

HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

May 3, 2006

The regular meeting of the Coronado Historic Resource Commission was called to order at 3:04 p.m., Wednesday, May 3, 2006, at the Coronado City Hall Council Chambers, 1825 Strand Way, Coronado, California, by Chairperson Keith.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Commissioner Herron.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of April 5, 2006 were approved as amended.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There was no separate report.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Mary Joralman, 1116 5th Street, said she is very concerned about the number of demolitions in the community. She wants to know how she can help save these homes.

Chairperson Keith responded that one of the ways she can help is to contact Council members and communicate her concerns, as well as encourage other residents to do the same. She is aware that Ms. Joralman is involved with the Cottage Conservancy, which is making major headway in getting the word out to the community about the importance of historic preservation.

Chairperson Keith referred to an article from the Wall Street Journal, which speaks about a significant rise in property value for homes located in historic districts. She asked that staff distribute the article to the Commissioners at the next meeting.

Commissioner Wilson said she received an email regarding the San Luis Rey property that was demolished. The citizen felt that SOHO would have helped the Commission save the property. Ms. Wilson said she does not feel that the Commission has the tools to prevent the demolition.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

NOI 2-06 **MICHAEL A. NAPOLITANO** – Consideration of Notice of Intent to Demolish the two single family residences addressed as 555 and 559 E Avenue and located in the R-3 (Multiple Family Residential) Zone.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. Both of the homes are older than 75 years of age which triggers the review process by the Commission. The front home was built in 1924 and is 82 years of age. The rear home was built in 1925 and is 81 years of age. Both homes were owned and built by A.E. Brusk. City permit records indicate few if any alterations have occurred to both homes since their original construction. Both homes generally represent the Craftsman architectural style with low pitched gabled roofs with wide, unenclosed eave overhangs, exposed roof rafter tails, porch wood siding and double hung windows. The front home appears to be in fairly good condition and represents the small, bungalow style cottage. The back dwelling appears to be not as representative. It is important to note that in 2005, the Commission reviewed two other homes on the same property for demolitions. Those homes were also built by the same owner/builder, and the Commission found that those homes did not meet the criteria to be deemed an historic resource. There currently is a new home that is being built on the site as well as a home off the alley above a tandem garage. If the Commission deems these homes are not historic, the owner plans to proceed with the same kind of development project for the next lot. That will leave one remaining lot for this parcel. Correspondence was received from Sandra and Roger Locke, indicating their opposition to the demolition of the homes. It appears to be more representative of concern for what may replace the structures rather than the removal.

The applicant, Michael Napolitano, 125 G Avenue, said they began on construction of one home last year. He has plans to construct two new homes for his daughter and grandson. He added that the interior of the front house is in very poor condition.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mary Joralman, 1116 5th Street, said the home is very lovely and there are not many left on E Avenue.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Chairperson Keith said that the City Council passed an ordinance that stated that any home which is 75 years or older must come before the HRC to determine if it meets the criteria to be designated an historic resource. If it is not deemed historic, the demolition permit is granted. If it is designated historic, the applicant must go through another permit process. The Commission needs to make a determination as to whether the subject homes are deemed historic.

Commissioner Draper said she walked by the property at 555 E Avenue and the home's exterior appeared to be well maintained and in good condition. However, she agreed that the rear home is not in good condition.

Vice Chair MacCartee said she felt that a good case could be made in favor of these homes in that the architectural style exemplifies what Coronado is. She has worked with Mr. Napolitano in the past and he has been a great friend of historical preservation on previous occasions. She also understands this is happening due to economical reasons.

Commissioner Wilson said the Commission does not have the tools to keep this as an historic property.

Chairperson Keith said that the homes are in an R-3 zone and are virtually the only homes on that block that have not been developed. Although it does represent the architectural history of our town, the neighborhood cannot be saved at this point.

COMMISSION ACTION

VICE CHAIR MACCARTEE MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE STRUCTURES ADDRESSED AS 555 AND 559 E AVENUE (NOI 2-06) DO NOT MEET THE CRITERIA TO BE DESIGNATED A HISTORIC RESOURCE, WITH THE ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION STATING THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- A. IT DOES EXEMPLIFY OR REFLECT SPECIAL ELEMENTS OF THE CITY'S 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 19 (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).

FURTHER, IT IS NOTED THAT THE BLOCK HAS BEEN SIGNIFICANTLY ALTERED AND COULD NOT BE PART OF AN HISTORIC DISTRICT.

IN ADDITION, THE OWNER MUST 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 KEITH SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed 4-0.

There is a 10-day appeal period.

NOI 3-06 **STANLEY J. KMIEC** – Consideration of Notice of Intent to Demolish the single family residence addressed as 366 E Avenue and located in the R-1B (Single Family Residential) Zone.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. This home was built in 1912; it is 94 years of age. City records indicate a permit was issued in 1912 for the construction of a 4-room dwelling at an estimated cost of \$1,500. No information was available regarding the contractor or designer of the residence. Few, if any, alterations have occurred to the building other than routine maintenance. It represents a simple Craftsman bungalow architectural style which is representative of the type of housing development that occurred within the community in the early 1900's. The Historic Resource Inventory completed in the 1980's gave this home a rating of 5. Homes were rated 1 through 5, with 1 being most significant, and 5 having been altered or in poor physical condition. A letter was received by Sandra and Roger Locke objecting to the demolition of the home, stating it had historical significance and concerned with what might be built in the future.

The applicant's representative, Lorelei Rossi, 3605 Earnscliff Place #57, San Diego, is representing her father, Stanley Kmiec, who resides at the subject property. Her father is 92 years old and has lived and worked in the community as a groundskeeper on the Coronado Golf Course. She needs to find alternative living arrangements for him and plans to use the funds from the sale of the house to sustain him for the remainder of his life.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Nancye Splinter, 1027 G Avenue, said that she had no issues with the home being sold. She would prefer to see the home designated as an historic resource and perhaps have the Cottage Conservancy work with the new owners to make it more habitable. In addition, she would like to see the Commission work with new criteria.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Vice Chair MacCartee asked if the owner was asking for a demolition permit so that he could obtain more money during the sale. She understands if this is the case, and agreed that the criteria needs to be re-worked as the smaller homes have no protection.

Commissioner Wilson again asked Ms. Rossi if she was asking for a demolition permit in order to bring in more money during the sale.

Ms. Rossi responded that as her father is aging, the medical upkeep can be significant. She does not know how she can maintain the home and still care for her father. She feels there would be more money to cover expenses if she had a demolition permit when she sold the home.

Vice Chair MacCartee asked Ms. Rossi if she would be demolishing the home.

Ms. Rossi responded no. She is planning to sell the property as-is. Unfortunately, she cannot wait any longer.

Commissioner Draper said it is unfortunate that the owner couldn't just sell the property to a potential buyer who was interested in remodeling it. There is plenty of room to add on in the rear of the home as it is 140 feet deep. However, she understands the situation.

Ms. Rossi said it is her understanding that the home may be viewed as historic, therefore, it is necessary for her to look at what may be available to the new owner. If she puts it on the market as is, the potential buyer would then have to go through this process and wait about two months to obtain permission to demolish or alter the home.

Commissioner Draper stated that the potential buyer would not necessarily have to wait two months; it could be as quick as two weeks. Once the home is designated, they would have relief of various codes and many other benefits.

Ms. Rossi said she would make this information available to potential buyers.

Chairperson Keith asked Ms. Rossi if she was familiar with or had contacted the Coronado Cottage Conservancy.

Ms. Rossi responded no.

Chairperson Keith explained the purpose of the Conservancy and the many benefits it offers.

Ms. Rossi said that because of time and economical constraints, she would prefer a decision today.

Chairperson Keith encouraged Ms. Rossi to look for other alternatives other than demolition. For example, it is zoned R-1B and the neighborhood consists of older homes. There are no apartment buildings in the block and it is a wonderful neighborhood. Further, they are finding that homes that are designated bring in more money if they are in an historic district because the potential buyer knows that the neighborhood will remain the same. She then asked Ms. Rossi what she wished to do.

Ms. Rossi requested that the Commission proceed with the ruling.

Chairperson Keith clarified that if the Commission rules that the property is not historic, it will be very difficult to return at a later date and declare it historic, unless there is new information.

Ms. Rossi confirmed that she understood.

Chairperson Keith asked staff to clarify information in the ordinance that states that historic homes can be demolished if it is due to financial hardship.

Ms. McCaull read from the Ordinance, Section 70.22.180(b), which states, "Any proposed relocation or demolition shall require one or more of the following findings: demolition of a home that has been designated as an historic resource..." and "...the property owners

demonstrated a thorough analysis has been undertaken for a viable option for the preservation of the structure including but not limited to relocation, alternative land uses...but there does not appear to be a solution and has resulted in considerable financial hardship to the property owner.” In other words, if a property has been designated as an historic resource and the property owner decides that they want to demolish it or relocate it, the only way that a demolition or relocation permit can be issued is to show that they have explored alternatives to keep the home but the solution is not an economically viable one.

Chairperson Keith stated it would make it more complicated, so maybe that would not work.

Ms. McCaull said there are other options which include (1) denying without prejudice; or (2) stating that the findings, based upon the information that is in the application, do not meet the criteria to designate the home historic – but do so “without prejudice,” so that if someone wants to return and provide new information, the Commission could reconsider the request.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER DRAPER MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE STRUCTURE ADDRESSED AS 366 E AVENUE (NOI 3-06) DOES 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 OR REFLECT 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 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 19 (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).

FURTHER, THIS RULING IS MADE WITHOUT PREJUDICE. SHOULD NEW INFORMATION BECOME AVAILABLE IN THE FUTURE REGARDING THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROPERTY, THE COMMISSION WOULD

BE WILLING TO CONSIDER A HISTORIC DESIGNATION REQUEST FOR THE SUBJECT PROPERTY.

IN ADDITION, THE OWNER MUST 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 KEITH SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed 4-0.

There is a 10-day appeal period.

MISCELLANEOUS

None.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

HR 14-04 City of Coronado: Consideration of a Draft Demolition Permit Review List to replace the existing ordinance that uses a 75-year criteria as a trigger mechanism for the Notice of Intent to Demolish Permit process. This List includes single family, multiple family, and non-residential properties.

The Commission reviewed the list of potential properties and made a determination as to which properties should be kept, reviewed further, or eliminated from the list.

Discussion regarding the Coronado Cottage Conservancy (no report)

Chairperson Keith reported there was an Open House held on April 30 at 941 G Avenue, at Ann and Henry Patterson's home. There are three structures on the property: a house, studio, and barn. There were 93 visitors and many positive comments were received. Also, there are two new members who signed up for the Coronado Cottage Conservancy (CCC) and many others who took information. Funds were collected for the three Open Houses held to date.

Vice Chair MacCartee will run ads of persons who have saved/restored a cottage and recognize their contribution to the community. The first ad should run in about two weeks.

Ms. McCaull reported that the City is in receipt of the CCC's recommendation/request for assistance from the City to help in the preservation of cottages. She met with the Director of Administrative Services, who reviewed the CCC's proposal and she will be forwarding a recommendation to the City Manager in the next day or so, and will advise the Conservancy.

Discussion regarding the Mills Act Program (no report)

Chairperson Keith requested this item be placed on the agenda because she would like to ask for the City Council's permission to hold a workshop(s) to discuss possible language that may improve the Mills Act, and include criteria for historic preservation designation. She suggests drafting a letter to City Council stating this request.

Ms. McCaull suggested that the Commission ask for changes to the process so that the Commission not only comments on the list of improvements but also on the agreement itself.

Chairperson Keith felt it is the responsibility of the Commission to say whether a home is eligible or not.

Ms. McCaull suggested, along with the recommendation to approve, listing the persons who have applied and recommending that "given the current condition of the property, which is not in jeopardy of being demolished, that the Council not accept these agreements." Persons who applied for designation understand that they are eligible to apply for the Mills Act but there is no guarantee they will receive it.

Chairperson Keith asked staff if she would write a draft letter to Council requesting a public workshop for the Mills Act. Ms. McCaull accepted.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Tony A Peña
Director of Community Development