

HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

July 6, 2005

The regular meeting of the Coronado Historic Resource Commission was called to order at 3 p.m., Wednesday, July 6, 2005, at the Coronado Police Department Emergency Operations Center, 700 Orange Avenue, Coronado, California, by Chairperson Keith.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Commissioner Draper.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of June 15, 2005, were approved as amended.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There was no separate report.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

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

Chairperson Keith reported that in the Sunday edition of the San Diego Union, there was an article about the City of Chicago protecting its beloved bungalows. Four million dollars have been given out through grants, no-interest loans, mortgages to assist persons interesting in saving their bungalows, which is the subject matter later on in the agenda. A copy of the article was made available for public viewing.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

HAP 2-04 **Johnson, Dr. Mark:** Request for modification to previously approved Historic Alteration Permit regarding the proposed two-car garage for the Historically Designated residence addressed as 1504 Glorietta Boulevard and located in the R-1A (Single Family) Residential Zone.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. The property was designated as an Historic Resource in June of 2004. The Commission subsequently approved some alterations to the home including some renovation / restoration work to the main dwelling, as well as construction of a new two-car garage. Along with the approval of the two-car garage, the Commission granted an exception to the rear yard setback requirement due to the site constraints at the property. Any property designated as an Historic Resource is eligible to apply to the Commission for some exceptions to the normal standards which Dr. Johnson took the benefit of applying for. He is full into

construction and has submitted a letter to the Commission for their consideration, requesting a delay in the construction of the two-car garage. The reason for that delay is outlined in the staff report. The Code requires that for existing homes, there exist one covered and one uncovered space. There is room on the site to provide for two uncovered spaces. Staff is recommending that the Commission consider the request, authorize a delay in the construction of the two-car garage, require a minimum of two uncovered parking spaces, and have the applicant return within a certain period of time to review future plans for required parking.

Chairperson Keith asked if there was a time requirement for a project to be completed after it is approved.

Ms. McCaull stated there was no time requirement but indicated that the applicant desired to complete the ongoing construction at his residence. For zoning purposes, in order for the Planning staff to final the project, the applicant would need to meet the parking requirements.

The applicant, Dr. Mark Johnson, 1504 Glorietta Boulevard, requested a delay in the construction of the two-car garage. He stated he was unhappy with the plans, issues of grading expense, and indicated there is room for parking underneath the house.

Chairperson Keith clarified that the reason the applicant is asking for the delay is that he cannot obtain a final from the City on his house if the parking is not completed unless a delay is granted.

Dr. Johnson confirmed that was correct except for the latter part. He clarified that he needed a covered and uncovered space and he did not want to build a two-car garage, and he is unaware of a time limit and would like to finish the project as soon as possible.

Chairperson Keith clarified that the applicant could not move into his house without a final from the City, and the applicant was unable to obtain a final approval from the City that the building is completed unless he has the required parking.

Dr. Johnson said he understood that statement to be mostly correct. He said that the Historical experts indicated that he could move into his house before the garage is in, but was glad to wait for final inspection.

Chairperson Keith expressed concern and asked why the issue was being heard.

Commissioner Wilson stated that when a person pulls a building permit, a person has a time frame to complete the project whether it is historical or not.

Ms. McCaull stated the permit is good and there is no time period for completion of a construction project, as long as an inspection occurs once every six months.

Commissioner Wilson inquired if occupancy is granted upon the project passing a final.

Ms. McCaull clarified that the plans submitted by Dr. Johnson proposed a two-car garage, one covered and one uncovered space is required. The project that the Commission approved required a two-car garage. The applicant wants to explore the possibility of not constructing a two-car garage, possibly having it at a different location, and that issue is what is triggering the applicant's need to be

heard by the Commission.

Dr. Johnson proposed to have the covered parking underneath the house in the “guest quarters” downstairs. There would be no construction necessary as the space is already open. He indicated the proposed site on a map, and said that the area is designed with windows and doors, the space is already open, has no support, and he would just drive into the area. There would be room for one car.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Nancye Splinter, 1027 G Avenue, said she was familiar with the property and have toured the inside of the house. She indicated the applicant was asking to do less than the original proposal and said it was wonderful and refreshing to have someone who did not want to build out their property. In addition, she indicated that the restoration of the home was exceptional, and she and her husband were pleased to see such a quality remodel. She asked the Commission to support the applicant’s request.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Herron said she had an opportunity to view Dr. Johnson’s home and stated it was exceptional. She commented that one covered and one uncovered parking space was approved by the Commission because it was requested by the applicant. She supported approving the applicant’s request.

Commissioner MacCartee agreed with Commissioner Herron and supported the applicant’s request.

Chairperson Keith supported the applicant’s request. She asked Ms. McCaull if the previously approved Resolution had to be amended.

Ms. McCaull said that the Resolution did not have to be amended. Action by a vote of the Commission was sufficient. In addition, she asked the applicant for clarification on whether the previously approved plan was requested to be modified so that the Commission would require one covered and one uncovered space as described by Dr. Johnson. She also inquired if this request was temporary or permanent.

Dr. Johnson indicated he was requesting one covered and one uncovered parking space, and requested leeway on the matter.

Commissioner Wilson suggested the request be approved as submitted and that the Commission place a time limit, possibly six months, to obtain an update from the applicant. She then suggested one year.

Commissioner Herron suggested six months. She wanted to view the canopy.

Chairperson Keith stated the law required one covered and one uncovered parking space.

Commissioner Herron stated that part of the presentation today was the canopy request which was not previously approved.

Dr. Johnson said it was optional.

Commissioner Wilson said she wanted to see the canopy, and also give the applicant a time frame to return and update the Commission.

Dr. Johnson said the canopy resembled the same awnings he was placing on the front window and front porch.

Chairperson Keith inquired if awnings had been previously approved for placement at the residence.

Dr. Johnson stated the awnings were not previously discussed with the Commission.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER MACCARTEE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REQUEST TO DELAY CONSTRUCTION OF THE TWO-CAR GARAGE AND THAT THE ALTERNATIVE PARKING ARRANGEMENT BE APPROVED.

COMMISSIONER HERRON SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed 4-0.

HAP 6-05 **Heitz, Deborah and Wagener, Shaw:** Request for Historic Alteration Permit for the Historically Designated residence addressed as 1156 Isabella Avenue to construct a kitchen and guest room addition and other modifications to the main building and for the construction of a detached one-story garage. The property is located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. The property was designated as an Historical Resource in March of 2005. The owners requested an alteration permit for new construction on the property and for the construction of a new two-story garage, accessory building that would have exceeded the number of stories permitted in the Code, the building height, and did not comply with the rear yard setback. The Commission considered the alteration permit at the Commission meeting of May 18. The Commission continued the request citing concerns with the lack of compatibility of the proposed accessory building with the surrounding properties. The applicant has submitted revised plans for the Commission's consideration. All property owners within 300 feet were notified. The most significant change that occurred with the project proposal is the modification to the accessory building, it is no longer two stories, does not exceed the building height, does not require an exception to the rear yard setback requirement. The architect and owners have done their due diligence in addressing concerns from the Commission and surrounding property owners. The applicants have brought the accessory building into compliance with current zoning regulations. In addition, at the last hearing, clarification was requested regarding the pool equipment

that appeared to be located at the side and rear yard setbacks. Exceptions to that equipment is no longer necessary. The one story guest quarters addition located at the northeast corner of the property is still proposed. The kitchen addition is proposed at the southeast port of the building, fronting along Isabella Avenue. Minor modification was done to the interior of the building which allows the original home to be reverted back to its existing condition if a future owner chooses to do that. The enclosed balcony facing Isabella Avenue is proposed to be removed which will become an open balcony. A minor change to the front window above the entry is proposed to be enlarged slightly to allow for an ocean view. Staff is recommending that direction be provided in terms of the proposed structure being grandfathered with any future Codes that will soon become effective. Staff recommended to proceed through the discretionary permit process and zoning plan check process under today's Codes.

Chairperson Keith asked what part of the project did not meet the RSIP requirements.

Ms. McCaull stated that the only component she was aware of was the roof deck.

Stuart Sawasaki, Heritage Architecture, 625 Broadway, San Diego, representing the applicant, thanked Ms. McCaull for describing so well the changes made to the original proposal. The main objection to the previous design was the two-story garage structure. The first item was to redesign the garage. The current proposal is a one-story garage that is slightly depressed so that it meets the current 12' height restriction for the property. The use of brick is still the most compatible with the site and lends itself to the more horizontal ground floor architecture that Irving Gill provided in the main building. The revised plans do not ask for variances to the current Code. The stairway to the second floor structure is no longer needed for the second story use. The actual pool equipment can fit within the storage area space located in the northeast portion of the site. The kitchen addition is proposed to be moved further south.

Commissioner Wilson said she was pleased to see the site plan proposed a slightly recessed one-story garage. She was concerned with how far out the garage would be built.

Mr. Sawasaki confirmed that the area she was inquiring about was open parking and the garage was not built out very far.

Commissioner Wilson asked about the second floor front bay window and expressed concern about having it removed.

Mr. Sawasaki stated that the bay window proposed to be enlarged was in keeping with the overall design. The applicant wanted to convert the use of the room to a library and wanted to have a view from that side of the building. Photos and color renderings were made available for public view.

Commissioner Herron said her concern was the white space which forms the symmetry over the door, not the window over the door.

Commissioner Wilson stated that the symmetry she was referring to was referenced in Dr. Brandon's report because of the entry access. When one walks through the front door, the perpendicular direction to the door and hallway lining up with the pergola used to be the rear garden. The white sets off the door. If it changes, it changes the Guild design.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Susan Hevelon, 1144 Isabella, said the applicant had done a wonderful job. She expressed concern with the garbage area located in the five foot setback, and the possible rodent problem.

Sharon Sherman, 657 Pomona, stated she felt the applicant was making a considerable effort in complying with the Commission's request. She asked the Commission not to approve the proposed change to the exterior over the door that Irving Gill designed.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Chairperson Keith reported that Ms. McCaull, Commissioner MacCartee and she met with the applicant and her architects. No additional changes were proposed at this meeting.

Commissioner Wilson said she was appreciative on the complete turn-around effort on the look of the garage, the fact that it is slightly depressed and unobtrusive. She expressed concern about the second story change to the exterior Gill construction, and wanted to see the original design kept intact.

Commissioner Herron said she hoped the applicant would maintain the window as it is for reasons previously stated.

Commissioner MacCartee asked if the applicant would consider retaining the window.

The applicant, Mr. Shaw Wagener, 1035 Star Park Circle, stated that he purchased the house in October of 2004. He said that what the Commission was suggesting was fine, however, in researching Gil homes, he found significant modifications to windows. He stated as an example the Marston house, all windows downstairs facing south were increased in size. He did not feel there was a major impact to the integrity of the home. He said if the Commission felt very strongly about the window, he could leave the window the same. His original intent was to create a spectacular space coming up from the stairway.

Commissioner Herron asked the applicant about the proposed change to the staircase.

Mr. Wagener stated the staircase is currently a pseudo spiral staircase which was unlike other designs of similar size homes that Gil made during that period of time. He said he wanted to remove as much of the service stairwell as possible, expand the stairwell out and make it a dramatic space. He said the objective was to make the entire entry way more dramatic.

Chairperson Keith said she would like to see the small window remain.

Commissioner Wilson stated that it was an honor to live, own and work on an Irving Gill home. In honoring that sense of place, she noted the value that Irving Gill placed on simplicity and modesty. She hoped that Mr. Wagener would keep the exterior the same.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER WILSON MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE HAP 6-05 HISTORIC ALTERATION PERMIT AS SUBMITTED TO CONSTRUCT A KITCHEN, GUESTROOM

ADDITION AND OTHER MODIFICATION TO THE MAIN BUILDING AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A DETACHED ONE-STORY GARAGE AT 1156 ISABELLA, AND THAT THE EXISTING WINDOWS ON THE SECOND STORY, AS DESIGNED BY IRVING GILL, WOULD REMAIN THE SAME, AND THAT THE EXISTING DESIGN WOULD BE GRANDFATHERED TO COMPLY WITH NEW ZONING, IF ANY.

THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS WERE MADE:

- A. THAT THE ALTERATION IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT IN THE GENERAL PLAN;
- B. THAT THE PROPOSED ALTERATION WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE HISTORICAL, ARCHITECTURAL OR AESTHETIC VALUE FO 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 RESOURCES;
- E. THE PROPOSED ALTERATION WILL COMPLY WITH THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR'S STANDARDS AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT OF 1966.

COMMISSIONER HERRON SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed 4-0.

NOI 10-05 Rauber, Michael: – Consideration of Notice of Intent to demolish the single family residence addressed as 436 H Avenue and located in the R-1B (Single Family) Residential Zone.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. The current owner of the property is Ms. Maureen Carr. The owner has authorized Michael Rauber to submit the application on her behalf. Her property is in escrow and may have already closed. Representing Michael Rauber is Carl Uveges. The property is a 50' X 140' lot located in the R-1B zone. The intent is to demolish the existing residence for a future development of a home on each 25' wide lot. City records indicate the home was constructed in 1929; it is 76 years old, so it is subject to the new Intent to Demolish permit process. The Commission is being asked to consider whether the home meets the criteria to be designated as an Historic Resource. City records indicate that no alterations have occurred to the property since its original construction. The Carr family has owned the home since the early 1970's. The structure has a Mission Revival architectural style with a stucco exterior, arched front windows, flat roof and tiled front entry porch. The applicant indicated the structure is in fairly poor condition. The Historic Resource Inventory completed in the 1980's ranked homes from 1 to 5, 1 being the highest in terms of historical significant. The property was rated a 4, which means it was built before 1942, was relatively in fair condition, and has had modifications to its original exterior appearance.

Staff finds that the property does not meet the criteria to be designated an Historic Resource and recommends that the Resolution be adopted finding it does not meet the criteria for designation, which would allow for the future demolition of the property. There are standard conditions relating to the owner's cooperation with the Coronado Historical Association and their "Keep it in Coronado" program.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Nancye Splinter, 1027 G Avenue, representing the Demolition Subcommittee of the Preservation Committee of the Coronado Historical Association, expressed concern regarding the number of cottages demolished. She stated that another member, Martha Jordan, has submitted a photograph of the property. She reported that the home has had three owners and has not had any remodeling or additions done. If the property is demolished, the property will have double density; the intent is to build two houses on the property. The Subcommittee has visited the home and feels that the block is "pure," which means that from the street side, there are single homes on single lots. The concern is that this would be the first house that would be a double density on the block. The Subcommittee is requesting that the Commission work with individuals who own valuable cottages that are structurally sound and have not been given extensive remodeling.

Mary Turrell, 1116 5th Street, stated that she was not in support of the demolition.

Story Vogel, 350 D Avenue, expressed concern that well financed citizens were buying cottages, demolishing them, and building new structures. He stated he was not in support of the demolition.

Mark Johnson, 1504 Glorietta Boulevard, said he was not in support of the demolition. He stated the cottage was small but exquisite, and urged the Commission to keep the cottage in Coronado.

Valerie and Greg Hebert, 1027 Adella Avenue, were not in support of the demolition nor splitting of the lots.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Wilson was not in support of the demolition. She stated the cottage met the age requirement to be considered an Historic Resource, and it was part of the architectural and cultural history.

Commissioner Herron was not in support of the demolition. She said that the findings indicated the home met the requirements to be considered an Historic Resource and suggested that the owner consider other alternatives.

Commissioner MacCartee was not in support of the demolition. She said the cottage was one of the remaining architectural styles that made Coronado what it is today.

Chairperson Keith asked if anyone had contacted the owner, Maureen Carr. She said it appeared the Commission felt there were findings to support preserving the structure and inquired if the applicant desired to continue this item. In light of the applicant and her representative not being present, she stated that the Commission did have the authority to continue this item.

Carl Uveges, 320 F Avenue, said the Commission should continue the process and vote. He stated he did not have authority to represent the applicant and/or her representative.

Ms. McCaull told Mr. Uveges that since she did not have any written authorization from Mr. Rauber indicating he had the ability to represent Mr. Rauber, she asked Mr. Rauber could be contacted within the next thirty minutes so that the Commission could get some indication on whether the applicant desired the Commission to take action on this item.

Mr. Uveges stated that Mr. Rauber was out of town and could not be contacted at this time.

Chairperson Keith indicated she did not feel comfortable taking action without the applicant and/or her representative being present.

COMMISSION ACTION

CHAIRPERSON KEITH MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE ITEM.

COMMISSIONER HERRON SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed 4-0.

Chairperson Keith requested that Ms. McCaull send a letter to the applicant and/or her representative, indicating that the item had been continued.

NOI 11-05 **Napolitano & Webb:** Consideration of Notice of Intent to demolish the two single family residences addressed as 557 and 563 E Avenue and located in the R-3 (Single Family) Residential Zone.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. Michael Napolitano and Dennis Webb are the current owners of the property. The site contains 10,500 square feet. There are four homes on this site, two which are proposed to be demolished. In their place, a new single family residence would be constructed with a detached garage off the back and with another unit above. City records indicate that a permit was issued in 1925 for the construction of a five-room dwelling on 557 E Avenue. The structure is 80 years old and subject to a demolition permit process. No other permits were issued until 1990 when permits were issued for repairs to a fire damaged floor. The rear structure at 563 E was constructed in 1922. It was built by the same owner, A.E. Bruske, and City permits indicate that this structure was originally the servants quarters, most likely built for the original building in the front. No other permits were issued for this home until 2001, when the electrical was updated. Photos provided by the applicant shows that the front residence appears to be in fairly good condition. It is a simple bungalow home with a front porch, exterior wood siding and double-hung windows. The rear residence does appear to be in fairly poor condition. The Historic Resource Inventory completed in the 1980's gave both homes a value of 4, which is middle to low in

significance. A Resolution has been prepared stating that the properties did not meet the criteria to be designated as Historic Resources, and would allow for the future demolition of the two homes.

Chairperson Keith requested for clarification on the number of homes existing on the lot, and the number proposed to be demolished.

Commissioner Herron stated there are four homes on the lot and two are proposed to be demolished and replaced with one home.

Ms. McCaull clarified that the proposed structure would be one home in the front, a four-car garage off the back, and one unit above.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Nancye Splinter, 1027 G Avenue, representing the Demolition Subcommittee of the Preservation Committee of the Coronado Historical Association, expressed concern about the front residence located at 557 E Avenue. She stated that a similar Craftsman home next door had been beautifully restored and asked the Commission to work with the owners in order to preserve the front house.

Valerie Hebert, 1027 Adella, stated she did not support the demolition. She said she really enjoyed seeing the alley houses. She felt they were the essence of Coronado.

Mary Turrell, 1116 5th Street, stated that she was not in support of the demolition.

Story Vogel, 350 D Avenue, stated he was not in support of the demolition. In addition, he did not believe in the destruction of any house, increased density or change in streetscape.

Mark Johnson, 1504 Glorietta Boulevard, said he was not in support of the demolition. He stated the home had a remarkable presence, and the lath, plaster and siting was remarkably intact.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Chairperson Keith stated that this home is located in the R-3 Residential Zone, and the applicant is proposing to build a single family home where they could be putting in apartments.

Commissioner Wilson felt that if approval was given to demolish the back house, ultimately the front house would also be proposed to be demolished.

Commissioner Herron said it is difficult to save every cottage. She said that this block has lost its character and family home feeling.

The applicant, Dennis Webb, 952 A Avenue, stated he sympathized with the Commission's goal of saving older structures. He stated that he has worked on saving many older structures, but was also concerned with saving families. He stated that his father-in-law, Mr. Napolitano, purchased the property in 1983, with the intent to provide for his family and future grandchildren. He is intending to build a new home for his granddaughter, whom he described as fifth generation Coronado. He said he was not looking to put six condominiums, only a single family residence for his family. He said he would return in the future to request the removal of the front home in order to build a single

family residence for another grandchild. He stated that interest should also be given to saving future generations and giving them the opportunity to live in Coronado.

Commissioner Herron thanked Mr. Webb for communicating his intentions to the Commission.

Commissioner Wilson thanked Mr. Webb for speaking with the Commission.

Derrick Warner, 555 E Avenue, although not beautifully restored, said he had done it for his children.

COMMISSION ACTION

CHAIRPERSON HERRON MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE STRUCTURES ADDRESSED AS 557 AND 563 E AVENUE (11-05) DO NOT MEET THE CRITERIA TO BE DESIGNATED A HISTORIC RESOURCE, 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 NOT 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;
- E. IT DOES NOT MEET THE STATE PROGRAM OF LANDMARKS AND POINTS OF HISTORICAL INTEREST AS SET FORTH IN ARTICLE 2 (COMMENCING WITH SECTION 50280) OF CHAPTER 1 OF PART 1 OF DIVISION 1 OF THE CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE AND ARTICLE 1.9 (COMMENCING WITH SECTION 439) OF CHAPTER 3 OF PART 2 OF DIVISION 1 OF THE CALIFORNIA REVENUE AND TAXATION CODE (AS AMENDED FROM TIME TO TIME).

COMMISSIONER WILSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed 4-0.

MISCELLANEOUS

None.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Discussion regarding establishment of a program to encourage the retention and restoration of Coronado Cottages.

Ms. McCaull gave background information regarding the retention and restoration of Coronado Cottages. The Commission has been discussing establishing a program to help encourage retention and restoration of the smaller cottages within the community. The program would assist homeowners with designs or additions being planned, instead of opting for demolition. The Commission is discussing the possibility of being a nonprofit entity to carry out the Cottage Conservancy Program, and has been working closely with Attorney Sharon Sherman, to develop a mission statement, goals and objectives, so that the plan can be submitted to the City Council for their consideration.

Chairperson Keith wanted to give the Commission an opportunity to give the program a name. She complimented Attorney Sharon Sherman on the mission statement and necessities for the organization. She felt it was a great starting point and said it answers almost all questions that Ms. McCaull had posed at the last meeting.

Attorney Sharon Sherman stated that the only reason “cottage” was taken out was that Commissioner MacCartee had spoken with an architect and was told that the term “cottage” is a term of art – a specific style. Ms. Sherman wanted to include all small homes and bungalows. She states she liked the word “cottage” but did not want to limit a person’s understanding of what the organization was doing.

Commissioner Wilson asked Ms. Sherman to clarify the meaning of “term of art,” because she was under the impression it was strictly Craftsman.

Ms. Sherman stated that within the architectural design community, the word “cottage” means a particular style of architectural and style of building.

Commissioner Wilson mentioned she had written down some possibilities: Cottage Collection, Restore our Cottages (ROC), Save the Old Cottages (STOC), Coronado Cottage Collection (CCC), Coronado Cottage Committee, Coronado Historic Cottages (CHIC).

Chairperson stated a definition should be given to the word “cottage.”

Commissioner Wilson said that criteria should also be considered such as age, square footage, and height. She said that the criteria should reflect social and aesthetic issues.

Commissioner MacCartee said the architectural history was important because that was what was being lost when a small cottage was lost.

Ms. Sherman suggested the wording “aesthetic and / or architectural.”

Commissioner Wilson suggested “social, aesthetic, and architectural,” but leave out military, cultural, economic.

Chairperson Keith suggested to remove “military, cultural, economic, and political,” and leave in “social, aesthetic, and/or architectural.”

After general discussion, the Commission agreed not to include a height requirement.

Ms. Sherman commented that the larger homes would come under the purview of the HRC process whereas the smaller houses are pre-systematically excluded because they do not have the notable personage.

Commissioner Keith asked if a requirement of 1,500 square feet or less should be included.

Commissioner MacCartee suggested, “unless otherwise determined by the Commission.”

Ms. Sherman suggested, “approximately 1,500 square feet or less.” The Commission agreed.

Nancye Splinter, 1027 G Avenue, stated the Commission did not have to be so specific; they should instead “give birth to it and push it on.” She felt the Commission should just take the idea, form a concept, go forward with it, and pass it on.

Chairperson Keith responded that the Commission was only trying to establish some guidelines.

Ms. Sherman agreed and added that when this item is brought before the City Attorney or City Council, the Commission should be able to articulate what the organization is going to do that Historical Resource Commission (HRC) cannot. She felt that general guidelines should be in place, and then the initial Board can refine some of the issues. She commented that it is important to have the support of the HRC and the City. She also wanted to be able to communicate to the City that because of the criteria that was placed on the homes and what the Commission can do, there is a gap and the Commission wants to participate with the City in filling in the gap – the Commission is not tasked to do this.

Commissioner Wilson suggested that on the Mission Statement, the fourth paragraph regarding the Mills act, should be deleted. In its place, “at the present time” should be changed to “at the present time, unless a cottage or bungalow meets historic criteria in addition to its age, the community is without a method of protecting it...” Strike “while a small home might qualify for assistance....” She felt that the Mills Act is controversial and funds are limited, so it would be better to rely on finding a way to refer individuals to a bank who will make low interest loans for cottages through the program, perhaps receive grants generated by the new Board, and take that financial component and do away with it so the City has no fiduciary liability.

Chairperson Keith agreed with removing the fourth paragraph. She also stated that any house that goes through the program and is made livable with the assistance of the “Conservancy” must still be labeled and designated a Historic Resource.

Ms. Sherman asked clarification from Commissioner Wilson if she was alluding that citizens in

Coronado were not able to apply for the Mills Act money. Commissioner Wilson said she was not communicating that information. She clarified that citizens may qualify but funds are limited. Other options may include involving local banks in the program and having them offer low interest loans.

Commissioner Keith clarified that there are limited funds that City Council puts aside each year for the Mills Act.

Story Vogel, 350 D Avenue, clarified requirements on the Mills Act.

Ms. Sherman said that it would be a better idea to not include the Mills Act. In response to Mr. Vogel's questions, she said that one of many possible benefits is low interest construction loans, obtaining pro bono or low cost architectural consultations, supplementing what the City already provides to the Commission but targeting persons who do not quite meet the criteria or qualifications. Another possible benefit would be exemption from the RSIP requirements for having a historically sensitive modification.

Ms. McCaull stated that the only properties that are eligible under the original criteria are those have been designated as historic resource.

Commissioner Wilson stated that the Commission is trying to define what Coronado's cottages should be and what benefits will be offered. Focus should be given to benefits such as assistance by reduced interest rates, free professional advice from a referral list, grants from the Cottage Committee, loans from local banks for rehab only.

Ms. McCaull stated that since the person is going through a discretionary permit process through the HRC to obtain the alteration permit, while they can provide exceptions, that addition will be sensitively done so that the neighbors' privacy will not be affected, and so it will be consistent with the goals of the RSIP.

Commissioner Wilson said that when she reviewed the cottage designation information, she felt it was a separate but equal program from the historic designation program. Creating livability not history was the objective.

Ms. Sherman stated that credibility is lost if the criteria for demolition is watered down, which is why a separate organization should be formed. Once the Conservancy is given permission, the HRC would be responsible for approval or designation.

Holly Nappen, 1033 Adella Avenue, concurred with the separation idea. She felt it would be difficult enough to retain the cottages and if persons must go through more red tape, they may not want to do it.

Mary Turrell, 1116 Fifth Street, inquired if the Commission had contacted the National Trust for assistance.

Nancye Splinter, 1027 G Avenue, suggested that maybe the Commission may could the cottages and then pass it on to the Conservancy.

Ms. McCaull added that when the Commission goes before City Council with a new list used for demolition permit requests, maybe they could indicate a desire to modify some of the criteria for the demolition.

After a brief discussion, the Commission decided in the interim to call the new Board, "Coronado's Cottage Conservancy," or "the Conservancy."

Commissioner Wilson stated that the Mills Act paragraph should be deleted. She read it as follows: "At the present time, unless cottage or bungalow meets historic criteria in addition to its age, the community is without a method of protecting it from demolition and promoting its historically sensitive modification." She stated it ties onto the last portion of the paragraph preceding it.

Commissioner Wilson referred to Page 80, regarding the original Board, and asked Ms. Sherman if only the original Board would be comprised of the architect, contractor, interior designer, banker, etcetera, because often it is very difficult to get professional persons to commit.

Ms. Sherman stated it would be in the bylaws that any Board would be initially comprised of those types of persons.

Nancye Splinter, 1027 G Avenue, suggested that the mission statement could include, "As a courtesy, one non-voting member could be from the HRC, one non-voting member should be from Coronado Historical Association." She did not feel the HRC should appoint the five to seven voting members.

Chairperson Keith said that one person from the HRC could sit in as a non-voting member and could keep the liaison open.

Ms. Sherman felt the HRC should be able to recommend appointments but did not have the authority and should not appoint persons. She confirmed that Commissioner MacCartee would be assisting in the recruiting of members.

Chairperson Keith suggested that each Commissioner submit the names of five persons whom they felt may be interested in serving. She felt that there should be only one non-voting member selected from the HRC.

Nancye Splinter, 1027 G Avenue, stated that Dr. Mark Johnson had left the meeting, but had volunteered to pay for an additional mailing, up to \$1000. He has already designed the postcard with the cottage in the front of it.

The Commission thanked Dr. Johnson.

Ms. Sherman confirmed that she would be returning at the next meeting with a revised Mission Statement.

The Commission thanked Ms. Sherman.

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

This item was continued to the next meeting.

Discussion regarding the Public Outreach Program.

This item was continued.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Tony A Peña
Director of Community Development