

HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

December 7, 2005

The regular meeting of the Coronado Historic Resource Commission was called to order at 3:02 p.m., Wednesday, December 7, 2005, at the Coronado City Hall Council Chamber, 1825 Strand Way, Coronado, California, by Chairperson Keith.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners Draper, Herron, Keith, MacCartee, and Wilson

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Ann McCaull, Associate Planner  
Martha Alvarez, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of November 16, 2005, were approved as amended.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There was no separate report.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Commissioner Wilson asked if anyone had seen the 60 Minutes Edition on Sunday evening about mansions. It communicated what they were trying to accomplish in this community.

Vice Chair MacCartee reported that the first Cottage Conservancy Open Cottage is scheduled for this Sunday at 749 C Avenue, from 1-3 p.m. The purpose of the program is to get citizens to tour the cottages in Coronado and learn how to sensitively alter them and live in smaller spaces. Everyone is invited to attend. The cost of the tour is \$5. There will be an Open Cottage tour every other month.

Chairperson Keith suggested that the next HRC meeting be canceled, however, she has been advised by Ms. McCaull that the agenda is already full. The Commission agreed not to cancel the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

**HAP 15-05** WARREN, DAVID & CAROL – Request for Historic Alteration Permit for modifications to historically designated residence addressed as 566 B Avenue and located in the R-1AE (Single Family Residential) Zone.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. This property was designated as an Historic Resource. The owners are in the process of restoring the residence and are planning on changing out the front windows on the building, which triggers an Historic Alteration Permit review by the Commission. The owners are proposing to replace all the windows along the front of the residence. The windows have termite damage and need replacement. The windows are to be

replaced with “Pella” wood windows, and the window style, detailing, mullions, etc. will be identical to the existing windows.

The applicant, Carol Warren, 566 B Avenue, is proposing to replace the front windows of the home; there are six – one large picture window in the middle, the two side windows, and the three above. The alterations will be going back to the original picture which has the pane windows. In the 1960’s, the windows were replaced with louvered windows on each side and the center window was left as a pane window. The applicant is requesting approval to replace all of the windows to its original version. They plan on replacing all the windows in the home, but will only be replacing the windows at the front at this time.

Chairperson Keith asked if the request was included in the application.

Ms. McCaull said that the request was not part of the application but that the additional request can be included as part of the application.

Commissioner Draper said she was delighted that the applicant would be restoring the windows back to their original condition, and asked the applicant if she knew what the original color was, in keeping with the Tudor look.

Ms. Warren said the windows were going to be paint grade and would be painted. She had considered a cream color with a black trim. The window itself will not be black – it will be wood.

Commissioner Herron asked what was the color of the wood.

Ms. Warren said it was a composite “mousy” brown.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public wishing to speak.

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Wilson had no objections, but suggested deferring the item and doing the project all at once rather than piece meal.

Chairperson Keith said she was in favor of the applicant restoring the windows back to their original condition. She said it made sense to incorporate all the windows at the same time, replacing them with identical windows and upgrading them to more modern insulation.

Commissioner Herron asked if a motion could be made to approve an alteration to the home’s windows, and restore only the front windows at this time.

Chairperson Keith responded yes.

Commissioner Herron asked if the paint trim and color would be discussed.

Chairperson Keith commented that if there was a way to find out what the original color was, it would be fine. Otherwise, the proposed colors presented by the applicant are acceptable.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER DRAPER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE HAP 15-05 HISTORIC ALTERATION PERMIT AS SUBMITTED. APPROVAL IS GIVEN AT THIS TIME TO RESTORE THE WINDOWS IN THE FRONT WITH WOOD WINDOWS IN THEIR ORIGINAL COLOR IF POSSIBLE, AND AT A FUTURE DATE, THE REMAINDER OF THE WINDOWS ON THE SIDE AND BACK WILL BE RESTORED.

THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS WERE MADE:

- A. THAT THE PROPOSED ALTERATION IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THIS CHAPTER, THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT AND THE GENERAL PLAN.
- B. THE PROPOSED ALTERATION WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE HISTORICAL, ARCHITECTURAL OR AESTHETIC VALUE OF THE HISTORIC RESOURCE.
- C. THE PROPOSED ALTERATION WILL RETAIN THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS THAT MAKE THE HISTORIC RESOURCE SIGNIFICANT.
- D. THE PROPOSED ALTERATION WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE'S RELATIONSHIP TO ITS SURROUNDINGS AND NEIGHBORING HISTORIC RESOURCES.

COMMISSIONER MACCARTEE SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Commissioners Draper, Herron, Keith, MacCartee, and Wilson  
NAYS: None.  
ABSENT: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

Ms. McCaull advised the applicant that she will need to return before the Commission if she desires to change the colors from what is currently proposed.

Commissioner Wilson asked if there was any way to check the original permits to determine if the home had a cedar shake.

Chairperson Keith suggested looking into the records for additional information. In 1985, a picture may have been placed in the Source Point Survey Book, which may be helpful.

Commissioner Draper suggested the applicant visit the Coronado Library.

**NOI 15-05** **RED SLIPPER HOLDINGS, LLC** – Notice of Intent to Demolish the single family residence and guest house addressed as 527 Ocean Boulevard and located in the R-1A (Single Family) Residential Zone.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. This site contains a two story dwelling at the front of property and a detached garage with guest quarters above at the rear of the property. The owner plans to build a new single family dwelling on the property and is requesting that the Commission find the home to be demolished as it does not meet the criteria to be designated as an historic resource. Sheryl Jackman of the Jackman Group has been authorized to represent the owner with this request. City records indicate that a permit was issued in 1910 for the construction of the dwelling, which is 95 years old. The Notice of Intent to Demolish permit process is triggered when a home that is 75 years or older is planned on being demolished. The original residence was owned by G.C. Stephens and the contractor was identified as S.D. Construction Company. In 1964, Robin Goodenough owned the property and about 40 years ago, he completed several alterations on the exterior of the residence. He replaced the front windows on the dwelling in 1964. He had the guest house and garage constructed at the rear of the property in 1965, and in 1967 he constructed an exterior stairway at the second floor of the residence. In 1993, substantial changes including new windows, a re-roof, service upgrade, and exterior siding changes to the residence. The back structure is not subject to the Notice of Intent to Demolish permit process since it was built in 1965. Robin Goodenough was very involved with City government and local politics. He served on the City Council from 1954 to 1960. He was the Mayor of the community from 1960 to 1962 and from 1970 to 1971. The original contractor to the building, S.D. Construction Company was a design and building firm out of San Diego, and constructed some fairly prominent homes in Coronado, one of those being the property at 1704 Visalia, which was recently designated as Historic Resource. The application notes that the structure is in fairly poor condition. It has been substantially altered from its original condition due to the forementioned alterations, i.e. the addition of the vinyl siding on the exterior, the vinyl fascia that has been added to the building, and all the windows that have been changed out from wood to vinyl. The Historic Resource Inventory completed in the 1980's gave this building an historical value rating of 4, which means that the home was built before 1942, it was in fair physical condition or had modifications to the original exterior appearance, and could not be returned to its near original appearance.

The applicant's representative, Sheryl Jackman, 1001 B Avenue, made herself available to answer questions.

Commissioner Herron asked Ms. Jackman if she had been in the house.

Ms. Jackman said that the home has been a rental for many years. When the rear home was built, Mr. Goodenough signed a document stating that he would not rent out the rear home. He lived in the rear home and rented out the front home.

Commissioner Herron asked if the home was well constructed.

Ms. Jackman said that it had not been property maintained and is in poor condition.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public wishing to speak.

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Wilson said that she does not like to lose any structure that is not only 95 years old but

is located on Ocean Boulevard. She does feel that the rear house should be demolished as it is a recent addition and looks like a square box but has mixed feelings about the beach house as there is a possibility that it could be restored.

Commissioner Herron said that the character of Ocean Boulevard is being lost and it is sad to see another home on Ocean Boulevard go down. However, she understands that this home is not redeemable and will support the demolition.

Commissioner Draper said that the home is good enough to meet the criteria to be designated as historic, but feels that the property has been significantly altered and has deteriorated to a point where she is willing to let it go.

Vice Chair MacCartee agreed that it is not one of the outstanding cottages. However, if the owner were asking to save the cottage, she would agree to do so, but they are not.

Chairperson Keith agreed. She felt that if the owner wanted to restore the home to its original condition, it could be done. However, that is not the situation, so she will support the demolition.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

CHAIRPERSON KEITH MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE STRUCTURE ADDRESSED AS 527 OCEAN BOULEVARD (NOI 15-05) DOES NOT MEET THE CRITERIA TO BE DESIGNATED AN HISTORIC RESOURCE (IT HAS BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY ALTERED), WITH THE ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION STATING THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- A. IT DOES NOT EXEMPLIFY SPECIAL ELEMENTS OF THE CITY'S MILITARY, CULTURAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, AESTHETIC, ENGINEERING, OR ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY;
- B. IT IS IDENTIFIED WITH A PERSON(S) OR AN EVENT(S) SIGNIFICANT IN LOCAL, STATE OR NATIONAL HISTORY;
- C. IT IS NOT ONE OF THE FEW REMAINING EXAMPLES IN THE CITY POSSESSING DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF AN ARCHITECTURAL STYLE, AND IS NOT VALUABLE FOR THE STUDY OF A TYPE, PERIOD, OR METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION AND HAS BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY ALTERED;
- D. IT IS NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NOTABLE WORK OF A BUILDER, DESIGNER, ARCHITECT, ARTISAN OR LANDSCAPE PROFESSIONAL.

IN ADDITION: (1) THE OWNER SHALL NOTIFY THE CITY AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO DEMOLITION TO ALLOW CITY AND/OR THE CORONADO HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION AN OPPORTUNITY TO PREPARE A PHOTOGRAPHIC, FILM, VIDEO, OR OTHER APPROPRIATE RECORD OF THE EXTERIOR/INTERIOR OF THE STRUCTURE; (2) THE OWNER SHALL NOTIFY THE CORONADO HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION (CHA) AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO DEMOLITION TO PROVIDE CHA WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO

SALVAGE HISTORIC BUILDING MATERIALS FOR THEIR “KEEP IT IN CORONADO” RE-USE PROGRAM.

COMMISSIONER DRAPER SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Commissioners Keith, Draper, MacCartee, Wilson, and Herron  
NAYS: None.  
ABSENT: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed 5-0.

Commissioner Wilson clarified that when the Commission says “the interior items can be used by the Coronado Historical Association,” that it also applies to hinges and door knobs. Those items can be utilized by someone who is saving a property.

**HR 25-05**     **HELMERS, SCOTT & WOOD, ROBIN** – Request for Historic Designation of the property addressed as 744 B Avenue and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. This property is 50’ wide and 140’ deep, totaling 7,000 square feet. It contains a two story dwelling with a detached accessory building. The owners have applied for historical designation to preserve their home as a representative of Craftsman-style bungalow architectural style within the community. They also plan to apply for an alteration permit if the designation is approved to restore the building to its original state and also plan to apply for an Historic Preservation Mills Act Agreement. City records indicate this home was built in 1911 so the home is 94 years old. The original owner and builder was F.C. Winchester. He was also the owner and builder of the property next door at 738 B Avenue, which was recently designated as an historic resource. He was the developer of about 17 properties in the 700 block of B and C Avenues, and is noted as being the person who constructed the first masonry building in Coronado, the Winchester building located on Orange and Loma. The Winchester family also operated the inn at 1401 Inez, commonly known as Trant Manor. That building has also been recently designated as an historic resource. City records indicate no exterior changes have occurred to the building since its original construction. The Historic Resource Inventory completed in the 1980’s indicates the home has a Bungalow architectural style and was given a historical rating value of 3, which indicates the structure was built before 1942, was in good physical condition, and has had minor modifications to its original exterior appearance.

The applicant, Scott Helmers, 744 B Avenue, said he enjoyed living in his home, wanted to preserve the structure, and made himself available to answer questions.

Chairperson Keith asked the applicant to comment about his plans on replacing the first floor front windows.

Mr. Helmers said the previous owner took out the original wood sash windows and replaced them with vinyl windows. He plans to replace them with the original wood.

Chairperson Keith said it was a great cottage and invited Mr. Helmers to attend the Open Cottage on

Sunday, December 11, sponsored by the Coronado Cottage Conservancy.

Commissioner Herron asked Mr. Helmers what was the square footage of his home, and in particular the basement.

Mr. Helmers responded his home is about 2,400 square feet, and the basement is about 15' by 15'.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public wishing to speak at this time.

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Wilson said this home is a poster child for what the previous cottage should have been. It is very lovely and worth preserving.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER WILSON MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION WOULD CONSIDER 744 B AVENUE (HR 25-05) TO BE A HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT PROPERTY AND WOULD APPROVE A REQUEST FOR HISTORIC DESIGNATION IF REQUESTED, WITH THE ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION STATING THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- A. IT DOES EXEMPLIFY OR REFLECT SPECIAL ELEMENTS OF THE CITY'S CULTURAL, SOCIAL AND ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY;
- B. IT IS IDENTIFIED WITH PERSONS SIGNIFICANT IN LOCAL (WINCHESTER FAMILY), STATE, OR NATIONAL HISTORY;
- C. IT IS ONE OF THE FEW REMAINING EXAMPLES IN THE CITY POSSESSING DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF AN ARCHITECTURAL STYLE, AND IS VALUABLE FOR THE STUDY OF A TYPE, PERIOD, OR METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION AND HAS NOT BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY ALTERED;
- D. IT IS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NOTABLE WORK OF A BUILDER (WINCHESTER), DESIGNER, ARCHITECT, ARTISAN OR LANDSCAPE PROFESSIONAL.

CHAIRPERSON KEITH SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Commissioners Draper, Herron, Keith, MacCartee, and Wilson.  
NAYS: None.  
ABSENT: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed 5-0.

Chairperson Keith thanked the applicant and advised they would be receiving a plaque during a City Council meeting in the near future.

**HAP 13-05**    **DOLGEN 2004 REVOCABLE TRUST** – Request for Historic Alteration Permit for modifications to historically designated residence addressed as 1045 Loma Avenue and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone. The Alteration Permit also requests exceptions to zoning standards as provided in the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. The Commission took a look at this project at their November meeting. It was a preliminary hearing. All property owners within 300 feet were notified. The purpose of the hearing was to take a look at some conceptual drawings. The applicants were thinking about some alterations and the Commission provided some early input and comment to the owner, however, no formal action was taken. The applicants have considered the input and have submitted a formal application. There are two basic components to the alteration permit request. The first is the enlargement of the existing garage on the property to accommodate about four cars and would contain about 1,800 square feet. The garage footprint would be closer to Flora Avenue than presently is. This is technically considered the front yard of the property and would normally require about a 19 ½' setback, and the applicant is requesting approval to have a 10' yard setback. During the prior hearing, one of the reasons why this is a preferred option for the applicant is that it has less impact on the historic residence and does not impact the view of the residence as much. There is an existing second story above the garage which will remain. The applicant is not proposing further expansion of the second story. The second component of the alteration permit request is for the construction of the new motor coach garage along Loma Avenue similar to what was presented before. It would be 16' wide, 45' deep totaling about 720 square feet. Loma Avenue would be considered the side yard and would typically require 12 ½' setback and the applicant is requesting a 10' setback. This garage would be located partially below grade of about 30". Above that would be a new second story addition. When the Commission approved an alteration permit for this home a few years ago, there was a second story proposed in this general vicinity, however, since the new Codes became effective in July 2005, this second story addition would actually encroach into what is considered today's required rear yard setback, so a reduction would need to be allowed. There will be some minor modifications to the semi circular drive. When the project is completed, it would comply with the lot coverage and floor area ratio standards. It would have a lot coverage of about 25% where 50% is permitted, and a floor area ratio of 40% where 50% is the maximum. The Commission received a detailed colored rendering where it shows that the project materials and colors would be consistent with the existing structure.

Vice Chair MacCartee asked Ms. McCaull if the Commission had previously approved the 4 car garage, or if an 1,800 square foot garage had been proposed at the preliminary hearing.

Ms. McCaull said it was not presented, but that the applicant can address that today. The applicant has refined the preliminary plans and has given her more information.

Steven McGill, the applicant's representative, 2703 E Bainbridge Road, San Diego, gave an overview of the proposed alterations and responded to a neighbor's concern regarding the second story element, which will not be enlarged. With regard to the motor coach garage, there was some sensitivity to the massing. In response, they have lowered the elevation than first proposed, and dropped the ceiling line 1 ½ feet so that the plate ceiling line in the garage matches what is a normal residence ceiling elevation. They have added windows to the perimeter of that elevation so that it gives it a very residential appearance from the exterior. In addition, the garage has been narrowed an additional one foot to keep with a very residential proportion for the structure. The home does not

have a downstairs bedroom suite. Looking ahead, a future owner of this home may want to desire a downstairs master suite, and if they do not have a motor coach they wish to store on site, the dimensions of this addition are in keeping with what would be required for a downstairs master suite, so the use may be changed as future use may require. He has noticed there are many motor coaches that are being parked on the street because there is nowhere for residents to store them at their homes. Although the City is moving in the direction to remedy that issue, it would appear that lots and homes do have the ability to accommodate motor coaches, and do so in such a way so they are not visible to the public, are treated sensitively and are not sitting in a resident's front yard.

Commissioner Wilson said that the proposed garage space is about 2,500 square feet with four garages on the right side of the home, and the motor coach. She commented that Mr. McGill had previously said that the applicant wanted to keep the motor coach on their property because it was used on a weekly basis. She expressed reservation about the applicant storing the motor coach on the property when other Coronado residents store their motor coaches elsewhere.

Mr. McGill said that the applicant does use the motor coach on a regular basis.

Commissioner Wilson stated he had previously said the applicant uses the motor coach on a weekly basis.

Mr. McGill said the applicant uses the motor coach on most weekends. The home has approximately 150' of frontage, has a lot of undulation to it, and the proposed improvements are in keeping with the scale of this lot.

Commissioner Herron asked Mr. McGill if he has seen the motor coach. She asked if it was currently stored in Coronado.

Mr. McGill responded that it is not stored in Coronado.

Commissioner Herron asked about the size of the motor coach.

Mr. McGill said that he did not know, but that he reduced the size of the exterior dimensions of the proposed garage so that it would accommodate the motor coach.

Chairperson Keith said that at the last meeting, he mentioned that it was a 40' motor coach.

Commissioner Wilson stated that the proposed garage is 16' by 45' and it was previously mentioned that the motor coach was 40'.

Mr. McGill said that the purpose of that making the garage that size was to leave additional room in the garage. They have reduced the width an additional foot but the applicant can still access the motor coach. He said that the length can be slightly reduced.

Commissioner Herron said that she saw a motor coach similar in size and that it is very large and overwhelming.

Mr. McGill said that it seems preferable to create an aesthetically pleasing structure to store such a vehicle.

Commissioner Herron asked that Mr. McGill about the height of the total structure proposed.

Mr. McGill asked the architect, Mr. Bob Bowlus, to provide the information.

Mr. Bob Bowlus, the architect, said he did not have the exact dimensions of the building, but added that the scale of the motor coach garage has architecturally been reduced to 9' by putting the garage underground by 2 ½'. It is a 9' wall which is exactly the scale of any one story residential structure in town. Above that, there is the master bedroom, which is another 9' plate with about 2' of sloping roof. So it is a two story structure, about 18', with about 4' of roof, maybe 22' to 24' high. It is not a tall barn-like structure. It is a one story structure that happens to have an "evil" thing in it, and a partial bedroom above that.

Chairperson Keith said the Commission was not here to discuss "evil" things or the pros or cons of a motor coach. The Commission is here to decide if an addition should be made to one of Coronado's most historically designated homes, and if that addition is in keeping with the historicity of the house. That is the Commission's goal – they are not interested in what is placed inside of the proposed structure.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Scott Aurich, 916 Glorietta, suggested displaying the plans so that members of the public could see the rendering of the plans. He commented that the plans had been shown to neighbors, the Forsythes, and they said they were fine with the proposed plans. The other neighbors, the Peltiers, also did not express reservations about the proposed structure.

Bob Lindsey, 1117 Isabella, expressed concern about the proposed structure on the Loma side. There are currently beautiful trees and it is difficult to believe that a 45' long by 15' wide structure can be placed without taking down the screening.

Vice Chair MacCartee asked if a condition could be placed on any acceptance.

Chairperson Keith responded yes.

Commissioner Wilson said that was discussed at the last meeting but they were given no assurances that it could be done. The architect had said that he could try to do this.

Mr. McGill said he recognized it was a sensitive elevation on the Loma side and they expressed at the last meeting. He said that if the Commission would like to make that a part of a recommendation, the applicant is certainly very willing to include whatever specificity for that plant material on that side. The six foot wall extends 20' high because the screening is so thick. His preference is to be able to see through the landscaping at this structure.

Linda Carrozza, 1155 Star Park Circle, reported that her property is directly across the street from the Requa residence. Her balcony overlooks the property and the view from the balcony is a great value to her. She requested that the Commission oppose changing the setback requirements proposed by the applicant. In addition, increasing the density of the vehicular storage facility seems completely

incompatible with the aesthetics of the property, and she opposes having a large, massive garage on the Loma side to house the motor coach.

### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Draper clarified that the 2,600 square feet included the garages on the right, which are four, and the proposed garage on the left.

Commissioner Draper said she did some research and has found eight existing Requa homes in Coronado. Requas are rare in this community. She said that she does not want to “hide” the Requa home and is opposed to the setback on both proposed garages. In addition, she does not support the addition of the pop-out kitchen in the front yard area.

Vice Chair MacCartee said that many people love historic homes and want to live in them. Other people want a large house where they can accommodate their life. This is an historic home and was not meant to have four cars and a garage the size of some of our homes, and a motor coach area in addition to that. She feels that the owners of this home want to live in a big, modern house with all the conveniences. She does not feel that they will find that in an old, wonderful, graceful home. Instead, they will find an antique. She stated that homes should not adjust to people; people should adjust to homes, which is what makes Coronado so special. She is opposed to the proposed alterations.

Commissioner Wilson said that she was opposed to altering a Requa house.

Commissioner Herron said that she was at first willing to adapt to the needs of the applicant, however, she is now unable to support the proposed alterations.

Chairperson Keith said that Star Park is the most historic area in Coronado. She has spoken to residents in Star Park, and she is very familiar with the home. She feels that the prospective owner has not found the right match for his needs, and does not support the proposed alterations.

### COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER DRAPER MADE A MOTION TO DENY HAP 13-05 HISTORIC ALTERATION PERMIT AS SUBMITTED.

THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS WERE MADE:

- A. THAT THE PROPOSED ALTERATION IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THIS CHAPTER, THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT AND THE GENERAL PLAN.
- B. THE PROPOSED ALTERATION WILL ADVERSELY AFFECT THE HISTORICAL, ARCHITECTURAL OR AESTHETIC VALUE OF THE HISTORIC RESOURCE.
- C. THE PROPOSED ALTERATION WILL NOT RETAIN THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS THAT MAKE THE HISTORIC RESOURCE SIGNIFICANT.
- D. THE PROPOSED ALTERATION WILL ADVERSELY AFFECT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE'S RELATIONSHIP TO ITS SURROUNDINGS AND NEIGHBORING HISTORIC RESOURCES.

COMMISSIONER WILSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Commissioners Draper, Herron, Keith, MacCartee, and Wilson  
NAYS: None.  
ABSENT: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

Mr. Aurich said he is still trying to sell the house and prospective buyers may want to restore or remodel the home. He expressed concern that the use is an issue with the Commission and did not feel it was fair.

Ms. McCaull clarified for the record that the Commission does not have any authority over the use of the property. What the Commission ruled on today was the new structure and the architectural compatibility with the historic residence.

Mr. Aurich asked if the Commission would look at future plans openly if it specified a different use.

Chairperson Keith clarified that the Commission does not look at uses, and does not debate the use of motor coaches.

**HAP 11-05**    **GARBUTT, APUA & MARK** – Request for Historic Alteration Permit for historically designated residence addressed as 576 E Avenue and located in the R-3 (Multiple Family Residential) Zone including future subdivision of the property to create two parcels with some exceptions to zoning standards as provided in the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. This property was designated as historic resource in September, 2005. This item was continued at the September 21 hearing to allow the applicant to refine the project requests. There is a home in the front of the property that has been designated an historic resource. The applicants want to retain that and at the same time subdivide the property and sell off the rear half. To sell off the rear property will trigger a lot line adjustment and from what has been submitted by their engineer, everything looks okay for staff. The rear Parcel B will have a 50' lot depth, which is normally about 70'. This will require a suspension of lot depth requirements. The Commission has the ability to grant that exception through their historic review process. The second item is the garage. The parking will be located on Parcel B so normally there is a required parking on the same parcel where the structure is located. They are requesting the ability to have the required parking for Parcel A, the historic home, on Parcel B, and the ability to access the parking via the sidewalk where normally it would be through the public right-of-way. Staff does not have major concerns zoning wise with those requests. With the lot line adjustment and the new plat that has been provided, staff has confirmed that both parcels would comply with the lot coverage floor area ratio. The last item is the dwelling on Parcel B which is located right up to the rear property line. Normally when there is a lot line adjustment process, staff requires that any non confirming use that exists on the site to be brought into today's Code regulations. Staff is recommending that as part of the lot line adjustment, the rear portion of the building that encroaches into the 5' rear yard setback be required to be removed. The applicants are indicating that it appears

that the structure that encroaches on the rear yard setback has been there since perhaps its original construction and they are requesting to be able to retain that. Staff has included three possible scenarios as conditions of approval: (1) The rear structure be removed along with the lot line adjustment to comply with the rear yard setback. The portion that is encroaching into the rear yard be removed along with the lot line adjustment approval; (1) Allow it to remain as is; (3) Retain the non conforming structure until remodeling begins on the home – continue to remain until the time the building permit is pulled – when the alteration work is done on the home. This does not include the garage as that will have to be done right away. There will be a condition of the lot line adjustment that the garage become accessible. When they undertake improvements for the home, then they will need to bring it into compliance as they will not be living in the residence.

The applicant, Apua Garbutt, 576 E Avenue, stated that she and her husband request the following: (1) Lot line adjustment to separate the historic front property from the non historic back property as indicated on the submitted plat. This includes a lot line depth variance to keep the historic structure intact yet still satisfy the minimum lot line requirements; (2) Variance to allow two enclosed parking spaces for the front property to remain on the back property as it is now in keeping the current alley entrance parking; (3) Variance to allow access to the parking space for the front house to be the existing public sidewalk as it is currently; (4) Allow any part of the back structure which is deemed illegal in the future to be removed at the time of remodel.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public wishing to speak.

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Chairperson Keith said there are four items, the first being the lot line adjustment.

The Commission agreed there were no concerns about the lot line adjustments and it could go forward.

Chairperson Keith said the second item is the use of the garage on a separate parcel for Parcel A to use the parking area on Parcel B.

The Commission agreed there were no concerns on this issue and it could go forward.

Chairperson Keith said the third request is that the applicant be allowed to use the public sidewalk to access their garage versus going through the back yard. Many places will have an easement through a backyard for persons to walk through. Since this is on a corner, it makes it fairly easy to just walk around.

The Commission agreed there were no concerns on this issue and it could go forward.

Chairperson Keith said the fourth request is to allow the rear house to infringe on the setback until the building permits are pulled. At the time the building permits are pulled for the back structure, it would have to comply with setbacks.

Commissioner Wilson said that her understanding is the back structure would have to comply with setbacks when the construction begins, not when the permits are pulled.

Ms. McCaull said that it is on the back building. There are no alterations proposed to the front home, so when they pull a building permit for improvements on the rear structure, then they have to remove the portion that's there.

Chairperson Keith clarified that when the work begins on the back structure, the building must comply with setbacks at that time.

The Commissioner agreed.

Ms. Apua said that Ms. McCaull had mentioned three different options, one of which would be to retain it, another would be to remove it at time of remodel, and another one would be to remove it immediately. She requested to retain it, as it appears to be of the same character of the original house with the same wood siding.

Chairperson Keith said that structure is not historic and has not been designated historic. She asked the applicant if it would qualify to be designated historic.

Ms. Apua agreed that the structure was not historic and probably would not qualify.

Chairperson Keith said if it is not an historically designated home, it needs to comply with the Ordinances. When construction begins, she needs to bring it up to compliance. Ms. Keith said she was not willing to make an exception for a non-historically designated home.

Commissioner Herron clarified that the applicant wanted to split her property into Parcel A and Parcel B, with Parcel A being historic.

Ms. Apua said she wanted to fix up Parcel B only.

Commissioner Draper asked if the applicant could go before the Design Review Commission or the Planning Commission for a variance.

Commissioner Wilson said that it was within their purview and did not have to go before the Planning Commission.

Ms. McCaull agreed. Staff would normally just require the removal with the lot line adjustment. Whether it was legally or illegally constructed, it is still something the City would want removed because they don't want building or windows on a zero property line. In addition, there are many fire code issues.

Chairperson Keith said the decision is whether it should be removed today, or whether they should keep it until they begin construction.

Commissioner Wilson said the reason this item is before the HRC is because they are talking about a lot split for an historical residence. There is a question on whether they want to accommodate the

owners of the historic property if they will be living in the historic property. Do you continue a non conformity as a “perk” of having this designated property which the owner is not living in?

Chairperson Keith said that it was one lot and there are many nonconformities in the community. It is almost a norm with historic homes. She said if both homes were historic, it would be different. In this case, the applicant came forward and wanted to have the non designated historic home designated with all the criteria, which was done. Now the applicant is returning with a proposed property line adjustment so that there are two parcels. By doing that, the non historic home does not meet the setbacks of the zoning ordinance of today. What makes this different from any other home in town? With Parcel A, two parking spaces must be provided and they don't have room to do that without tearing down part of the house.

Ms. Apua stated that the back part of Parcel B encumbers the rear parcel on Parcel A property which they are giving them which is why they are doing this “panhandle.”

Chairperson Keith said he only other option to that is to not ask for the lot split.

Commissioner Draper asked the applicant if two of the four garages belonged to Parcel A.

Ms. Apua responded yes.

Commissioner Herron asked Ms. Garbutt what the width of the non conformity is, and a three foot easement is all that is required.

Ms. McCaull said that she needs a five foot rear yard setback and it is currently zero.

Commissioner Herron suggested it be split.

Ms. McCaull clarified that the applicant would be returning for approval of an addition to the rear structure, and that is why the requirement to take down the five foot section would take effect.

Commissioner Wilson said they were being asked to consider requiring the removal when the work is undertaken so that is a handy compromise as well.

Chairperson Keith said she would like to include a condition of no later than one year otherwise it could go on forever.

Commissioner Draper suggested one year after Parcel A sells.

Chairperson Keith clarified that the applicant cannot sell Parcel A without the lot split.

Commissioner Draper suggested the applicant proceed with the lot split.

Ms. McCaull said the building permits are microfiched and when she begins the work on Parcel B, the City would know.

Chairperson Keith reiterated the issues: (1) lot line adjustment; (2) allowing the garage to be used; (3) use the sidewalk instead of going through the property; (4) encroachment.

Commissioner Herron said that also included in that is the suspension of the 50' lot line.

Commissioner Wilson said that in all good faith, she would want to see the nonconformity removed within a certain time frame in exchange for all of these other things that will occur.

The Commission agreed on a time frame of three years, and if more time is needed, the applicant may return and petition for an extension.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

CHAIRPERSON KEITH MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE HAP 11-05 HISTORIC ALTERATION PERMIT AS SUBMITTED: (1) APPROVE THE LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT (PARCELS A AND B, EACH WITH 3,500 SQUARE FEET); (2) ALLOW PARCEL A TO HAVE TWO OFF STREET COVERED PARKING SPACES ON PARCEL B; (3) APPROVE USING THE PUBLIC SIDEWALK TO GET FROM PARCEL A TO PARCEL B; (4) REQUIRE THAT PARCEL B COME INTO CONFORMANCE WITH ALL SETBACKS NO LATER THAN THREE YEARS FROM THE PROJECT APPROVAL DATE.

THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS WERE MADE:

- A. THAT THE PROPOSED ALTERATION IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THIS CHAPTER, THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT AND THE GENERAL PLAN.
- B. THE PROPOSED ALTERATION WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE HISTORICAL, ARCHITECTURAL OR AESTHETIC VALUE OF THE HISTORIC RESOURCE.
- C. THE PROPOSED ALTERATION WILL RETAIN THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS THAT MAKE THE HISTORIC RESOURCE SIGNIFICANT.
- D. THE PROPOSED ALTERATION WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE'S RELATIONSHIP TO ITS SURROUNDINGS AND NEIGHBORING HISTORIC RESOURCES.

VICE CHAIR MACCARTEE SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Commissioners Draper, Herron, Keith, MacCartee, and Wilson

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

Scott Helmers, 744 B Avenue, asked if the applicant would need to return before the Historic Resource Commission for Parcel B.

Chairperson Keith responded that was part of the condition for allowing the lot split.

Ms. McCaull said that it was part of the condition of the alteration permit that gave her all the exceptions to the Code.

## **MISCELLANEOUS**

None.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **Discussion regarding the formulation of a Demolition Review List (HR 14-04)**

The Commission reviewed the list of potential properties and added one page to the list. A report will be generated for submittal to City Council, per their request.

Chairperson Keith suggested a change to the following sentence: "If the Commission determines the structure appeared to be historically significant, the property was included on a future demolition list." She feels this sentence implies to the Council that the Commission has authority to determine that the homes are historical. She suggested changing the sentence so that Council understands that the Commission believes there is a possibility that the homes may be historical and further research must be done. Further, she was under the impression that values would not be used.

Ms. McCaull said she wanted to present all the information to the Commission so that they can review and have available all the numbers.

Commissioner Wilson said that she would like to add to the report the following: "that out of so many homes, only 10% of the homes represent the properties."

Vice Chair MacCartee said there is some validity to Source Point that is now recognized. If they say there were 1,500 of Source Point but we've narrowed it down to 698, then the City Council may want to remove the homes rated 4 and 5. Some of the nicer homes that have been restored were rated 4 and 5.

Chairperson Keith suggested removing the value and the status from the list.

Commissioner Draper said she had an issue with the date. Construction dates were used as opposed to the date the permit was taken out and we don't really know when construction was started. Sometimes the permit was taken out nine or ten months before construction started.

Ms. McCaull said that generally it meant when the project was completed. She went through the list to attempt to obtain the original permit dates. In some cases, back in the early 1900's, all that was given was the construction issuance date and no final inspection was noted. If the construction permit date was given and the sewer permit followed, she is sure that construction followed soon thereafter.

After general discussion, the Commission agreed to use the dates on the list, remove the status and value, and for any date later than 1931, the Commission will do further research.

### **Discussion regarding the Historic Resource Commission Newsletter (no report)**

Commissioner Wilson spoke with the City Manager and he said there was no problem to insert the

Newsletter into the Currents, published by the City. This will cut down costs significantly, about \$700. She also shared that she was given much help from Kelly Purvis, who did a mock-up of the Newsletter on glossy paper, gray scale, which looked very classy. Ms. Purvis will set this up on a template which can be updated by one of the Commissioners.

The Commission was very pleased with the news. January will be the due date for the next Newsletter.

**Discussion regarding the Coronado Cottage Conservancy (no report)**

This item was continued. No action was taken.

**Discussion regarding Historic Resource Designation Benefit of applying for relief to zoning standards as provided for in the Historic Preservation Ordinance (no report)**

This item was continued. No action was taken.

**Discussion regarding Historic Districts**

This item was continued. No action was taken.

Ms. McCaull provided to the Commission a new publication from the National Trust regarding how to create local historic districts.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

---

Tony A Peña  
Director of Community Development