

HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

October 4, 2006

The regular meeting of the Coronado Historic Resource Commission was called to order at 3:08 p.m., Wednesday, October 4, 2006, at the Coronado City Hall Council Chambers, 1825 Strand Way, Coronado, California, by Chairperson Keith.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of September 20, 2006 were approved as amended.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. McCaull reported that the next meeting scheduled for October 18 will be lengthy. There will be three historic designation requests, three requests for demolition, one Mills Act request, and one alteration permit request.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

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

Commissioner Draper reported that she had spoken with Dr. Iris Ingstrand regarding the possible hire of a student as a consultant to the Commission. Dr. Ingstrand stated she has three students in mind and will provide more details within three weeks. It appears the compensation is \$20 to \$25 an hour plus expenses.

Chairperson Keith asked Ms. Draper to forward the information to Ms. McCaull so that it may be placed on a future agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

**HR 10-06**     **TIMOTHY ROHAN** – Request for Historic Designation of the single family residence addressed as 108 D Avenue and located in the R-1A(E) Zone. A future Historic Alteration Permit would request exceptions to building height regulations and side yard setback requirements.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. On September 6, 2006, the Commission conducted a preliminary review hearing to consider the possible designation of this

property along with future planned alterations. That proposal was well received. The applicant has returned with a formal application. The site contains a single family residence at the front of the property and contains about 630 square feet. A guest cottage at the rear of the property contains about 230 square feet. The site is 3,500 square feet. City records indicate that the residence appeared on the 1892 lot book so the home is about 114 years old. The Historic Resource Inventory completed in the 1980's gave this home an historical value of 3, which indicated the structure had some historical significance. The structure is a bungalow architectural style with board and batten siding and a high gable roof with a center chimney. The applicant completed additional research on the property which he will present. If the property is designated historic, the applicant plans to construct an additional building in the center of the property. The applicant would request relief from the height regulations for accessory buildings and for reduced side yard setbacks.

The applicant, Timothy Rohan, 108 D Avenue, said he noticed a discrepancy on the Source Point page regarding the date the home was constructed.

Chairperson Keith said that there have been errors discovered on the Source Point. Those errors are corrected as they are found.

Ms. McCaull said that the staff report reflects the correct date of construction.

Mr. Rohan said the home has single wall construction. With regard to the proposed addition, the applicant would apply for the construction of an accessory building to be located between the main dwelling and the guest house. The purpose of the accessory building is to create additional living space for his family without adding directly onto the existing older home. Along with the new building, the applicant would request relief in the height regulations for accessory buildings to allow a 21'6" tall building instead of the 14'3".

Chairperson Keith commented for the record that the request for relief for the proposed accessory building was discussed in great length at the previous meeting.

Commissioner Draper asked if the applicant's neighbors had commented about the proposed setback.

Mr. Rohan said his neighbor was very supportive of the proposed setback.

Vice Chair MacCartee asked the applicant about the source for his information that the home was built for Mr. Babcock of the Coronado Beach Company.

Mr. Rohan said the log book of 1892 lists the owner as Mr. Babcock. The original Deed of Trust currently in his possession is dated 1894 and states the home was sold to E. Quinlan. Mr. Babcock either bought the home or had it built for him.

Commissioner Draper said she enjoyed reading the historical information the applicant provided.

Mr. Rohan said Mr. Quinlan was also known for the building of the sewer system and Mary Quinlan was a driving force behind the construction of the first Coronado library.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

Daphne Brown, 226 First Street, supported the request for historic designation.

### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Chairperson Keith said the Commission should not discuss proposed future alterations but rather decide if the home meets the criteria to be designated historic.

Commissioner Wilson said it is a wonderful house and should be designated.

Commissioner Herron said in saving this home, the Commission has accomplished what they set out to do.

Vice Chair MacCartee agreed.

Commissioner Draper said she was glad to save the home.

### COMMISSION ACTION

VICE CHAIR MACCARTEE MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION WOULD CONSIDER 180 D AVENUE (HR 10-06) 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 SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AESTHETIC, AND ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY;
- B. IT IS IDENTIFIED WITH PERSONS SIGNIFICANT IN LOCAL HISTORY IN THAT THE ORIGINAL OWNERS, THE QUINLAN'S, WERE ONE OF THE PIONEERS IN CORONADO. MARY QUINLAN WAS A DRIVING FORCE BEHIND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE FIRST CORONADO LIBRARY AND MICHAEL QUINLAN WAS ONE OF THE FIRST CITY OF CORONADO EMPLOYEES AND WAS KNOWN FOR THE BUILDING OF THE CORONADO SEWER SYSTEM AND ALSO FOR OPERATING THE WATER TRUCK WHEN THE CITY HAD DIRT ROADS;
- C. IT IS ONE OF THE FEW REMAINING EXAMPLES IN THE CITY POSSESSING DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BUNGALOW ARCHITECTURAL STYLE, AND IS VALUABLE FOR THE STUDY OF A TYPE, PERIOD, OR METHOD OF SINGLE WALL CONSTRUCTION WHICH IS LOST WITHIN THE COMMUNITY AND HAS NOT BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY ALTERED.

COMMISSIONER HERRON SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed 5-0.

Chairperson Keith announced that this is the 88<sup>th</sup> home to be designated historic.

**HR 15-06**      **GEORGE WILEY** – Request for Historic Designation of the single family residence and compound addressed as 1043 Ocean Boulevard and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone. This designation request is being made contingent upon a future owner receiving Mills Act Agreement for the property.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. The site is 120' wide and about 140' deep totaling about 16,800 square feet. The property contains a main dwelling containing 7,300 square feet; a detached guest house containing about 3,100 square feet; and a garage structure with two apartments above containing about 2,400 square feet. The home was completed in 1908 so the residence is 98 years of age. The owner at that time was John D. Spreckels. According to the application, the home was built for his son, Claus Jr. Spreckels and his bride, Miss Ellis Moon, as a wedding gift. Before the couple occupied the residence, a red tile roof was added to the residence. The application also notes the home was designed by Harrison Albright, a well noted architect both locally and regionally. Some examples of the structures he designed in Coronado include the Coronado Public Library, Glorietta Bay Inn, the Coronado Bank building. In San Diego, he designed the U.S. Grant Hotel. The application also notes that the home has a "Beaux Arts" or Italian Renaissance Revival architectural style. The Historic Inventory completed in the 1980's gave this residence a historic value of 2H, which indicated that the structure very historically significant. The "H" designation indicated the home was on the Coronado Historical Association Register. The unique situation with this item is that the property is currently for sale. Mr. Scott Aurich is the authorized representative. The applicant is not interested in the designation of the property but the future owner is interested in the designation and the Mills Act Agreement. When the City adopted the Mills Act Program, a cap was placed on the program. There is a Special Exceptions clause written into the Resolution that indicates the Council can grant exceptions to the Mills Act Program when there is a very special, unique situation or when the property is in jeopardy of demolition,. The Commission should be aware that the application is being made contingent upon the City Council granting the special exception to the Mills Act.

Chairperson Keith said this is the first time they have considered this type of item. She spoke with Mr. Aurich and they both agree that this is one of the most historic homes in Coronado. She asked staff if the City Attorney has been involved with this contingent agreement.

Ms. McCaull said the designation is conditioned upon obtaining the Mills Act. If the Mills Act is not approved, the designation of the property would be withdrawn. However, if an application

is received in the future for the demolition of the structure, it certainly would be deemed an historic resource, not only locally but on a State level.

Vice Chair MacCartee asked what the difference was between this property and Crown Manor.

Ms. McCaull said the only difference is that Crown Manor first applied for designation. The person who owned it wanted to have it designated and then they subsequently came in with the Mills Act.

Vice Chair MacCartee said that this designation is contingent whereas Crown Manor was not and asked if it would require a City Council special vote.

Ms. McCaull responded yes. The current owner does not want to apply for the Mills Act Agreement. If the evaluation is done on the prospective buyer, the City ultimately would be receiving more property tax revenue. If the applicant applies for the Mills Act Agreement, City staff will recommend that the Agreement be solely for the front home and the back property would be assessed at a normal tax rate.

Commissioner Draper said this information makes a difference. She added that per Historic Resource Preservation Mills Contract Procedures 70.20.100, prior to submitting the application, the applicant should have a scheduled Pre-Application Review Conference. Historic designation is required prior to applying for the Mills Act. Ms. Draper also mentioned that six years ago yesterday, October 3, the Ordinance setting up the Mills contract was adopted.

Ms. McCaull conveyed that the City Manager, staff and Mr. Aurich have met regarding the Mills Act issue.

Scott Aurich, 1037 Loma Avenue, said the prospective buyer is anxious to preserve the home and would also like to benefit with some tax savings by adopting an agreement with the City for the Mills Act. He made himself available to answer questions.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Tim Rohan, 108 D Avenue, said it appeared to him that this was a “back door way” to get the Mills Act. He wondered if this would become the norm where persons would go before the Commission requesting historic designation contingent upon the Mills Act.

Commissioner Herron asked if Mr. Rohan was speaking about the individual case or the entire process.

Mr. Rohan clarified that he was speaking about the entire process.

Commissioner Herron said that each item must be considered on an individual basis.

Mr. Aurich said this process was similar to the preliminary review process where applicants get feedback on their requests. He felt the applicant was going through the process made available by the City.

Ms. McCaull clarified that, if approved, the item would be forwarded to City Council for approval.

Vice Chair MacCartee asked if the buyer was comfortable with the two back houses not being included in the Mills Act.

Mr. Aurich responded yes. His understanding is that the entire property would be deemed historic and any improvements or changes to the property would need to return before the Historic Resource Commission. He has not spoken to the prospective buyer about this yet.

Commissioner Herron said it is nice to have Mr. Aurich on “their team.”

Mr. Aurich said the applicant has been very cooperative in finding a prospective buyer who would appreciate the home. In addition, the applicant has done a wonderful job of maintaining the home.

Jeff Alison, 1057 Ocean Boulevard, said he disagreed with the “back door” comments and supports the request for historic designation and exception to the Mills Act cap.

Genevieve Rohan, 108 D Avenue, thanked the owner of the home and expressed support for the request.

Daphne Brown, 226 First Street, said she supported the request for designation.

### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Draper said that over the last six years, 23 out of 88 designated homes have been granted Mills Act contracts. She asked if the Mills contracts could be cancelled for any reason.

Ms. McCaull responded that in the Mills Act Agreement, there is a provision stating that either party can cancel the agreement.

Chairperson Keith reminded the Commission that the Mills Act is not in their purview. The home certainly meets all the criteria to be designated historic. However, she does not understand how the historic designation will be removed if the home is designated and the Council does not grant special dispensation for this home.

Commissioner Wilson said she understands this to mean that the applicant is reserving the right to legally pursue removal of the historic designation status.

Chairperson Keith understands that the historic designation is contingent upon the Mills Act. She disagrees with this.

Commissioner Herron said her understanding is that the prospective buyer will not purchase the property if they do not receive the Mills Act.

Chairperson Keith said the Commission is being asked if this house qualifies to be designated an historic structure.

Ms. McCaull said it would help to clarify the process by including in the Resolution an acknowledgement that the designation is contingent upon the Mills Act Agreement being approved.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

CHAIRPERSON KEITH MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION WOULD CONSIDER 1043 OCEAN BOULEVARD (HR 15-06) TO BE A HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT PROPERTY AND WOULD APPROVE A REQUEST FOR HISTORIC DESIGNATION IF REQUESTED, WITH THE ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION STATING THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- A. IT DOES EXEMPLIFY OR REFLECT SPECIAL ELEMENTS OF THE CITY'S CULTURAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, AESTHETIC, AND ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY DUE TO ITS AESTHETIC AND ARCHITECTURAL PROMINENCE AND BEING DESIGNED BY A NOTEWORTHY ARCHITECT; FOR THE ORIGINAL OWNER AND THE SPRECKELS INVOLVEMENT WITH THE CITY'S ECONOMY BOTH LOCALLY AND REGIONALLY; AND FOR THE SOCIAL ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS THAT OCCURRED AT THE SPRECKELS MANSION;
- B. IT IS IDENTIFIED WITH PERSONS SIGNIFICANT IN LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL HISTORY AS JOHN D. SPRECKELS WHO HAD THE BUILDING CONSTRUCTED FOR HIS SON AS A WEDDING GIFT; WAS ONE OF CORONADO'S AND SAN DIEGO'S GREAT FOREFATHERS WHO AT ONE TIME OWNED CORONADO BEACH COMPANY, THE HOTEL DEL CORONADO, AND CORONADO TENT CITY, NORTH ISLAND, THE SAN DIEGO CORONADO FERRY STEM, UNION TRIBUNE PUBLISHING CO., AND BELMONT PARK; AND MR. SPRECKELS CONTRIBUTED SIGNIFICANTLY TO THE 1915 PANAMA-CALIFORNIA EXPOSITION ;
- C. IT IS ONE OF THE FEW REMAINING EXAMPLES IN THE CITY POSSESSING DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ITALIAN RENAISSANCE REVIVAL ARCHITECTURAL STYLE, AND IS VALUABLE FOR THE STUDY OF A TYPE, PERIOD, OR METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION USING REINFORCED CONCRETE, AND HAS NOT BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY ALTERED.
- D. IT IS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NOTABLE WORK OF AN ARCHITECT, HARRISON ALBRIGHT, WHO IS KNOWN LOCALLY AND REGIONALLY FOR DESIGNING BUILDINGS CONSTRUCTED OF REINFORCED CONCRETE AND FOR THEIR ARCHITECTURAL SIGNIFICANCE INCLUDING THE CORONADO PUBLIC LIBRARY, GLORIETTA BAY INN, CORONADO BANK BUILDING, AND U.S. GRANT HOTEL TO NAME A NEW.
- E. IT DOES 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).

THE DESIGNATION IS CONTINGENT UPON A FUTURE OWNER OBTAINING A MILLS ACT AGREEMENT.

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 announced that this is the 89<sup>th</sup> home to be designated historic.

**NOI 11-06**    **CHARLES C. BROGGER**: – Notice of Intent to Demolish the single family residence addressed as 258 H Avenue and located in the R-1B (Single Family Residential) Zone.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. Charles C. Brogger is the current owner of the property and Christine M. St. Clair has Power of Attorney for the owner. City records indicate that the building appeared on the 1892 lot book so the home is estimated to be about 114 years old. The application notes that the original home had 330 square feet and currently has 918 square feet. The current owner completed an addition to the home in 1975 after acquiring the property. At that time, he added a 14' X 14' room addition and an 8' X 8' entry to the residence. The home is not identified in the Historic Resource Inventory completed in the 1980's and does not have a distinctive architectural style. It could best be described as beach bungalow with a gable roof with fish scale shingles and wood siding. Mr. Brogger is planning to sell the property to help fund the ongoing 24-hour nursing care required for Mr. Brogger.

The applicant's representative, Celeste Kennedy, 12643 Ridgeton Drive, Lakeside, made herself available to answer questions.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Draper said she had no issues with granting the demolition permit as the home does not meet the criteria to be designated historic.

Vice Chair MacCartee asked if the structure was going to be demolished and the land sold, or if the structure and property would be sold together.

Ms. Kennedy responded that the property is currently listed. In making the decision to sell the property, they were advised to go through this process because the prospective buyer may want to build a new home. However, there were a few prospective buyers who mentioned that they may want to renovate the home.

Vice Chair MacCartee asked staff on the procedure if a prospective buyer wanted to renovate the home and then apply for historic designation.

Ms. McCaull said that once the decision is made that the home is not historic, that is final. In the past, the Commission has added a caveat in the motion that stated if a future owner discovers new historical information regarding the historical significant of the property the applicant could return for reconsideration for designation.

Vice Chair MacCartee asked Ms. Kennedy if she was comfortable with adding this condition.

Ms. Kennedy nodded her approval.

### COMMISSION ACTION

VICE CHAIR MACCARTEE MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE STRUCTURE ADDRESSED AS 258 H AVENUE (NOI 11-06) DOES NOT MEET THE CRITERIA TO BE DESIGNATED AN HISTORIC RESOURCE, WITH THE ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION STATING THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

THE PROPERTY DOES MEET THE 75-YEAR AGE REQUIREMENT;

- A. IT IS NOT IDENTIFIED WITH A PERSON(S), OR AN EVENT(S) SIGNIFICANT IN LOCAL, STATE, OR NATIONAL HISTORY;
- B. 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 HOWEVER IT HAS BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY ALTERED;
- C. IT IS NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NOTABLE WORK OF A BUILDER, DESIGNER, ARCHITECT, ARTISAN OR LANDSCAPE PROFESSIONAL.

D. 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 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).

A CONDITION WAS ADDED TO THE RESOLUTION WHICH STATES:

IF A FUTURE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY DISCOVERS NEW HISTORICAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROPERTY, THAT OWNER COULD RETURN TO THE COMMISSION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF DESIGNATION FOR THE RESIDENCE.

COMMISSIONER DRAPER SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed 5-0.

There is a 10-day appeal period.

**HAP 8-06**     **DUTCH AND PEGGY SWAGEMAKERS** – Preliminary review and discussion regarding possible improvements and or alterations planned for the historically designated Granada Court addressed as 936-954 C Avenue and located in the R-3 (Multiple Family Residential) Zone.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. On June 21, 2006, the Commission considered a Notice of Intent to Demolish Permit application for the Granada court complex. The Commission determined at the hearing that the complex met the criteria to be considered an historic resource. The owners are interested in making improvements to the complex and have hired Kevin Rugee to be the architect for the project. The Commission has established a policy to allow for preliminary review applications to be filed with the City to allow property owners to submit potential projects to the Commission for early input and comment. The Commission typically provides initial feedback and direction to the applicant as to whether the proposed alterations are headed in the right direction. Mr. Rugee has prepared a site plan and rear elevations of potential alterations to the site for preliminary discussion with the Commission.

The applicant, Margaret Swagemakers, 1631 Strand Way, said her husband is not well and they have decided to redevelop the property and move on with their lives. They would like to keep the property as beautiful as it is today and are working with Mr. Rugee to find possible solutions.

The applicant's representative, Kevin Rugee, Architect, 1024 Isabella Avenue, said the purpose of the meeting today is to propose possible solutions to improve the property; however, the owners are undecided on what they wish to do. One preliminary proposal involves refurbishment of the existing single story cottages on the property. No additions or exterior alterations would occur to the cottages. The back two-story structure would be converted from four units to two townhome units. This would result in a total of eight dwelling units on the property. The existing storage building located at the northern corner of the site off the alley would be demolished. In its place a new single car garage, laundry and trash facility would be constructed with a small studio/dwelling unit above. On the southern side of the property, a new two-car garage would be constructed with a new dwelling unit above. When completed, the site would have 10 dwelling units which is one less than permitted by the Code. The site would also gain three additional off-street parking spaces. When the project is completed, the site would have a 50% floor area ratio (90% is allowed) and a lot coverage of 35% (60% is allowed). The exterior materials, finishes, textures and colors to be used for the alterations would be consistent with the existing structures on the site. The long range plans for this property include the sale and future conversion of the complex to condominiums. He displayed a site plan of the existing property, discussed additional possibilities, and answered questions.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Tim Rohan, 108 D Avenue, said he liked the first proposal and was supportive of preserving as much of the structures as possible.

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Wilson said she liked the ideas presented and was not concerned with parking because the property has never had it. The proposal as presented works very well and she would like to see it preserved as a court.

Commissioner Herron agreed. She loves the interior of each of the bungalows.

Vice Chair MacCartee said she absolutely loves the idea of keeping all of the bungalows. She agreed that the property has never had parking so there is no need to give it any now.

Commissioner Draper said she loved the first proposal. She likes the idea that the laundry room will be kept at the rear of the property and loves the detached bungalows idea. She is willing to work with the owners of the property because they have kept the property in such good shape for such a long time.

Chairperson Keith agreed. She also offered the idea of adding a second story to the rear units, nos. 3 and 8, should it be needed. The idea of a condo complex is better than dividing it up and selling each parcel separately. She felt there may be a need for a CC&R's if the property is to be converted into a condo-type project. She is very happy that the courtyard will be kept intact as it is unique to Southern California.

Mr. Rugee addressed the issue of dividing the cottages into separate lots. There would still be CC&R's that would control the architecture and not allow residents, for example, to paint each

cottage a different color. With a fee-simple condominium, there are CC&R's but no Association. Persons purchasing the property would have to maintain certain standards which are spelled out in the CC&R's. Mr. Rugee asked the Commission about minimal ground floor expansion of about 8-10 feet to Units 3 and 8 versus adding a second floor to the units without imposing on the center court.

Chairperson Keith said she would rather not have ground floor expansion because it would lessen the courtyard space.

Vice Chair MacCartee asked if a porch or a patio was included in the ground floor expansion.

Mr. Rugee said that was a possibility.

Commissioner Wilson said she would consider a patio area in the courtyard area but not walls.

Ms. McCaull asked how far the structures would need to be brought out to make them line up.

Mr. Rugee responded about 4 to 5 feet.

Commissioner Draper asked if there was room in the rear of the structures to expand.

Mr. Rugee said there was some space.

Ms. Swagemakers said there is ample space on the sides between the cottages. It would be lovely to have space for a small powder room or extra closet.

Chairperson Keith said that the Commission should keep in mind the historicity of the project. The façade should not be changed very much.

Mr. Rohan commented that if the cottages were to be attached, there should be some demarcation between the units.

Commissioner Herron mentioned the new condos in downtown San Diego and said that they are similar in square footage.

Mr. Rugee said that the sizes of the cottages are part of its character. Prospective buyers will be attracted to the cottages because of its charm and look. Vice Chair MacCartee asked about cottages nos. 3 and 8 having setbacks.

Ms. McCaull asked the Commission how they felt about the units being attached.

Commissioner Herron said she preferred the units be detached.

Commissioner Wilson agreed.

Commissioner Draper also agreed. She said she would rather have the second addition on unit nos. 3 and 8.

Mr. Rugee said he liked Mr. Rohan's idea that if the cottages were attached, it would be in the rear 50 percent and the two entries would be maintained. He thanked the Commission for their consideration.

Ms. Swagemakers thanked the Commission for allowing a parking variance. She said that they are very short on square footage and asked if the proposed parking area can be deleted from the proposed design.

The Commission agreed that parking is not an issue and would not be a requirement.

Ms. Swagemakers said that the residents would probably prefer to have a washer and dryer incorporated into each individual unit.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

No action was taken on this item.

#### MISCELLANEOUS

None.

#### DISCUSSION ITEMS

##### **Discussion regarding the status of the Mills Act Agreement for 605 Tenth Street and located in the R-1A Single Family Residential Zone.**

This item was continued.

##### **Discussion regarding Historic Resource Designation criteria 70.20.030 (E) and meeting the State program of landmarks and points of historical interest.**

Ms. McCaull reported that the Commission had requested information on determining whether a home meets the State Program of Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest. Ms. McCaull provided the Commission with information for making this determination. In summary, the basis for the Landmark and Point Criteria is found in Section 5031 (a) of the Public Resources Code. All resources must be of statewide historical importance to California. They must demonstrate their statewide significance by meeting one of the following three requirements:

- The property is the first, last, only, or most significant historical property of its type in the region.
- The property is associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.

- The property is a prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement, or construction, or...it is one of the more notable works, or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer, or master builder.

In addition, the landmarks must be fifty years of age or older. The City's requirement is that the property to be at least 75 years of age so this is not an issue.

And lastly, the landmarks must be visibly accessible from a public thoroughfare.

Commissioner Draper said that there are not many properties in Coronado that would qualify as an Historical Landmark under "an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California," based on information found in the "California Historical Landmarks in the San Diego County" 5-page informational booklet. This booklet lists only two properties in Coronado as historical landmarks: Hotel Del Coronado and the site of the flight school.

### **Discussion regarding the Historic Preservation Newsletter.**

Ms. McCaull reported that Commissioner Wilson asked that this item be placed on today's agenda for discussion. The next Coronado Currents will be distributed in January 2007. The deadline for the Commission's newsletter to be submitted to the City Manager's office for inclusion in the Coronado Currents is December 1, 2006. Possible items for the upcoming newsletter may be, according to a suggestion by the City Manager, information about the City's Mills Act Program to include the program's philosophy statement and purpose. Clarification should be made that the program is not an entitlement program or a direct benefit that residents receive for having their home designated. Instead, it should be communicated that the program was established to assist residents with the restoration of their homes and that the City increases the Mills Act Program every year by an additional \$10,000.

Chairperson Keith asked that each Commissioner make a list of possible items to include in the newsletter.

Vice Chair MacCartee suggested listing homes that have been approved for demolition.

Commissioner Herron said that a good source for this type of list is "teardown.com."

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

---

Tony A Peña  
Director of Community Development