

HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

October 15, 2008

The regular meeting of the Coronado Historic Resource Commission was called to order at 3:04 p.m., Wednesday, October 15, 2008, at the Coronado City Hall Council Chambers, 1825 Strand Way, Coronado, California, by Chairperson MacCartee.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners Crenshaw, Jones, MacCartee, O'Brien and St. Denis

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of October 1, 2008, were approved as submitted.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There was no separate Director's report.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Commissioner St. Denis invited the public to attend the Coronado Historic Association Mayoral Forum on Historic Preservation on October 20, 2008, at 5 p.m.

Commissioner St. Denis also reported that the Soroptimist International Club of Coronado will be honoring three outstanding Coronado women who have contributed in a variety of ways to make the world and community a better place. The 2009 Legends will be Toni Gaylord, Gerry MacCartee, and Nancy Cobb.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

HAP 10-06 JOE AND CAYLEE PINSONNEAULT – Request for Historic Alteration Permit for alterations and additions and exceptions to zoning standards for the historically designated property located in the R1-A (Single Family Residential) Zone, addressed as 941 J Avenue, including the construction of a replacement dwelling and garage located on the rear of the property addressed as 937 J Avenue.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. On October 18, 2006, the Historic Resource Commission conducted a public hearing and adopted a Resolution approving

an Historic Alteration Permit. The project proposal is before the Historic Resource Commission for reconsideration in light of alleged deficiencies in the public noticing. The item is being “reheard” by the Historic Resource Commission as directed by the Court via litigation filed with the City. The purpose of the “re-hearing” is to provide all owners within 300 feet of the subject property notice of the project proposal and an opportunity to comment, and for the Historic Resource Commission to receive additional evidence. With the rehearing, the decision of the Historic Resource Commission will be advisory to the City Council. Fifty-five property owners within the vicinity were notified of today’s public hearing and six letters were received objecting to the issuance of the permit. The City also received yesterday six additional letters from residents within the community objecting to issuance of the alteration permit.

The Historic Alteration Permit included the following: (1) Restoration and interior remodel of the historic dwelling; (2) minor addition to the historic dwelling with a reduced side yard setback; (3) demolition of an existing garage at the middle of the property and elimination of the driveway and curb cut off of J Avenue; (4) construction of a three car garage along with a replacement dwelling above for the dwelling planned to be demolished; (5) and exception to the second story rear yard setback requirement from 36’ to 5’.

Commissioner St. Denis asked at what point during construction did the neighbors become aware and inquire about the activities taking place.

Director McCaull said she believes that the neighbors became aware of construction during the time the foundation was being placed, but referred the question to the applicant’s representative.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if the Commission is being asked to review this item as if construction had never taken place.

Director McCaull responded yes.

Chairperson MacCartee confirmed the Commission should take into consideration that new carriage house laws were not in effect during the time the original hearing was held.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The applicant’s representative, Kevin Rugee, Architect, 1024 Isabella Avenue, gave a brief overview and answered questions.

Commissioner St. Denis asked how the request changed from a 500 to 800 square foot structure.

Mr. Rugee stated that on July 19, 2006, the Commission approved the demolition of the rear dwelling (937 J Avenue). Staff, at that time, confirmed that the proposed addition would be considered a dwelling because it had a separate address and contained a kitchen. On September 6, 2006, there were discussions about conceptual plans for the project. On September 29, 2006, the completed plans were presented including a design for the 800 square foot dwelling over a

three-car garage at the rear of the property. The proposed increased square footage of the rear dwelling evolved over the course of several meetings with the Commission.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked, with regard to the non conforming lot, if the rear structure was built at the same time the front dwelling was built.

Mr. Rugee responded that the rear dwelling was built in 1921 and the front dwelling was built in 1929.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked if historic designation was requested for the front dwelling only.

Mr. Rugee said the entire site was designated historic; however, the rear dwelling was not designated as an historic resource. The demolition of the rear dwelling occurred before the front dwelling was designated.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked if the rear dwelling is considered to be a non conforming legal lot.

Director McCaull stated that it is a legal parcel that contains two legal dwelling units.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked if both dwellings fall under the Standards of the R1-A zoning.

Director McCaull responded yes, with the exception of the Standards waiver granted by the Historic Resource Commission which included the side yard setback, the reduced parking for the front home, and the reduced rear yard setback for the rear building.

Mr. Rugee added that when he speaks about the floor area and coverage, he is referring to the aggregate with both dwellings. He states it is 59 percent on the floor area and 32 ½ percent on the coverage. No variance was requested on the floor area.

Commissioner St. Denis asked at what point during the construction did the neighbors begin inquiring about the ongoing activity, and how was it determined to keep construction going if questions were being raised.

Mr. Rugee stated that he did not have a day-to-day role in the construction management of the project. Harry Jackman built the project and Mr. Rugee was available if issues arose. He was aware there was some opposition to the building structure and he recalls it was during the framing stage.

Commissioner St. Denis asked about the time frame.

Mr. Rugee said the plan check corrections were approved about mid February 2007, and construction began the first part of March. He estimated the foundation was then poured in April.

Commissioner Jones said the minutes of October 18, 2006, noted that former Commissioner Wilson had an issue with the rear structure and the separate addresses. Ms. Jones asked if Mr. Rugee recalled any discussion on that matter.

Mr. Rugee said he understood that (former) Commissioner Wilson had some issues but noted that every vote taken by the Commission was unanimous approved.

Vice Chair O'Brien asked if the rear unit can be sold off separately.

Mr. Rugee answered no.

Director McCaull confirmed that the rear unit cannot be sold off separately.

Jim and Joanne Scott gave a brief overview, passed out handouts, and answered questions. Mr. Scott stated that in attendance were his wife's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Eddy, who also reside in the Shores. He said that in April of 2007, they first learned, by looking at the foundation and talking to neighbors, that the plan for the rear of the property was to construct a new second dwelling above the garage, which would be larger than the previous one. They visited City Hall to protest. On April 11, 2007, the City Council held a Closed Session to discuss potential pending litigation and thereafter they were told that the Stop Work Notice that had been placed on the property on September 29, was being lifted. They also later learned that the owners "cut a deal" with the City, the City agreed to lift the Stop Work, and they agreed to indemnify the City if any of the neighboring property owners chose to take legal action. He found it distressing that all of the residents on I Avenue were not notified. Mr. Scott states that he, his wife and others object to the proposed project to the extent of the second dwelling. They have no issues with the front dwelling. He noted key points for their objection:

1. The Coronado Municipal Code (CMC) does not provide the Historic Resource Commission the authority to permit new buildings or the authority to designate a non conforming rental which is what the prior second dwelling was considered to be.
2. The Historic Resource Commission does not have the authority to designate a non historic dwelling and then permit reconstruction of that rental unit.
3. The R-1A zone clearly allows one single family dwelling per lot—not two.
4. The applicant seeks to build this new dwelling on a garage which violates the new Carriage House Ordinance.
5. The CMC does not allow the Historic Resource Commission the authority to grant zoning exceptions to non historic buildings—it only allows authority to grant limited zoning relief for designated historic buildings.

Commissioner St. Denis asked Mr. Scott what action he would like to have the Commission take today.

Mr. Scott said that he would request the Commission decline the permit application. He does not like the precedent this item would set. He also requested that neighboring property owners be given an assurance that the unit would not be used as a rental.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if he agrees that the building should be left standing.

Mr. Scott responded yes.

Chairperson MacCartee stated that the Commission is aware that there was a problem with notification and noted that their powers of zoning relaxation have been removed from their authority and given to City Council. She asked if Mr. Scott's concerns have been addressed.

Mr. Scott stated that some concerns have been addressed.

Florence Draper, 460 E Avenue, said she served as a Commissioner in 2006 when this item was being reviewed. She agreed with Commissioner MacCartee that the Commission worked very hard and did the very best they could considering they were the "new kids on the block." The Commission had no idea that neighboring property owners were not noticed as they always considered it important to receive feedback from the neighbors.

Carl Schott, 916 I Avenue, said he is not a bit surprised by the fact that there was no [public] discussion during the previous Commission meetings. He stated he did not believe that lack of notification to surrounding property owners was "accidental." In addition, he stated he has never been able to ascertain that a site can be designated historic. He is adamant that this request be disapproved.

Chairperson MacCartee said she would ask that Director McCaull respond to the statement that lack of public notification was deliberate and not accidental. She asked staff if this type of incident has ever occurred in the past.

Director McCaull stated lack of public notice was because of a technical error. The Commission has been reviewing projects since 2000 and she does not recall this situation ever happening before. It was very unfortunate and a hearing is being conducted today to allow everyone to participate. Based upon those comments, the Commission can then take action.

Chairperson MacCartee stated that this Commission is new and all members serve as volunteers. The Commission would never purposely fail to notify property owners for any subversive reason.

Sarah Wells, 961 J Avenue, said they too have tremendous respect for the Historic Resource Commission, having gone through the historic resource and alteration process. She and her husband respectfully request that the Commission deny the applicant's request so it does not set a precedent in the community.

Robert Vaughn, 937 Alameda, said that Mr. Scott requested, via the Superior Court, that the hearing be "re-heard," and subsequently had a Stop Work Order issued. He feels that this situation should have been handled locally rather than have it escalate to the Superior Court level. He stated he would like to know who authorized the Stop Work Order be lifted.

Jim Rabun, 936 I Avenue, said he lives directly across the alley from the subject property. He stated that he is opposed to the project.

Dorothy Ecks, 930 J Avenue, asked how the architect was granted permission to expand the structure to 815 square feet. She suggested that the Commission require the applicant to tear down the structure and begin over.

Deni Herron, 1718 Visalia Road, said she served as a Commissioner on this project. She said the Commission made well informed decisions. She said there is no reason the rear structure should be removed because it is a replacement dwelling. The Commission's intent was to save the front historic home and enhance the neighborhood. They felt that removing an old garage at the rear of the property and replacing it with a new dwelling would revitalize the neighborhood.

Kelly Purvis, 560 C Avenue, said that hindsight is 20/20. She feels that by viewing a structure that is already built, they can determine how it impacts the property. Having served on RSIP for two years and worked on density issues in town, she is very concerned that they would allow a large second dwelling at the rear of a property to save the front house, which she feels is beautiful and worth saving. She said that when a non conforming property is torn down involuntary, the non conformance is lost and therefore the rear residence is lost. R-1A is the one area in town where one structure per lot is permitted. She feels that the less density in town, the better. The compromise would have been to allow the applicant to build a carriage house under the adopted RSIP rules. She does feel it is unreasonable to ask the applicants to tear down the structure and feels that it is reasonable to have some of the RSIP requirements apply such as requiring a covenant and possibly removing the kitchen. This would give neighbors some assurance that the dwelling would not serve as a rental. She asked that the Commission not require the applicants to tear down the structure.

Scott McMillan, Attorney for John Scott, 4670 Nebo Drive, Suite 200, La Mesa, said he understands that the Commissioners are serving as volunteers and such service is critical because they are tasked with receiving information and, based on the rules in the City's Charter, they are making determinations within their discretion to make. For example, they must determine if the proposed change is going to burden or affect the overall design of surrounding properties. Where the process goes awry is when the procedural protections are not followed and everyone does not get to participate. There is a wonderful system in place to give everyone the opportunity to speak. He stated that the Commission lacks the authority to allow construction of a new residence. Therefore, the Commission must go through the regular variance procedure which is what should have been done at the outset. The applicant was advised by their attorney, Tim Treadwell, to proceed with the construction after they knew there was an issue with noticing requirements. They finished the house while litigation was pending and motions were being filed.

The applicant, Joe Pinsonneault, stated they were advised by their legal attorneys to move forward with the project. In his opinion, the Historic Resource Commission did have the authority or he would never have moved forward with the project.

Susan Keith, 801 Tolita Avenue, said she was serving as a Commissioner when this item was brought forth. She agreed with the statement by Kelly Purvis that “20/20 is great hindsight.” She said most Commission meetings will have one or two persons in attendance so lack of public attendance on those meeting dates did not raise a flag that residents had not been notified. She does not want anyone in the public to question staff’s integrity as staff gave the Commission all available information. The Commission made the best decision they could with the information provided. Ms. Keith said she has had the pleasure of working with Ms. McCaull and because of her dedication to the City, historic structures have been brought forth to the Commission.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Jones said it truly does not behoove the City or staff to deliberately not notify the public. The City bears great responsibilities and is aware of the legal ramifications.

Commissioner St. Denis agreed and said the Historic Resource Commission acted in good faith with the information they had, as did staff. In 2006, the RSIP review was completed and the Carriage House idea was formed. It was decided that front cottages should be saved in order to preserve the character of Coronado and its village atmosphere. A maximum square footage of 500 was established. As the carriage houses were built, residents voiced their concerns to the City and RSIP Committee. Public meetings were held, input received, and the maximum square footage was reduced to 400. The Standards of the Secretary of the Interior states, “...the relationship between an historic building or buildings and landscape features within a property’s boundaries or the building site defines the historic character and should be considered an integral part of an overall plan for rehabilitation project work.” Every decision that is made by the Commission must be based and conform to the Standards.

Commissioner Crenshaw said the Commission received many thoughtful and well written letters and thanked the many residents that took the time to address this issue because it is a precedent setting occasion. Ms. Crenshaw said she did not serve on the Commission when this item was heard. The Commission worked hard and did what they had to do and they are to be commended. She views this project as two houses on an R-1A lot, which is illegal. She would not have granted this request.

Vice Chair O’Brien said he also joined the Commission after the project was approved. He has seen the house and is familiar with the block on J Avenue. He sees the Commission’s role as preserving the character of Coronado as they know, appreciate, and love it. He gives two reasons for supporting the applicant’s position: 1) The restored front home is what the community wants to see in this town; 2) The unit over the garage at the rear of the alley is the price they must pay. Hearings were held on July 19, 2006, September 6, 2006, September 26, 2006, and October 18, 2006. In all instances, the Commission voted unanimously in favor. Mr. O’Brien said he thinks very highly of the members who previously served on this Commission. They did what they needed to do and they did it right.

Commissioner Jones said this is an R-1 residential neighborhood and she feels that it should remain as such. If a decision is made to allow this dwelling to remain a rental, it sets a precedent.

She agrees with Kelly Purvis that a covenant with the City is needed to create a guesthouse with no kitchen at the rear of the property. She cannot find it reasonable to allow this dwelling to have a separate address and remain a rental.

Commissioner St. Denis referred to the Historic Preservation Ordinance 70.20.090, Item G, Density Bonus, which states, that “An owner of an historic resource in a residential zone is eligible to apply for an historic alteration permit for a density bonus. A density bonus would allow an increase in the number of dwelling units that would normally be permitted in the underlying zone.” She stated the density bonus is only allowed within an existing historic resource and is grandfathered in by its use, i.e. the give-and-take by the Commission to preserve the front house if the rear dwelling is rebuilt. Ms. St. Denis said it would be so “un-Coronado” to ask the applicant to tear it down. She agrees with Commissioner Jones and Crenshaw that it may just fix itself because, according to the Municipal Code, “if a non conforming rental dwelling or habitable unit use is terminated, it is terminated if it is inactive for 120 consecutive days.” She suggested the Pinsonneaults (or the new owner) could sign a covenant requiring that the unit would not be rented.

Chairperson MacCartee said she served on the Commission that acted on the project. She does not feel it would be appropriate to advise the applicant that the Commission made a mistake so they must “pay for it.” She does not feel this would be fair. She will either be abstaining or supporting the request.

Director McCaull clarified that the purpose of the hearing is to provide adequate public notice to all property owners within 300 feet and to allow testimony by those not given an opportunity to do so. Those comments will be taken into consideration by the Commission in making its decision. Ms. McCaull reported that the City has historically, since 2000, treated historic resources sites interchangeably. Since 2000, 36 permits have been issued for alterations to historically designated properties that allowed exceptions to the Code beyond just a building on the site. The Commission was consistent in applying the Ordinance to the entire historic site. She added that a comment was made to have the matter referred back to the Planning Commission as it would be the appropriate Commission to review land use decisions regarding increased densities. This is part of the reason that the Historic Resource Commission was created. Part of the program incentive is that that the Planning Commission would not be able to make the findings to grant a variance for this type of situation. The Ordinance was written to give the Historic Resource Commission the ability to consider the site’s surrounding properties and the project as a whole beyond just the technical items that are outlined for the Planning Commission.

Vice Chair O’Brien commented that whatever action the Commission takes today will go to City Council. He feels it is important to support those members who served before them.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE HAP 10-06, REQUEST FOR HISTORIC ALTERATION PERMIT FOR ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS AND

EXCEPTIONS TO ZONING STANDARDS FOR THE HISTORICALLY DESIGNATED PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE R1-A (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE, ADDRESSED AS 941 J AVENUE, INCLUDING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A REPLACEMENT DWELLING AND GARAGE LOCATED ON THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY ADDRESSED AS 937 J AVENUE.

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;
- 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.

CHAIRPERSON MACCARTEE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if there was a way to allow the rear dwelling as a Carriage House and not have it rented.

Chairperson MacCartee said she understands that the applicant desires to keep it as a rental unit.

AYES: Commissioners MacCartee and O'Brien.
NAYS: Commissioners Crenshaw, Jones, and St. Denis.
ABSENT: None.
ABSTAIN: None.

The motion failed with a vote of 2-3.

The item will return before the Commission on November 5, 2008, to consider an alternative resolution.

Chairperson MacCartee called a recess at 4:52 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 5:03 p.m. All members were present.

HAP 14-08 LASALLE BANK N.A., TRUSTEE OF TRUST NO. 00-2361 – Request for Historic Alteration Permit for alterations and additions and exceptions to zoning standards for the historically designated property addressed as 1043 Ocean Boulevard and located in the R1-A (Single Family Residential) Zone.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. On October 4, 2006, the Historic Resource Commission designated this property as an Historic Resource. On December 4, 2007, the City Council approved a Mills Act Agreement for the front residence on the property. On February 19, 2008, a formal Historic Alteration Permit was filed with the City for proposed alterations and an addition to the residence including a request for exceptions to the zoning ordinance. The permit was approved and the decision was appealed to the City Council. An Administrative Hearing was scheduled for April 15, 2008, and subsequently continued to the May 20, 2008, meeting so that all Council members would be present to consider the matter. Prior to the City Council meeting of May 20, 2008, the owner's attorney submitted a letter to the City withdrawing the current Historic Alteration permit application. The application was deemed null and void, and since there was no longer an application to be considered by the City Council, the Administrative Hearing never occurred.

On June 12, 2008, a new Historic Alteration Permit Application was submitted to the City for additions and alterations to the residence including a request for exceptions to the zoning standards (Application II). This Alteration Permit was scheduled to be heard by the Commission at the July 2, 2008, meeting. Prior to the July 2, 2008, meeting, the applicant requested a continuance to allow time to explore new design options associated with the project to comply with staff's interpretation of certain zoning standards.

On September 25, 2008, a revised Historic Alteration Permit Application was submitted to the City (Application III). The application calls for additions and alterations to the residence including a request for exceptions to the zoning standards. This Historic Alteration permit application includes fewer exterior changes to the historic building than the previous Historic Alteration Permit application approved by the Historic Resource Commission, and retains the majority of the building's historical façade and architectural character. The Base Request includes the following general components: 1) second story master bedroom addition; 2) two French doors in lieu of existing windows at the first level of the residence; 3) new awnings at the first and second story levels; 4) new balcony and operable roof at the third story level along the front elevation; 4) modified roof line and new projection and balcony on the rear elevation; 5) a low site wall along the front property line and landscape improvements; and 6) new Juliet balcony and French door in lieu of existing window for the Caretaker Quarters at the rear of the property.

Staff has reviewed the project for consistency with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Staff supports the findings as presented in the application submitted by Dale Gardon of Dale Gardon Design with the application proposal. A recommendation to approve the project will automatically go to City Council for review. A recommendation to deny the project will go before the City Council in the form of an appeal.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The applicant, Jonah Shakhnai, Trustee for the Trust that owns the property, thanked everyone for their time and attention. He thanked the Commissioners individually and as a group for their consideration of this issue, their generosity in giving their time, and for being highly responsive to different ideas that have been presented. He appreciates that the Commissioners are all volunteers and is grateful for their service and commitment as it has been very helpful in fashioning a view of this project which is responsive to the needs of the community as expressed by many community members. It is consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards and will also fit the needs of his family, hopefully for many generations to come. He also wanted to express appreciation to Ms. Ann McCaull for her extraordinary effort in not only providing suggestions to him and responding to different ideas, but also for helping to organize meetings involving members of the community. When this project was undertaken, there was no anticipation that it would be nearly as controversial as it seemed to have been last spring and over the summer. He wanted to reach out to those members of the community that had strong views about the project, try and understand what their objections were, and to determine what they could undertake to overcome those objections whether through design modifications or by providing additional information. Several members of the community were determined to participate in those discussions and while there was no conclusion, it certainly was very helpful in modifying his proposal in order to preserve the building to the maximum extent possible while meeting the needs of his family in a modern society. He also pointed out that when he purchased the building, there was very little interest in the building other than as a point of admiration. The reality is that the building for many years prior to his ownership was in a state of significant deterioration. Major systems were flawed, windows were in complete disrepair, leaks were occurring in the home and any form of inspection for habitability would have yielded a negative result. In undertaking this project, it is true that the previous owner had applied for Mills Act relief. It is worth noting that simply to bring the structure, without any modifications, up to a standard of habitability that would reflect today's Code for safety and functionality, would take approximately 20 years of Mills Act relief without any consideration whatsoever of any other modifications. The Mills Act was applied appropriately to preserve the structure fundamentally and structurally, without any restriction beyond the Secretary of Interior Standards on modifications that would be necessary to modernize the structure. He said he was very grateful to the Commission for their time and attention. He introduced Dale Gardon, an award-winning architect, who has been with this project since its onset.

Dale Gardon, Dale Gardon Design, 20885 North 90th Place, Scottsdale, AZ 85255, gave an overview of the request via a PowerPoint presentation and answered questions.

Commissioner St. Denis asked about the proposed new French doors at the lower level on either side of the entrance. The staff report indicates that the central portion of the fixed portion of the window will be replaced by new French doors but the drawing shows that the entire window assembly has been replaced including the two double hung on either side.

Mr. Gardon stated that they have agreed and committed to the evaluation of all windows in the front. He does not know at this time whether they can simply replace the middle piece without

replacing the sides. Their drawings reflect their thought that the entire unit most likely must be replaced to accomplish the functionality of the French doors and significant jam hinges and elements. The current determination is the result of information provided by two window manufacturer experts who both do restoration and replacement. Both have recommended replacement. The applicant has agreed to have an additional expert guide them in obtaining more specific answers on which windows should be replaced on the front elevation.

Terese Finch, 1051 Ocean Boulevard, congratulated Dr. Shaknai for the purchase of this historical home. She appreciates his efforts in preserving and restoring the beautiful mansion and making it special for his family. However, she has come to the conclusion that adding a 700 square foot addition to the master bedroom over the solarium would not be in keeping with the historic façade and the setback of the addition would not be in keeping with the zoning standards. She added that the second story addition of the master bedroom would greatly interfere with her view of Point Loma. She has resided at this address for over 31 years and cherishes this view. She asked about the height of the extension of the roof line at the rear of the structure and said it may not be in keeping with the zoning standards. She stated she is not in support of the applicant's request to allow significant changes of the Spreckels Mansion nor is she in favor of granting exceptions to the zoning standards.

Jeff Allison, 1057 Ocean Boulevard, stated he was not previously consulted about the project. He said he was concerned about persons buying historical properties and then requesting changes to the homes to fit their present living conditions. He said he appreciates the significant investment the new owner makes in order to make the home livable for his family; however, there must be a balance of what is livable inside and what is acceptable to the community. He has no issues with the awnings but does have an issue with French doors at the ground level and the operable roof. He feels the neighbor's right to view should be respected. He stated that a view is not a legal right but is part of the community's history. He feels that the Commission must be sensitive to the community as should the property owner.

Nancye Splinter, 1027 G Avenue, spoke on behalf of the Spreckels Appeal Committee. She thanked Ann McCaull and the Commissioners for their efforts. She is encouraged with the way the historic application is moving along. The owner has certainly shown good faith in being responsive to the Commission and community's concerns. She said this project sets the tone for all future historic preservation in Coronado. The roof suggestion is very intriguing and it is wonderful to see something creative come forward. The importance of retaining the original float glass on some of the windows cannot be overstated. They applaud keeping the upper middle window original although they have concerns about how the upper division will look. It is wonderful to have the majority of the windows stay original and to not see the terraces pushed out. With regard to the two first floor windows in the living room and dining room being changed into French doors, they are hoping the owners will consider the option of retaining the double-hung windows on either side and perhaps just having the middle window become a solid glass door that would open up from the street as it would keep the original look. The front gate and wall does violate Rehabilitation Standard No. 5 but they can understand the owners may want some division in terms of a barrier, although it does create a false sense of history since there was never a wall there before. She has concerns about the trees blocking the view of the

home and placement of the Master bedroom addition although they appreciate it has been set back six feet. They also request that the balustrade not be allowed to be removed or made taller. She added that if the owner would consider pushing back the Master suite to where the chimney is located, it would allow the conservatory to retain its original lightness and would address concerns expressed by the community and the neighbors of the view and the mass. They also contend that the spatial relationship on top of the conservatory needs to be maintained to a greater extent than the project currently proposes. She added that when the Mills Act application went before the City Council it listed only the interior systems improvements which is why there was such a strong response from the community after the proposal was submitted.

Chris Ackerman, 765 C Avenue, thanked the Commission for their work. He stated that it is clear this is one of the most historic homes in Coronado and in the region. To have both Albright and Requa work on a property is really something special. Due to extenuating circumstances, there are person not present tonight to speak with regard to this project. He has spoken at length with the architect about the project, primarily about the operating covered terrace on the roof which he congratulates them as an intriguing and interesting possibility on how to work something out. He would be comfortable with the Commission conceptually approving the operable roof. He suggested a covenant that runs with the property be made to define the length of time it can remain open. He suggested that the proposed tree be removed. He feels that the exterior wall finish on the house is important—it is plaster and is not able to be replaced today with the current stucco that is on the market. He is glad to hear that the windows will be retained along with the glass. He does not support changing the dining and living room windows because they are part of the character defining facades. He has worked with the Standards for Historic Restoration and Preservation since their inception about 30 years ago and it is very clear to him that dividing the central window on the second floor with a wall goes against the Standards and will be highly visible. The structure is very serene, symmetrical and stately with the base being asymmetrical, having the ground floor conservatories on either side that are different widths. Adding the Master bedroom so far forward adds another block to the house. He is not opposed to an exception which adds square footage to the property on the third floor or the rear of the dwelling, or even the Master bedroom as long as it stays within the current side yard setbacks and is set further back behind the chimney. He feels raising the awnings up above the windows on the second floor is good. He has no issues with the low wall and the parking turn-around in the front is fine.

Kelly Purvis, 560 C Avenue, said the front façade is what most matters most to her. She is intrigued by the operable roof as long as it opens and closes on a regular basis. She is concerned about retaining the original material of the glass windows, changing the spatial look of the four windows and the installation of the French doors. The Standards say that “the guiding principal is the original element, even in poor condition, is preferable to a replicated element.” She likes the idea of having a solid door rather than a pane door. With regard to the Master bedroom addition, she is concerned about a lack of balance and suggested that it be set back. She has no other issues with the remainder of the request.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Crenshaw thanked the owner, Dr. Jonah Shaknai, their attorney, Marie Lia, and their architect, Dale Gardon for a fabulous presentation. She said many hours have been spent compromising and working with the owner and she is very appreciative. The home is a legacy for the owner and his family which is equally important. With regard to a right of a view, neighbors are disturbed when they lose any kind of view; however, that is progress. She feels that the owners have come forward with a wonderful treatment of a beautiful, old home.

Commissioner O'Brien said he appreciates everyone's efforts on this project. He stated that the applicant has done a great job of addressing the roof line which was never anticipated in the original house. He understands the owner's desire to have the Master bedroom and he supports the request as well as the movable roof line. He agreed that adding the tree for balance creates an issue for the next door neighbor who currently has a view of Point Loma.

Commissioner St. Denis said the Standards are so emphatic about historic windows being repaired rather than replaced. If by chance they must be replaced, they must be replaced in kind. To put a door where there was a window changes everything. The Standards also recommend against installing an entrance on a primary (public) façade. She has visited the site and is amazed by the sweeping roof. To have the owner go to a business specializing in airplane hangars (for the operable roof) is amazing. She thinks it is a wonderful idea and hopes that it works especially if all the original tiles can be preserved. The site wall is fine but she does not like the Juliet balcony at the caretaker house. The beautiful conservatory on the southwest side is so balanced with the little area popping out from the dining room. The original balustrades are itemized to be saved and she applauds the creativeness of leaving the upper deck to have glass behind it to bring it up to the safe height. She has concern with the Master bedroom. If the Master bedroom were set back the required 18 feet, the neighbor's view of Point Loma would not be impacted. With regard to additions, the Standards recommends, "...to locate the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of an historic building, limit the size and scale in relationship to the historic building..." They recommend against designing a new addition so that its size and scale in relation to the historic building are out of proportion, thus diminishing the historic character. The Commission has leeway in interpreting the Standards; however, she feels that the interpretation and leeway comes directly in proportion to the significance of the resource. She suggested that the Master bedroom be set back behind the fireplace and taken to the rear of the home so that it does not throw off the balance and symmetry of the house. She summarized that she supports the modification to the rear of the building and relief from zoning standards, conceptually the operable roof with the exception to the zoning height and FAR requirements, the site wall, awnings, caretaker balcony and railing, and parking area if it is not visible on the front lawn. She does not support adding the tree, any changes in the windows or the lower French doors, or the Master bedroom as presented.

Commissioner Jones said she was not a member of the Commission at the time the item was originally heard. She said she is hearing objections from neighbors and members of the community who are very involved in historic preservation. She has an issue with the request to replace the windows as she feels that it would change the overall outward appearance. She likes

the awnings and feels that the operable roof is a marvelous concept which should be further reviewed. With regard to the Master bedroom, she said it is important to listen to the community. She has no issues with the landscape or wall located next to the sidewalk or any of the changes requested at the rear of the house.

Vice Chair O'Brien said that there was a previous request to move the Master bedroom back so that the adjacent home's line of view to Point Loma is not affected. He added that the back window has a telephone pole in front of it. This issue was already addressed and the applicant graciously responded by moving the Master bedroom back. He said that the goal has already been accomplished.

Chairperson MacCartee said she will support the project today. She has seen significant changes in town and she will try to keep the story of Coronado alive. Over the years, the Commission has compromised and found solutions. They have given the Secretary of Interior Standards local interpretation. The Commission has taken into account such things as courtyard, light and air quality, quality of life, and owner's concerns. In trying to promote the retention rather than the demolition and preservation of our character of our town, she has sought to respect and address owners' needs. The Commission has allowed second stories, French doors, roof decks, and even on one of our major buildings, an RV garage. She believes that the homes in Coronado are not monuments. They are places where people live. Ms. MacCartee feels that they must listen to people today if they are to keep historic preservation. They need to admit that everything changes e.g. the Hotel Del and the Glorietta Bay Inn; however, the Coronado story remains. The distinctive features in this home have been preserved. With regard to the Mills Act, she views it as a thank-you to owners that are willing to maintain their properties.

Mr. Gardon added that, with regard to the French doors, they are suggesting a single pane of glass with a division because of the door function. To keep the frame narrow and thin, it would require a single pane on both French doors, to the ground, and not visible from the street. They are willing to meet with another expert and have an authorized and qualified historian review the report from the expert. This will indicate what they can/cannot do with repair and/or replacement.

Commissioner St. Denis asked about the width of the central fixed window which is proposed to be replaced by French doors.

Mr. Gardon said it is just under five feet from sash to sash.

Commissioner St. Denis said that the substantial side yard setback relief from zoning standards will need to go before City Council for approval.

Mr. Gardon said he understands. They are looking for as much favor from the Commission to indicate that the applicant has routinely responded to requests via multiple meetings.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER CRENSHAW MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF HAP 14-08, REQUEST FOR HISTORIC ALTERATION PERMIT FOR ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS AND EXCEPTIONS TO ZONING STANDARDS FOR THE HISTORICALLY DESIGNATED PROPERTY ADDRESSED AS 1043 OCEAN BOULEVARD AND LOCATED IN THE R1-A (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE OPERABLE ROOF IS CONCEPTUALLY APPROVED WITH DETAILS OF ITS FUNCTIONALITY AND AESTHETICS TO RETURN TO THE COMMISSION;
2. THE APPLICANT SHALL PROVIDE A DETAILED SURVEY PREPARED BY A QUALIFIED HISTORIAN THAT MEETS THE NATIONAL PARKS SERVICES STANDARDS OF THE EXISTING ORIGINAL WINDOWS ON THE BUILDING TO DEMONSTRATE THE NECESSITY TO REPLACE RATHER THAN RESTORE THE WINDOWS; AND
3. THE DECORATIVE BALUSTRADE ABOVE THE CONSERVATORY SHALL NOT BE MODIFIED AND INSTEAD A GLASS PANEL SHALL BE PLACED BEHIND THE BALUSTRADE TO MEET THE BUILDING CODE REQUIREMENTS FOR A BALCONY RAILING;
4. THE OPTION A LANDSCAPE PLAN IS APPROVED WITH THE ELIMINATION OF THE TREE PROPOSED TO BE LOCATED IN FRONT OF THE CONSERVATORY; AND
5. THE APPLICANT SHALL RETURN TO THE COMMISSION WITH DETAILED PROJECT MATERIALS AND COLORS.

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;
- 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 O'BRIEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Commissioners Crenshaw, MacCartee and O'Brien.

NAYS: Commissioners Jones, and St. Denis.

ABSENT: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed with a vote of 3-2.

This item is scheduled to be heard by the City Council on November 18, 2008.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Rachel A. Hurst
Director of Community Development,
Redevelopment & Housing Services