

HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

November 2, 2005

The regular meeting of the Coronado Historic Resource Commission was called to order at 3:02 p.m., Wednesday, November 2, 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
Leticia Martinez, Recording Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of October 19, 2005, were approved as amended.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. McCaull reported that City Council, at their meeting last night, considered the Commission's recommendation for the 2006 Mills Act agreements. City Council supported their recommendation with the exception of the property at 629 A Avenue. A list of seven properties will be forwarded to the County Assessor for Mills Act processing. There are currently 22 properties participating in the Mills Act program.

Chairperson Keith stated that the City Council also approved the property at 627 A Avenue for next year. The amount of money for that property was about \$8,000, which means that there will be about \$1,200 for Mills Act next year. City Council is very serious about keeping the \$10,000 cap and not having the Commission ask for additional funds. There was no one from the public speaking on this subject.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Chairperson Keith reported that HRC's Newsletter has been included published by the Eagle Journal today (November 2 Edition). She hopes that everyone reads the Commission's third Newsletter, and that it will keep the community updated. She noticed in the legal ad section that four separate properties will be considered for historic designation at the next HRC meeting. There are currently 64 designated historic properties and she looks forward to additional designations.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

HR 20-05 **Warren, Carol & David** – Request for Historic Designation of the property 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 is 50' wide and 140' deep, containing 7,000 square feet. It contains a single story dwelling with a large attic and a detached accessory building. The owners have applied for historic designation to retain the residence within the community for future generations. The home was built in 1925 so it is about 80 years old. It was built by O.W. Dorman, who built several homes within the community in the 1920's (605 10th Street, 1030 Olive), which are very similar in architectural style. This property is a Tudor architectural style and has a very steep multiple gable roof. The exterior is stucco and there is multi pane wood windows in the front façade that are symmetrically located. There is a larger arched front window in the middle and the front entry way mimics that single arched window. The inventory completed in the '80's gave this home an historical value rating of 3. The rating was between 1 and 5 depending upon their historical significance – a 3 meant it had some historical significance.

Carol Warren, 566 B Avenue, the applicant, said she would like to re-do the home and keep it as close to its original version in 1925.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Herron said she appreciated the applicant's thoroughness on her application.

Vice Chair MacCartee thanked the applicant for coming forward.

Commissioner Draper noticed on the application that it stated the front wood windows were damaged by termites and will plan to replace the wood windows in kind. If it is designated, this change will have to come before the Commission.

Chairperson Keith concurred with the Commissioners and said it will be a great addition to the list of designated homes. The architecture is very special and worth saving.

COMMISSION ACTION

VICE CHAIR MACCARTEE MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION WOULD CONSIDER 566 B AVENUE (HR 20-05) 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 AND ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY;
- B. IT IS NOT IDENTIFIED WITH PERSONS 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

- 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 (O.W. DORMAN), DESIGNER, ARCHITECT, ARTISAN OR LANDSCAPE PROFESSIONAL.

COMMISSIONER WILSON 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** – Preliminary Review and comment on proposed alterations to the historically designated residence addressed as 1045 Loma Avenue and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone. The proposed alterations would also involve exceptions to current zoning standards.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. The Commission has established a policy to allow for preliminary review applications to come before the Commission for early input. These applications are noticed to all property owners within 300 feet of the property. It provides for informal dialogue between the applicant, owners, surrounding properties, and the Commission on the best manner to approach potential alterations with [an](#) Historic Resource. This property was designed by Richard Requa, and is one of the larger properties in Coronado. The property is for sale and the person who is considering buying it would like to obtain some initial feedback from the Commission on proposed alterations to the property. The three main issues are as follows: (1) motor coach garage that the applicant would like to locate along Loma Avenue, as there is extensive landscaping on this avenue, the structure would not be very visible. It would be slightly recessed below grade, about one or two feet. The main issue is the location of the motor coach as it relates to the side yard setback requirement. If they locate the coach to comply with the nine foot side yard setback requirement, it would require removal of the portion of the historic house. It would be necessary to accommodate the width of the motor coach. Alternatively, if the applicant is allowed to have a reduced side yard setback of about two feet so the applicant would have a side yard setback along Loma Avenue of about seven feet, the applicant can accommodate the width of the motor coach and also it would not necessitate altering the historic building; (2) a second story addition that the owners would like to put above the motor coach. When this project was originally approved, there were alterations approved for this project about one year ago. There were second story additions in this general vicinity. The new standards that have been in effect with the RSIP proposal changed the rear yard setback requirements, so the proposed second story would not necessarily comply with the new standards. Additionally, there are some limitations on the amount of balconies that one can have projecting into the required rear yard, and the applicant is requesting some relief. The purpose of the balcony off the rear yard is to enhance the view of the Pacific Ocean; (3) modifications to an existing

garage (towards Flora Avenue). The applicant has two proposed scenarios: (a) one would move the garage structure close to the front of the semi circular driveway and it would comply with the Code requirements. However, this would obstruct the view of the historic building; (b) as an alternative, the applicant is proposing to bring out the garage closer to Flora Avenue. If this is done, it would not encroach into the front yard setback into the property and would allow for the existing historic building to be viewed. In addition, the alteration permit the Commission considered one year ago also proposed some modification to the garage structure. The concept being presented today is not as intense. As an historically designated property, the Commission has the ability to provide some relief to the Code pertaining to setbacks. Correspondence was received from Liz Forsyth Lovell, who is representing Albert and Mary Forsyth at 1022 Flora, the property next door. Their main interest pertains to the garage coming out on Flora Avenue. They have questions they would like answered today. The letter questions, "...if the proposed new garage on the north wing will continue to be a two story building. We object any further second story additions on this wing since it blocks our sunlight and view of the park. Secondly, the proposed new garage, how can they be history built to the original format proposed in 2004. It seems the architecture would be historically incorrect. The beauty of this property was designed as a Moorish castle and the two stories or any more additions featured at both north and south winds conflict with the architectural design of Richard Requa." In addition, there is a comment on a potential conflict of interest with the person who is the listing real estate agent who is also the adjoining property owner along Loma Avenue.

Steve McGill, 2703 E. Bainbridge Road, representing the potential buyer of the property, said he included in the packet a list of why he feels this alternative is more desirable in preserving the historical building than the proposed alterations submitted one year earlier. It preserves more of the front elevation of the home. Although Flora Avenue appears to be the front yard of the home, the functional front of the house is via Star Park Circle. The proposed garage is much smaller in mass and it exposes more of the front elevation of the home to Star Park Circle. This proposal would require reduction to 10' on Flora Avenue. On the Loma Avenue side of the home, the proposed expansion extends from the front outside corner of the existing residence and then goes towards the rear. That provides for much more front elevation on Star Park Circle to be exposed to the street. This proposal would require a decreased side yard setback on Loma Avenue from 9.75' to 7.75' and encroach into the recently adopted second story rear yard setback, a portion of the second story master bedroom and outdoor deck area.

Chairperson Keith said that on the 2004 proposal, there was a second story facing Flora Avenue. Does the applicant desire to keep the same second story in the 2005 proposed version?

Mr. McGill said the final design has not been done yet so it was not presented for discussion today. He was also not aware there was interest from the adjacent property owners relative to the second story element. He did clarify that the 2005 proposal included a second story, but was not as massive and does not extend as far into Star Park Circle. It is screened by the landscaping.

Chairperson Keith asked if the side of the proposed motor coach garage was 45 X 18.

Mr. McGill responded yes.

Commissioner Draper asked if the roof deck would be on top of the second floor.

Mr. McGill said he misspoke. It is on top of the first story and is accessible at grade from the master bedroom, second level. The 2004 proposed floor plan did have a third story roof top deck, but this plan does not.

Commissioner Draper said that in 2004, Mr. Dolgen had visited the San Diego Historical Association and found the original plans for the home. She asked if Mr. McGill has looked at those plans.

Mr. McGill said he has not. The plans done in 2004 identified the original structure, and the additions that were added in the last 25 years.

Bob Bowlus, Architect, said that although they did not see the original drawings for the structure, the 2004 proposed addition that was never done, the exhibits were very thorough and had a great deal of information on the original structure.

Deleted: Boules

Commissioner Draper said that in 2004, the intent was to replicate some of the damages that had been done to the building after to its original construction.

Mr. McGill said that when he recently saw the ceramic tile in the entry of the home, he realized that someone had not lovingly restored the home, which is the intent of the buyer, to properly renovate the home.

Vice Chair MacCartee asked if the present garage which was built about 25 years ago would be going.

Mr. Bowlus said that the garage will be expanded to get a more sizeable garage in keeping with the stature of the garage. They are more sensitive to the existing structure in that the current proposal does not encroach completely in front of the historical building on either side. They are not proposing anything two stories beyond what exists even though it is not historic.

Deleted: Boules

Mr. McGill said that the house has had some cosmetic improvements done over the years by various owners. The major systems in the house have never been updated. What needs to be done is that the heating, plumbing and electrical need to be re-done and brought up to Code. It is a substantial investment that needs to be done. It is necessary at the same time that the livability of the house be updated as well so that it will be preserved and maintained. That is the essence of the application. The owner wants to make the house so that it will be preserved and appreciated for the next 100 years.

Vice Chair MacCartee asked if the motor coach garage would house a motor coach.

Mr. McGill responded yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Lindsey, 1110 Isabella, asked if the 2004 proposal that was approved was still in effect or was it expired.

Ms. McCaull said it was still in effect.

Story Vogel, 350 D Avenue, said that the current proposed plan is a major improvement over the 2004 proposed plan in that there is no incursion into the Star Park area. However, he felt that putting a massive structure for a motor home on a Requa home is a big step.

Daphne Brown, 326 First Street, said that she realized that a historically designated home can have some forgiveness but one should be careful. She asked if the City Council has made any decisions with motor homes being parked on the street or in side yards.

Ms. McCaull said that the City Council is currently researching the issue of the motor homes and where they should be located on the street, restricting hours, etc., but have not come to any conclusion yet.

Scott Aurich, 916 Glorietta, said that the house he is building next door will not be impacted by this project. The second story setback requirement was really designed to protect privacy from rear yard setbacks and it is the structure and the way it sits on the lot that creates this rear yard setback which looks across his front yard. It is already a public area for visibility and is not private but the encroachment on the second story setback for the master bedroom does not look into any private space that would be protected otherwise. He does not have an issue with the proposed plans.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Vice Chair MacCartee asked if the second story of the motor home is just for the view.

Mr. [Bowlus](#) responded no. The motor home is a tall space; it is one story. The existing building has a non historic, second story edition over that sunroof off to the side. What he proposes to do is put a master bedroom on top of the motor home. There is a second story part over part of it and beyond that, there is some outdoor deck off the master bedroom proposed to be on the roof of the motor home, as well as a sloped roof to screen it and minimize the roof deck. The roof deck is not on top of the master bedroom but rather just off the open doors on top of the motor home garage.

Deleted: Boules

Commissioner Draper asked if it was on the same level.

Mr. [Bowlus](#) responded yes.

Deleted: Boules

Commissioner Herron said she appreciated what has been proposed so far – it is a gentler remodel. The relief that is being offered to the applicant is substantial in the sense that they are capturing the view of the ocean but they are also taking the motor coach off the street. She found it acceptable. She said that Mr. McGill represented this item well and appreciated that he spoke to the neighbors about this project.

Vice Chair MacCartee agreed. She is always concerned about this type of addition. She trusts that the applicant will keep the type of vegetation so that the motor coach garage is not so visible. She also asked if Mr. [Bowlus](#) could speak with the all of the neighbors.

Deleted: Boules

Commissioner Wilson said she was concerned about a motor coach being on the property at all, particularly a Requa property. She feels it is concealed fairly well, does not like the idea, but says the architect has done a good job in concealing it.

Commissioner Draper said she loved the new garage on the Flora Avenue side. She liked keeping the circular driveway but is still concerned about a potential second story on top of the new garage. She does not like the idea of putting a motor coach garage in a Requa home.

Chairperson Keith said they had done a great job. The vegetation is lush and would hide 90 percent of everything. She did have an issue with the sides. Although she complimented them on picking a good location for the garage, she felt that a 45' side is very large. She would like to know how this could be made compatible with the Requa building. Is there a way to reduce this structure in size?

Mr. McGill said that in terms of the mass of the building, the side that faces onto Loma Avenue is the most massive. That is also the side that has the most landscaping to make the building less noticeable. The combination of the wall and landscaping shields that side of the building from Loma Avenue. The front is simply a 12 X 12 door and above the door will be a very Requa style balcony off the master bedroom. The only elevation that will be seen of this motor coach garage is the front elevation with the 12 X 12 door and the balcony. He did not feel the size of the structure was a crucial element; it is how the massing is handled.

Chairperson Keith said that if it is done right, it could be an okay addition. She also reminded Mr. McGill that some plantings will be removed.

Mr. McGill said that enough plantings would remain to soften the wall. The second story master bedroom element of that side elevation will have articulation in glazing and will be very pleasing. The intent is to do something in keeping with the Requa home.

Commissioner Wilson asked if anyone had spoken with the owners about keeping the motor coach elsewhere. She understands that other residents keep their motor coaches on a special lot in a special place.

Mr. McGill said that the applicants use their motor coach on almost a weekly basis and to have it located elsewhere would not be acceptable. In addition, the garage has been designed in such a way by the architect that the motor coach will not be backed out onto the street.

Commissioner Wilson requested that for the record, there be a stipulation that there would have to be plants.

Mr. McGill said his preference would be to have tall vegetation but to be able to see the second story elevation through the vegetation.

Chairperson Keith thanked the applicant's representatives and asked them to do whatever they could to reduce the size of the building. She said the Commission looked forward to see them again.

Mr. [Bowlus](#) commented that the owners have a 40' motor coach. The proposed garage is designed for the motor coach.

Deleted: Boules

Commissioner Herron asked Mr. [Bowlus](#) to walk them through the turning radius of the motor coach garage.

Deleted: Boules

Mr. [Bowlus](#), using visual aids, explained the motor coach garage proposal.

Deleted: Boules

COMMISSION ACTION

No action was taken.

HAP 14-05 **WRIGHT, JOHN & NAN** – Request for Historic Alteration Permit for modifications to previously approved permit to include the minor expansion of the new garage, addition of a carriage house above the garage, and roof deck on the main dwelling of the historically designated property addressed as 1117 G Avenue and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone. The permit also requests exceptions to current zoning standards that were not in effect when the original permit was issued.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. A Notice of Intent to Demolish permit application was originally filed by the owners. It was determined at the hearing the property met the criteria to be deemed a historic resource and designated it as historic resource. The owners appealed the decision to the City Council. However, before it went before the City Council, the owners decided to work with the Commission and the neighbors and came up with a proposed alteration to the structure so that the structure would be preserved rather than demolished and an addition would be completed. The Commission issued an alteration permit for the property in January 2005, and that permit included a second story addition to the residence, a new garage, and miscellaneous changes to the exterior of the residence. They are proposing additional changes. The primary change to the historic residence is the addition of a roof deck. On the previous application, there was an identification of an upper roof mechanical well, but details were not provided. There is some flexibility on the proposed roof deck. The main issue is whether or not the alteration to the historic residence meets the criteria identified in the Code. In addition, the roof deck proposal, does comply with all of the new standards in effect under the RSIP proposal except for the new rear yard setback. When the new standards went into effect, the idea was to move the roof decks closer to the front of the property so that adjoining properties could have better privacy of their rear yards. If the applicant moves the roof deck towards the front of the property line to comply with the new setback requirements for the roof decks, it will detract from the original historical look of the residence. They are requesting some relief from the setback requirements for the roof deck. The second change to the site is a proposed terrace along the front of the property. They have basically widened that a bit and made it go along the entire frontage of the property. That complies with the Code. The next change involves a minor widening of the garage that was previously proposed at the rear of the property. It has increased slightly in length and complies with the current Code. The applicants are now proposing a carriage house above the garage. Carriage houses became allowed with the new RSIP standards that went into effect in July of 2005. A carriage house is essentially a two-story structure with habitable space in the second story. It is not a rentable unit and does not contain a kitchen. In order to build a carriage house, there are a number of requirements. The proposal meets about 10 of the 13 requirements. The applicants are requesting relief on three items. One requirement is that the second story of the main dwelling needs to be setback a certain distance from

the rear property line. The Code requires 54 feet; they have 38 feet. The second requirement is that the carriage house be separated from the main building by 25 feet. They do not have that open space between the two structures. Lastly, the Code requires that the carriage house not extend 26 feet from the rear property line. They want it towards the rear of the property line. One corner of the addition for the carriage house does extend into the 26 foot requirement. Those are the items under consideration. The lot coverage and floor ratio remain fairly similar to what was previously proposed and it does comply with today's Code requirements.

Kevin Rugee, Architect, 1024 Isabella Avenue, said that the carriage house came in as part of the RSIP changes. They felt it could work with this property and it was designed to comply with the Codes. He said that what complicates the property is the rear property line, it is diagonal and it skews every measurement taken. In some areas, there will be different dimensions. The second item is the roof deck. When the application was submitted, a mechanical well was included. The idea was to have some type of inconspicuous roof deck or mechanical area so if the owners wanted to access that area, they could use a pull down stair or something simple. The owners have since reconsidered and wish to have direct access to the roof deck. In complying with the Code, it will push the roof deck to the front of the house, which will detract from the house. He would like to locate it in the center of the house. He feels this is a better solution than what the Code requires. He has also added an interior stair to conceal the stairway than having an exterior stairway. There are five standards that are required to comply with the new zoning for roof decks and four are in compliance. The widening of the garage is within the Code. He would like to extend the terrace three feet to give more access to the courtyard that is adjacent to the existing house. He made himself available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Draper asked if he had filled out the application form and if the applicants were living at the 1117 G Avenue address as stated on the application.

Mr. Rugee responded yes, he had filled out the application, and the applicants were living at that address.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Martha Jordan, 1125 G Avenue, said she lives two houses down from the applicant. She said she objects to the project because it is not a historical restoration, it destroys the integrity of the original Requa courtyard, and it is a severe blow to the historicity of the block which at this point is 80 percent intact. In addition, moving the roof deck back puts it directly in line with her backyard which destroys her privacy.

Chairperson Keith clarified there are three issues before the Commission today. They are the rear setback, roof deck and front terrace. She asked Ms. Jordan if she was objecting to the roof terrace.

Ms. Jordan said she was opposed to the roof terrace.

Chairperson Keith stated that the front terrace was already approved and the applicant today was asking for an additional three feet.

Nan Wright, 1117 G Avenue, said that she talked to the neighbors, Larry and Lynn Laughlin, showed them the plans and they did not have an issue except for the addition on top of the carriage house. They wanted some more windows and more of a mid line detail to the roof. More windows are proposed to be added. She also spoke with her other neighbors who have not seen the final plan yet. She was going to meet with her neighbors so that the integrity of all three homes can be maintained which she feels is a great idea. They will also be talking about the courtyard and the landscaping.

Nicholas Vega, Coronado Historical Association, commented that the Association would like to urge the Commission to take conservative measures when considering modifications to this dwelling. The reason is two-fold: to preserve the historical significance of this dwelling, and if actions are taken, this would set the precedence for other alterations to occur on dwellings that have been deemed as historically significant.

John Wright, 1117 G Avenue, said that they would love to have the observation deck in the front, however, it would ruin the elevations of the house from the street. It would not look historical. He does not feel that the deck would go far enough back to look into anyone's backyard. They spend most of their time in the courtyard.

Kathleen Suros, 1105 G Avenue, is the Alameda side of the three cottage complex. She understands Ms. Jordan's concern about the mass and the somewhat lack of privacy on the ocean side. She hopes that something can be worked out to eliminate some of the issues to make it in conformance. With regard to the courtyard side on the shared garden, she is pleased to be part of the discussions with her neighbors.

Commissioner Herron asked Mr. Vega to be more specific about his feelings about the historicity of the home and what he envisions.

Mr. Vega said his concerns do not pertain to the carriage house or to a certain extent the terrace extension. His concern had to do with the alteration to the exterior façade through the roof deck. This is a historical home and he would like to see it kept intact. Any additions would alter that.

Chairperson Keith asked Mr. Vega if he has seen the property because what is being presented today is a completely different structure than what currently exists.

Mr. Vega responded no, but he plans on doing so.

Chairperson Keith clarified that the second story has already been approved as well as a new front to the building with different windows. It will be rebuilt in such a way that it is sensitive to their neighbors that share the courtyard. The Commission has already approved alterations. The applicants are slightly modifying the alterations and asking a bit more.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Wilson said she was very sorry that the Commission had originally approved the second story. In listening to the presentation today, she does not agree with adding a carriage house, and would prefer not to see a roof deck or an expansion of the front terrace into the side yard because it will also change the way the house looks.

Commissioner Draper agreed that she was also sorry that the second floor addition was approved one year ago. She supports the addition of the carriage house because it meets 12 of the 15 current requirements but she has an issue with the roof deck. She is glad that the applicant and their neighbors are working together.

Vice Chair MacCartee said that when they voted for this, it was her understanding that they were voting to maintain a William Templeton Johnson compound. That structure is not longer historically significant. What is significant is the compound. When she looks at the plans, they are altering an altered plan already that bears little resemblance to what Templeton Johnson had in mind. She does not have an issue with this as long as the compound is maintained and their neighbors are okay with it.

Chairperson Keith said she did not have an issue with the carriage as it is part of the RSIP and is a great addition. She also has no concerns with the extension of the terrace into the side which would be the side yard (compound) because it will give the applicant a second access into the home. However, she has concerns about the roof terrace. She understands why the applicant would not want to bring it forward.

Kevin Rugee, using visual aids, showed where the side lines are located.

Chairperson Keith said that it would be difficult to see a neighbor's backyard from the roof terrace.

Commissioner Herron stated that her friends had a home built next door to them. The house next door put a third story roof deck on their home and this has eliminated all privacy for her friends. She finds a third floor roof deck offensive.

Mr. Wright said that the observation deck was proposed to be able to see the ocean but it is not necessary to have it. They do not wish to invade their neighbor's privacy. So if it is not approved, it is okay with them. They withdraw their request for the roof deck.

Chairperson Keith reiterated that the roof deck has been withdrawn. She does not have an issue with the carriage house nor the extension of the terrace.

Mr. Wright clarified that the original application did have a provision for a mechanical well. He wishes to retain that request.

Chairperson Keith said that the motion will not direct the applicant to place their air conditioning underground.

COMMISSION ACTION

CHAIRPERSON KEITH MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE HAP 14-05 HISTORIC ALTERATION PERMIT AS SUBMITTED, PERMITTING THE SECOND STORY EDITION TO THE GARAGE AND THE CHANGE TO THE FRONT TERRACE AS THE ONLY TWO CHANGES TO THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED ALTERATION PERMIT.

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 DRAPER 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.

MISCELLANEOUS

Appointment of Historic Resource Commissioner to be a Non-Voting Member to the Coronado Cottage Conservancy (CCC) (no report)

The Commission agreed to elect Commissioner MacCartee to be a non-voting member to the CCC.

Commission discussion regarding Historic Alteration Permit requests for reduced setbacks (no report)

Chairperson Keith said that the Commission is being asked to grant variances on setbacks that are so severe that the buildings cannot be maintained. She requested that the Commission consider a policy considering a percentage reduction.

Vice Chair MacCartee said that each historic property is different because of lot divisions, illegal lot splits, etc. She was unsure if there should be a hard rule on this.

Commissioner agreed that it would be difficult to make a hard and fast rule.

Chairperson Keith suggested that a policy not be made but to say that each house is different and will be considered separately; however, they will communicate that small setbacks are not encouraged.

Commissioner Herron said that so many issues arise so they should be looked at individually.

Chairperson Keith agreed that they should be careful when they chose to make those exceptions.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

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

Ms. McCaull said that this list should be done by the next meeting. She still has about 100 photographs to take. The goal is to get a recommendation to Council by December.

Vice Chair MacCartee said she had a request from Mr. Vogel at 350 D Avenue to be placed on the list. His home is 72 years old and she requested that it be added to the list.

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.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

Tony A Peña
Director of Community Development