, 1873 (p. 167 in 1993 reprint).
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associated with the Glen Ellen post office. The listed residents were primarily farmers and vintners, and included the proprietor of the Half-Way House on Santa Rosa Road; Joshua Chauvet (who lists his residence as in Sonoma); Captain Charles Justi, the postmaster, who lived in the Justi Adobe on Dunbar Road; J. A. Poppe, whose place of business at this time was on the east side of the Plaza in Sonoma; and vintners C. V. Stuart, Dr. J. B. Warfield, and J. A. Williams. A map showing land ownership patterns in the vicinity of Glen Ellen at this time can be seen in Thompson’s 1877 Atlas of Sonoma County (see Figure 5).

Prefacing the Directory, the author L. L. Paulson describes his trip through Sonoma County in, “A General Description of Sonoma County, Incidents of Travel, Adventures, Etc.” He first arrived at the small community of Donahue by steamer from San Francisco, and records his impressions there. At the time of his trip there were 20,476 people living in Sonoma County. It was agriculturally rich, and its populace was considered well educated, due in part to the 102 schools throughout the county. Like the earlier author, he first described the town of Sonoma. Traveling from Sonoma to Santa Rosa by stage, along what would be roughly the route of Highway 12 today, east of Sonoma Creek, the author notes the farms of the Carriger brothers and William Hill, among others: “On all sides are elegant residences, surrounded by shade trees, fruit trees, vines and flower gardens . . . They all have large vineyards, fruit orchards and flower gardens; their places are kept in excellent order, and are among the most beautiful we have seen in our travels. Here we see growing side by side in the open air, oranges, apples, almonds, plums, figs, cherries, and other tropical and semi-tropical fruit . . . The vineyards contain almost every quality of grapes, from the finest imported to the more common Mission variety.”

Glen Ellen got less press, however: “. . . a two house town, where the post office and the necessary saloon are under the same roof with a shoemaker shop (doing a good business?) next door; on we pass more vineyards, more vineyards and vineyards again, having seen but very few grain fields since leaving Sonoma, and come to the farm of William Hood . . .”

Historian J. P. Munro-Fraser devoted just one paragraph to the young Glen Ellen in his 1880 history of Sonoma County. He noted the location of Captain Justi’s Glen Ellen post office (on what is Dunbar Road today, noting that Glen Ellen was “. . . only a mail stop, but is surrounded by some of the most experienced wine growers in the county . . . A radius of six miles, with Glen Ellen for a center, would, in the opinion of many, include the finest grape-growing section in the State of California.” This is no less true today than it was in 1880.

**Glen Ellen is Established – 1881-1918**

Twenty years later, by the turn of the century, Glen Ellen was established in its present location. The San Francisco & Northwestern Pacific Railroad (S.F. & N.P.R.R.) had arrived in Glen Ellen in 1881 and could now be used to transport wine, as well as the region’s other agricultural products. J. C. Chauvet built his stone winery building south of the city in 1881 as well. The 1899 Sanborn Fire Insurance map shows that at that time two hotels and a grocery were located across the street from the depot for the S.F. & N.P.R.R., among which are scattered residences, north of the bridge across Sonoma Creek. South of the bridge is a cluster of buildings that are not the same buildings that would be there by 1905-1906, but nonetheless represent the same uses, including two general merchandise stores, a hotel, and a saloon, as well as residences. J. C. Chauvet owned the winery south of town by this time, which included the substantial stone winery building, used for fermenting and storage, with scales and the crusher on the south end, a cooper and hay storage building to the south, and a distillery at the far south end of the parcel.

---

9 Note that the Glen Ellen post office at this time was still on Captain Justi’s property on Dunbar Road.
10 Donahue was a small community south of Lakeville on Petaluma Creek (Petaluma River today).
11 Paulson, 1874:87.
12 Paulson, 1874:88.
13 Paulson, 1874:88. The Hood Mansion was and is in Los Guilicos.
14 Munro-Fraser, 1880:30.
In addition to facilitating the export of wine and other products, the railroad also brought visitors to the region. The 1898 Reynolds and Proctor Atlas of Sonoma County featured two properties in Glen Ellen, Dr. C. C. O’Donnell’s Mineral Springs, “The Largest and Most Picturesque Pleasure and Health Resort in California,” which was located on a 103-acre property north of Glen Ellen on what is now O’Donnell Lane (see Figure 6), and the White Leghorn Poultry Farm of C. H. W. Bruning, four miles west of town. It introduced Glen Ellen as being “. . . one of the loveliest spots in all the county – and that is saying a great deal.” The resort, which consisted of 30 cottages, among other facilities, was described as follows: “At Glen Ellen there are fine mineral springs which have proved by analysis to be the greatest remedy for liver, stomach and bladder complaints, rheumatism, cataract and lung troubles. These springs are forty-six miles from San Francisco, to which there are four daily trains, via S. F. & N. P. R. Company. Realizing what the utilizing of these springs will do for mankind, Dr. O’Donnell has expended large sums of money in laying out the grounds, making roads, buildings, cottages, etc. The cottages all have from three to ten rooms. They are all named.”\(^{15}\) The Glen Ellen Community Church, still extant, was in place here, and the resort boasted fresh, local produce and meat. In short, “The climate is unsurpassed. Elegant bathing, fishing and game abundant, and here all those seeking rest and health, or pleasure, can find a spot that will meet their wants which all can easily bear and in all an ideal summer and winter resort.”\(^{16}\)

The Sonoma Home for the Care and Training of the Feeble Minded, which was 1670 acres in size at this time, was in place just south of Glen Ellen and provided a steady source of employment for local residents.\(^{17}\) The 1898 map of Glen Ellen, as seen in Proctor and Reynolds Atlas, shows both rail stations in place (see Figure 7). The S.F. & N.W.P.R.R. station was east of Sonoma Creek and directly west of what is Arnold Drive (about where the parking lot for the Glen Ellen Inn is). The town was made up of several small centers, as it is today. North of Carquinez Avenue, where it meets Glen Ellen Avenue (Arnold Drive today), was Gibson’s Addition. West of the Addition and Glen Ellen Avenue was the depot for the S. F. & N.W.R.R. East of the Addition, on what is Railroad Avenue today, was the Southern Pacific Railroad Depot.\(^{18}\) North of where the Southern Pacific track turned east before continuing to Santa Rosa was “North Glen Ellen,” an area occupied by the properties along Riddle Road today. Southwest of the confluence of Sonoma and Calabazas Creeks, the heart of Glen Ellen, was Chauvet’s Addition, which was served by Carquinez Street (Arnold Drive today), Chauvet Avenue, and Madrone Avenue. The land north of Bennett Street (London Ranch Road today) was owned by Joshua Chauvet. The large land holding between today’s Warm Springs Road and Henno Road was owned by C. C. and Emma O’Donnell and operated as a resort (see above description).

By the end of the first decade of the twentieth century Glen Ellen was quite well established, a result no doubt of the excellent railroad service, among other factors. The 1908 directory notes that Glen Ellen had daily mail, a Western Union telegraph, telephone service, and a Wells, Fargo & Company express.\(^{19}\) The directory also showed that about 140 male residents called Glen Ellen their post office, which was now located in Glen Ellen proper. About 55 of those men referred to themselves as farmers. One was a rancher, one was a vineyardist, and one raised poultry. Five were wine makers, including Henry J. and Joshua Chauvet. The railroads proved good employers. There were four engineers in town, two conductors, two foremen, a baggage master, two brakemen, and one agent. Five teamsters and two blacksmiths catered to the older travel trades. The boom period no doubt attracted members of the building trades as well. There were seven carpenters in town, a brick burner, a clay worker, and a painter. The town boasted five people who worked in or owned general merchandise stores. The service trades were represented by four butchers, six hotel and three saloon owners or workers, one waiter, and two barbers. Other trades people included a shoemaker, a tailor, and a druggist. The professions were

\(^{15}\) Reynolds and Proctor, 1898:47.

\(^{16}\) Reynolds and Proctor, 1898:47.

\(^{17}\) U.S. Census, 1910. The facility, still in place, is today called the Sonoma Developmental Center.

\(^{18}\) The railroad, which was constructed from Santa Rosa to Napa, had been run by the Northern Railway Company. It became part of the Southern Pacific Railroad in 1898 (Shere, 2012).

\(^{19}\) *California Polk-Husted Directory Co.’s Santa Rosa City and Sonoma County Directory 1908.*
represented by one physician, one veterinarian, a nurse, a lawyer, a journalist, and a teacher. The town was served by one mailman and two firemen. In short, Glen Ellen had a full component of services necessary for any small town and center for surrounding agriculturalists. Its most substantial masonry buildings were in place, including the Hotel Chauvet (1906), Poppe Building (1906), Chauvet Building (1905) and Chauvet’s winery south of town (1881), as well as the J. Chauvet House (1906), the H. J. Chauvet House (ca 1880), and the Gaige House (ca 1890) (note that these two latter buildings are wood frame). And although there were not many residences in town, the town provided employment for a substantial number of people.

Prohibition to a New World War - 1919-1940
By 1910 the state of California was producing over forty-five million gallons of wine, as well as exporting wine to Europe, and in 1918 the powerful California Wine Association, headquartered in Contra Costa County, paid its highest dividend. That would shortly change, however. National Prohibition became law on January 16, 1920, prohibiting the sale of alcohol for any but medicinal or sacramental uses. In California as a whole, the number of wineries went from approximately 700 in 1920, to 140 by the time prohibition was repealed in 1933. But in Sonoma County the number of acres in grapes went from 17,080 in 1919 to 21,496 in 1933, a 4,000-acre total gain of acreage planted in vineyard. Overproduction of grapes for juice and raisins collapsed this market as a whole in the mid-1920s, but Sonoma County was able to maintain its high percentage of wine grape vineyards. While research did not reveal specific information on the impact of Prohibition in Glen Ellen, historian Lynn Downey has written that, “In the Sonoma Valley, many businesses failed, and others barely held on. When repeal finally came in 1933, the damage could be seen all over town: closed wineries, abandoned buildings full of discarded machinery and rotting barrels, and shabby neglected vineyards.”

While the Eighteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibited the "...manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof from, or the exportation thereof to the United States,...," drinking in Sonoma County, particularly at the resorts, still went on behind closed doors. It would appear that the larger, established wineries in the Glen Ellen area were able to withstand Prohibition, whereas many of the smaller, lesser known names suffered. In the month of January 1920, the same month that Prohibition was enacted nationally, the 1920 census was taken in the Glen Ellen Township, which included west and east Glen Ellen, Glen Ellen Village, and Kenwood. The enumerator noted that the following names were still involved in the wine industry: Charles J. Pagani, viticulturist; Rose Pagani, bookkeeper at winery; Leopold Justi, winemaker; Felice Pagani (owner of the old Chauvet Winery), vineyardist and winemaker; and Louis C. Kunde, vineyardist.

In contrast, in the 1910 census of the Glen Ellen Township, the following called themselves farmers/vineyardists: Louis C. Kunde, John B. Valle, Arundel Pagani, Ramiges Abati, Christopher H. Bruning, Richard Pagani, William and Benjamin Bihler, Leopold Justi, Emile Graziani, Attilio Romani, Julius Wegener, Henry J. Chauvet, and Robert Hill. Whether or not the larger wineries bought out some of these smaller growers in these years, explaining the expansion of vineyards as a whole in the Sonoma County Viticultural District, would take additional research.

20 Peninou, 1998:32
23 Peninou, 1998:264
26 Downey, 2013:124.
27 U.S. Census, 1910, Series T624, Roll 109, Pages 150-164.
28 U.S. Census, 1920, Series T625, Roll 150, Pages 105-111. Henry J. Chauvet referred to himself as a landlord at this time.
World War II and Beyond – 1941 to the Present

The United States entered into World War II in December 1941. As explained by historian Lynn Downey in *A Short History of Sonoma*, World War II brought unexpected benefits for local winemakers: “Alcohol was an important raw material for the war effort. The tartaric acid produced as a result of winemaking was a vital component for the production of rayon, used for tents and parachutes.”  

Another by-product used by the war effort was pomace (the skins and seeds left over after pressing), which was used for medicine, paints and cattle feed. New wineries were even established in the war years, a Glen Ellen example being Val-Moon, the new name for the Madrone vineyards, which were purchased by Enrico Parducci and Peter Domenici in 1941. In 1943 Felice Pagani expanded his winery in Glen Ellen by building a new, concrete block winery and experimenting with concrete, rather than steel tanks. Buena Vista Winery, which at that time was not producing wine, was also purchased in the war years, with its first wine released in 1947.

The Sonoma Valley was actively promoting their wines in this time frame. They were featured with other California wines at the 1939 Golden Gate International Exposition at Treasure Island and in March 1941 the Sonoma Valley vinyardists attended a meeting in Santa Rosa with other winemakers that were interested in more actively promoting their wines. In 1944 four newsreel companies traveled to the Sonoma Valley to film the grape harvest. The results were shown in theaters in the United States, South America, and England and at army bases worldwide. And in 1947 the first Valley of the Moon Vintage Festival was held on Sonoma Plaza.
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Changes in the war years are reflected in development in Glen Ellen. While growth in Glen Ellen as a whole was more or less evenly distributed in the decades of the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, by far the largest number of structures built in the corridor (that are still extant) were built in the 1940s, many in 1940. Most of these are residences, and some former residences now serving commercial purposes. This may be attributed to the need for housing for war industry workers at Mare Island and elsewhere, which put a strain on housing stock throughout the Bay Area. For example, historian Mel Scott has noted that 14,000 workers at Mare Island traveled three-to-five hours a day to work in Vallejo, which is 28 miles from Glen Ellen. And the Navy commissioned Pacific Greyhound Lines to bring workers from as far away as Healdsburg.

As seen above, the wine industry continued to grow in the postwar years, regaining its health after the Prohibition. A third factor that may be attributed to growth in Glen Ellen during and after the war years is the fact that the Northwestern Pacific Railroad abandoned its line in Glen Ellen in 1942. The land formerly occupied by rail lines, between Sonoma Creek and Arnold Drive, then became available for development.

As mentioned above, Glen Ellen continued to see steady – primarily residential - development in the postwar years. This was the case throughout the Bay Area and Sonoma County as a whole, as subdivisions, as well as individual lots, were developed for housing for returning soldiers. It was

---

Note that the construction dates for the district have not been corrected, whereas the construction dates for the corridor have, which accounts for some of the differences in numbers between the two. Note that the discrepancy between the number of properties in the corridor identified in the survey and the number of properties in the corridor in this table is due to the fact that the list of properties that tabulated construction dates has more than one entry per property in some cases, more than one building was recorded on some properties. Albrecht, 1995:101. For example, Kaiser Shipyards in Richmond, California employed 4,500 people in the summer of 1941, and 100,000 by the end of 1943. Scott, 1985:249.
common, on the west coast, for soldiers who had been stationed in bases on the west coast to return to those areas after the war. The Bay Area as a whole also saw massive immigration of war workers at Kaiser Shipyards and others defense industries during the war years, and it is likely that many of those people stayed as well. Housing continued to be in high demand. In the Bay Area as a whole, 40,000 building permits for single family homes were issued in 1950, more than half of them in unincorporated areas in the counties. The table above shows that the largest period of growth in Glen Ellen’s history occurred from 1950 to 1959.

Famous Glen Ellen Residents

Another aspect of Glen Ellen that has not been discussed here, but which is certainly an important aspect of its history, is its association with the famous personages and celebrities that have made their homes in the Glen Ellen and vicinity over time. General Vallejo, who in essence settled Sonoma County, built his sawmill in Glen Ellen, which is still extant, although he lived outside Sonoma and in his ranch house outside Petaluma. The most famous Glen Ellen resident would have to be Jack London, who first visited Glen Ellen in 1903 and made his home there in 1906. Historically, many of the first residents of the Glen Ellen area are now ‘famous’ by virtue of the fact that they settled the area and gave their names (and sometimes their buildings) to this area. An example is Charles V. Stuart, who settled in the Glen Ellen area in 1869 and founded Glen Oaks Ranch. Many are famous now for having helped to found the Sonoma Valley’s wine industry, including Joshua and Henry J. Chauvet, Captain J. H. Drummond, and Mrs. Kate F. Warfield, and W. McPherson Hill. Charles J. Poppe lent his name to the building in which he was a long-time merchant and postmaster in Glen Ellen. Others with ‘high profile’ names who lived in the Glen Ellen area include the Rudolf Spreckles, son of Charles Spreckles, the industrialist, and later Rudolf’s sister-in-law Alma Spreckles; George and Phoebe Hearst, of the newspaper family; Henry “Hap” Arnold, a World War II general who is credited with creating the modern U.S. Air Force and who gave his name to one of the most important roads in Sonoma Valley; the food writer M. F. K. Fisher, who lived on the Audubon Bouverie Preserve property in her last years; and David Pleydell Bouverie, the 8th Earl of Radner, a well-known architect in his native England, and founder of the Audubon Bouverie Preserve.
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III. Architectural Context

Location and Setting
Glen Ellen is located approximately eight miles north-northwest of the town of Sonoma, which is in turn located in the southeast portion of Sonoma County, north of San Pablo Bay. Glen Ellen is within the Valley of the Moon, a valley distinguished by the presence of Sonoma Creek, which runs north-south through Sonoma Valley. At the heart of Glen Ellen is the convergence of Sonoma and Calabazas Creeks, which occurs just north of the bridge over Sonoma Creek. The crossing of Sonoma Creek occurs between the north and south commercial centers of the town, dividing the two areas. Sonoma Creek also defines the third commercial center of Glen Ellen, forming the eastern edge of Jack London Village. Jack London Village formed around a sawmill at the confluence of Sonoma and Asbury Creeks established by General Vallejo, which was purchased by Joshua Chauvet in the mid-1850s. The reason for the sawmill was the presence of the creek. The waterwheel for the sawmill – later a grist mill – is still there today. Beyond Glen Ellen are rolling hills and wilderness. The town backs up against Jack London State Park to the west, and Sonoma Valley Regional Park and eventually the Mayacama Mountains to the east.

Patterns of Growth
Within the corridor considered by this study is a broad range of building types and, to a lesser extent, architectural styles. The historic heart of Glen Ellen, signaled by a cluster of its most important historic structures, occurs just west of the crossing of Sonoma Creek. This is marked by the presence of the 1906 Hotel Chauvet, the 1906 Poppe Building, and 1905 Jack London Saloon. But there are other significant historic structures along the corridor as well, from the Grist Mill and H. J. Chauvet house at Jack London Village to the Gaige House, at the center of the northerly node of commercial development in Glen Ellen.

Clearly the first decade of the twentieth century was important for Glen Ellen, but only a handful of extant buildings that reflect that era. There are numerous other more modest, historically significant structures as well, however, from the several intact cottages along the corridor to Marshall’s Auto Body Shop, at the site of a former blacksmith shop.

There are distinctive periods of development in the town as well. The earliest extant building appears to be the 1839 mill, portions of which still exist despite the ca 1860 conversion of the mill to a grist mill and the addition of a second story, as well as numerous later renovations.

The largest periods of growth within the historic district as a whole occurred in the 1940s and 1950s. Growth in the 1940s, which can be seen along the corridor, was the addition of housing and related businesses that supported the war effort, specifically the need for housing for workers at Mare Island and other World War II industry sites. More recent development includes residences and commercial/institutional buildings from the 1960s, including the Glen Ellen Post Office and Glen Ellen Grocery, and residences and commercial buildings from the 1970s, including a cluster of 1970s residences south of Glen Ellen, and the Jack London Lodge (1978). Another small spurt of development occurred in the 1980s.
Architectural Styles and Building Types
The character of the larger Glen Ellen district, which is largely residential, differs from the character of development along the corridor, not only because the corridor contains most of the commercial development, but also because more postwar residential development occurred in the outlying areas, including the largest period of growth in the decade of the 1950s, followed by another period of growth in the 1960s. Within the corridor, by far the largest period of growth represented by extant buildings today occurred in the 1940s. About 20% of the properties include at least one building from this era.

The commercial corridor within Glen Ellen is characterized by relatively modest architecture, even among the most distinguished buildings. The Hotel Chauvet and Jack London Saloon are both examples of vernacular commercial buildings, distinguished by their segmental arched window openings with modest label molding and Victorian-era details. Two Victorian-era houses reflect the high period of the Queen Anne as it occurred in Sonoma Valley, the Gage House and the J. H. Chauvet House, although some detailing and features of both of these buildings have been altered.

Building styles and types from other eras reflect fairly typical versions of their types, including early twentieth century hip roof bungalows, commercial buildings, ca 1940s Minimal Traditional houses, modest Ranch houses, and residential buildings or residential-like buildings that contain commercial businesses. A few buildings are constructed to emulate earlier styles or types, from a Western Falsefront to a “new” Victorian residence. All these factors contribute to the eclectic character of Glen Ellen’s commercial core.

Summary
It is possible to define a historic district or to identify historic properties in Glen Ellen, in general, using following the guidelines. A building or structure may be a historic resource if it is over 50 years of age, generally speaking; it meets one of more of the following criteria; and it retains integrity.

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

Properties in Glen Ellen may be eligible for listing in a historic register individually or as a district if they maintain an association with the important themes outlined in the historic context. Themes include Glen Ellen’s development as a resort community, properties associated with the railroad, and properties associated with the wine industry. Additional themes, however, might be the development of the town in general, or its development at a specific period in time. There is no sizable concentration of properties associated with specific period, but individual properties, such as the Glen Ellen Community Church, could be eligible under this criterion. Additionally, a historic district could be defined very broadly. That is, Glen Ellen could be defined as a small agricultural center that from its founding, that operated as a market center for the surrounding vineyardists, with a Period of Significance from its founding to 1963. This definition would focus on the commercial nodes, rather than the outlying residential neighborhoods.

Criteria 2:
2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history;

Properties associated with ‘famous’ people or with people with a strong association with Glen Ellen’s history may also be eligible for listing in historic register. For properties

For a building or collection of buildings less than 50 years of age, it typically has to demonstrate “exceptional” significance to be eligible for listing.
that may be eligible under this criteria, the property must maintain integrity from the
time it was associated with the person under discussion and in many cases, must be the
property with the strongest association with that person. The buildings associated with
Joshua Chauvet would meet this criterion.

Criteria 3:
3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of
construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values;

Properties in Glen Ellen may be eligible for listing in a register if they represent a good
example of a particular architectural style, since 'high-style' architecture is relatively
rare in Glen Ellen, and the examples that exist are often singular in the town. Properties
may also represent a good example of a type, however. The wide range of styles and
types in Glen Ellen make nomination of a district associated with a specific architectural
style or building type less likely here.

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

This Criterion most commonly applies to archaeological properties and is not as relevant
to evaluating buildings or structures.

In addition to meeting one or more of the above criteria, properties must retain integrity in order
to be eligible for listing in the California or another register. Integrity is a function of a
property’s setting, design, location, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. A property
must maintain most of the aspects of integrity in order to be historically significant, and ideally it
will maintain the aspects for integrity most relevant to its importance. For example, a property
that is historically significant for its architectural design should retain integrity of design,
materials, workmanship and feeling. In order to be eligible as a historic district, more than half of
the properties in the group should retain integrity, in addition to representing the Area(s) or
Significance and Period(s) of Significance for the district.
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