

HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

March 17, 2010

The regular meeting of the Coronado Historic Resource Commission was called to order at 3 p.m., Wednesday, March 17, 2010, at the Coronado City Hall Council Chambers, 1825 Strand Way, Coronado, California, by Chairperson Crenshaw.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Ann McCaull, Senior Planner
Tricia Olsen, Associate Planner
Martha L Alvarez, Recording Secretary, Minutes Preparer

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of March 3, 2010, were approved as amended.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There was no separate Director's report.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

HAP 2-10 **SHAW WAGENER** – Request for Historic Resource Alteration Permit for installation of solar panels on a historically designated residence addressed as 1156 Isabella Avenue and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone.
(continued from March 3, 2010, hearing)

Ms. Olsen introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda.

Commissioner Ryan asked about the source whose findings regulate placement of solar panels.

Ms. Olsen said state law limits the ability to deny a solar panel installation based on aesthetic reasons. Staff has been communicating with the City Attorney in order to determine the level of review that is appropriate for placement of solar panels on historically designated resources.

Commissioner Ryan asked if the City Attorney had commented on the impact that solar panels may have on Mills Act homes.

Ms. Olsen responded that it would be considered a separate issue, one that the property owner should take into consideration prior to installing solar panels that could adversely affect their Mills Act eligibility.

Ms. McCaull added that if the Commission was to take action today to approve the request, she would recommend that the motion include a statement about the possible adverse effects on a property owner's eligibility for Mills Act should they decide to install the solar panels. She said this request would be considered a special exception.

Commissioner St. Denis asked about the more expensive alternative—a photovoltaic thin film integrated into the roof shingles. She also asked about the Mills Act tax savings amount per year for the property once it is funded.

Ms. McCaull responded that the \$34,000 estimated amount represents the potential property tax revenue loss the City would incur by entering into the Mills Act agreement.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if this amount takes into consideration loss of funds by the state.

Ms. McCaull stated that when Mills Act agreements are approved, there is an impact to the City of Coronado and its Redevelopment Agency. A remaining portion of the property taxes is given to the County of San Diego. The Mills Act agreement does not impact the state budget.

The applicant's representative, Kevin Mulvey, Sullivan Solar Power, 7964 Arjons Drive, San Diego, answered questions from the Commission. He stated that the property owner was made aware of possible issues with Mills Act should they choose to install the solar panels. In response to Commissioner St. Denis' question about photovoltaic shingles, he said that the shingles require direct sunlight so placement would need to be on the roof above the front façade, which is less aesthetically pleasing. In addition, photovoltaic shingles are twice the cost and produce half of the power production than solar panels.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Ryan asked about energy production if the third story shingle panels are excluded.

Mr. Mulvey said it would reduce energy production by about one-third. He then displayed photographs of the mock up of the solar panels that were temporarily placed on the property's roof and indicated that they are minimally visible from the street.

Commissioner Jones asked about the length of time the mock ups were displayed.

Mr. Mulvey said the mock ups were on display for one day only.

Commissioner St. Denis said she visited the site and viewed the mock ups. She asked if the rails will be a solid black, or if there will be a visible space between the panels and the roof.

Mr. Mulvy said the underside of the module will be black and the space below the panels will not be visible.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if the measurement from the top of the roof to the top of the rail will be about 12 inches.

Mr. Mulvey said it will be slightly less than 12 inches.

Chairperson Crenshaw said she drove by the site three times, finds no issues with the solar panels being visible from the street, and believes there should be no issues with the neighbors. She added that she supports going green in the community.

Commissioner Jones agreed, and stated that she does not find the solar panels obtrusive.

Commissioner Ryan asked if the Mills Act request for this home was approved.

Ms. McCaull stated that approval was given by the Historic Resource Commission; however, different members were serving at that time.

Commissioner Ryan said this situation is very upsetting. He stated that the Commission is tasked with reviewing historic residential structures. There are very strict Mills Act requirements regarding alterations and additions, and he is very concerned about any precedent setting actions by the Commission. He stated he would prefer to hide the solar panels in order to obtain the "greater good," which is to obtain the Mills Act, if this is what the applicant desires. It concerns him that the Mills Act agreement for this property has been approved, and a request for an "add on" is being considered after the fact.

Ms. McCall stated that the policies for the City and the Commission have changed over the years regarding Mills Act properties; they are now clearly more defined and strict. The owner of this property submitted the Mills Act application several years ago. Ms. McCaull said she would recommend that the Commission convey to the City Council their concerns about the installation of solar panels on a Mills Act approved home.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if the garage and central front window had been added to the home after the Mills Act agreement had been approved.

Ms. McCaull indicated that they had.

Commissioner Jones echoed Commissioner Ryan's comment that the property owner may have to choose between Mills Act benefits and potential savings on his electric bill.

Mr. Mulvey agreed and said that they have made the property owner fully aware of this information.

Vice Chair O'Brien stated that he was not as concerned about the Mills Act implications

inasmuch as alterations in the Mills Act can be approved, particularly if it is removable. The property owner at some point may make the decision to remove the solar panels if he desires to obtain approval by the City Council for Mills Act. Mr. O'Brien said he visited the site on Friday and feels that the applicant has done a very special job with the house over the years. Mr. O'Brien commented that he served on the Commission at the time the Mills Act agreement was approved, and he is more than pleased to support the request.

COMMISSION ACTION

VICE CHAIR O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REQUEST AS SUBMITTED, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

1. THE COMMISSION DETERMINES THE INSTALLATION OF THE SOLAR PANELS ON THE DORMER ARE INAPPROPRIATE FOR A MILLS ACT PROPERTY AND WHEN THE PROPERTY OWNER FILES A MILLS ACT APPLICATION WITH THE CITY COUNCIL, THE COMMISSION'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE WILL BE CONVEYED TO THE CITY COUNCIL AT WHICH TIME, THE CITY COUNCIL MAY DETERMINE THE INSTALLATION OF THE PANELS HAS JEOPARDIZED THE MILLS ACT ELIGIBILITY OF THE PROPERTY, AND IN ORDER TO QUALIFY FOR A MILLS ACT, THE SOLAR PANELS ON THE DORMER SHOULD BE REMOVED.

THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS WERE MADE:

- A. THE PROPOSED ALTERATIONS ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THIS CHAPTER, THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT AND THE GENERAL PLAN.
- B. THE PROPOSED ALTERATIONS WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE HISTORICAL, ARCHITECTURAL OR AESTHETIC VALUE OF THE HISTORIC RESOURCE.
- C. THE PROPOSED ALTERATIONS WILL RETAIN THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS THAT MAKE THE HISTORIC RESOURCE SIGNIFICANT.
- D. THE PROPOSED ALTERATIONS WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE'S RELATIONSHIP TO ITS SURROUNDINGS AND NEIGHBORING HISTORIC RESOURCES.
- E. THE PROPOSED ALTERATIONS WILL COMPLY WITH THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR'S STANDARDS AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 106 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT OF 1966.

COMMISSIONER CRENSHAW SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed with a vote of 4-1.

There is a 10-day appeal period.

NOI 1-10 **HOLLOWAY FAMILY TRUST** – Notice of Intent to Demolish the single family residence addressed as 1117 AND 1127 Sixth Street and located in the R-1B (Single Family Residential) Zone.

Commissioner Jones recused herself from the meeting and stepped down from the dais.

Ms. Olsen introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda.

The applicant, Dino Morabito, Napolitano GMAC Real Estate, 939 Orange Avenue, answered questions from the Commission.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if there was additional information about the outside pillars being reduced in size, per the information on the application.

Mr. Morabito said there was no additional information available.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner St. Denis said the house meets the criteria to be designated a historic resource. It is unique and, with the exception of the reduction the height of the outside pillars, is almost in pristine condition. She understands the house is for sale and would encourage a potential buyer to remove the wood fence and apartment building that was subsequently added. She considers this house to be a historic treasure, and stated that she will not support the request.

Vice Chair O'Brien said that three different sets of standards have been developed over time for Mills Act homes, historically designated properties, and demolition requests. The Commission has been very careful in prohibiting property owners to demolish a home as there must be strong points in support of an action to deny the request. The Commission has in the past been criticized by City Council for not providing sufficient criteria in support of denial. Mr. O'Brien stated that because of the home's location, he is unable oppose the request.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if the apartment building on the property is a legal rental and if it can be rebuilt as a rental.

Ms. McCaull stated that the site would allow for construction of two dwelling units. She

considers it a legal non conforming in that it does not comply with today's setbacks. The site requires four parking spaces.

Commissioner Ryan stated that the agent and broker are present in the audience. Mr. Ryan suggested that a prospective buyer may want to be informed that this home may be eligible for Mills Act if the main house is restored, which could result in significant tax savings. He also said he understood the owner's desire to apply for a demolition permit.

Commissioner St. Denis added that if a new owner chose to rebuild the small apartment at the rear of the property and designate the front property, he could apply for an exception to the zoning standard which would reduce the requirement for four parking spaces. There are many benefits in having a historic property.

Chairperson Crenshaw said this site contains a very attractive home at the front of the property, but also a very unattractive house at the rear of the property. She added that there is a large business complex across the street and an apartment complex next door. She feels that it would be difficult to designate this home historic as it does not meet the basic criteria.

COMMISSION ACTION

VICE CHAIR O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE STRUCTURE ADDRESSED AS 1117 AND 1127 SIXTH STREET (NOI 1-10) 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 DOES NOT EXEMPLIFY OR REFLECT SPECIAL ELEMENTS OF THE CITY'S MILITARY, CULTURAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, AESTHETIC, ENGINEERING, OR ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY;
- B. IT IS NOT IDENTIFIED WITH A PERSON(S), OR AN EVENT(S) SIGNIFICANT IN LOCAL, STATE, OR NATIONAL HISTORY;
- C. IT IS ONE OF THE FEW REMAINING EXAMPLES IN THE CITY POSSESSING DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ARTS AND CRAFTS ARCHITECTURAL STYLE;
- D. IT IS NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NOTABLE WORK OF A BUILDER, DESIGNER, ARCHITECT, ARTISAN OR LANDSCAPE PROFESSIONAL;
- E. IT DOES NOT MEET THE STATE PROGRAM OF LANDMARKS AND POINTS OF HISTORICAL INTEREST AS SET FORTH IN ARTICLE 2 (COMMENCING WITH SECTION 50280) OF CHAPTER 1 OF PART 1 OF DIVISION 1 OF THE CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE AND ARTICLE 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).

CHAIRPERSON CRENSHAW SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Crenshaw, O'Brien, and Ryan.
NAYS: St. Denis.
ABSENT: None.
DISQUALIFIED: Jones.

The motion passed with a vote of 3-1.

There is a 10-day appeal period.

NOI 2-10 MS. KIMBERLY CASTIGLIONE – Notice of Intent to Partially Demolish the single family residence addressed as 1138 Glorietta Boulevard and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone.

Ms. Olsen introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda.

The applicant's representative, James Blair, 733 Mountain View Drive, gave a brief overview of the request and answered questions from the Commission.

The applicant's representative and general contractor, John Gillem, 1 Pine Court, said that performed a roof test to determine if the original tiles could be saved. Because it was a full mudded roof, the tiles disintegrated when removed. The new roof will be a full mudded, boosted, tiled roof to replicate the original roof.

Commissioner Ryan asked about the property's square footage.

Mr. Gillem said the original square footage was 1,967, and the new square footage will be 3,378, excluding the garage.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if the final results of the modification reflect the approved plans on file with the City.

Mr. Gillem responded yes. The only issue in question was the amount of demolition.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Vice Chair O'Brien asked staff to further clarify the purpose of this hearing.

Ms. McCall stated that, in addition to the Commission making a determination on whether the partially demolished structure meets the criteria to be deemed historic, the project had exceeded what the City had anticipated would be the amount of demolition. Ms. McCaull stated that if the Building Division had been aware that the structure would be stripped down to the studs, it would have required the property owner to obtain Commission approval. Staff was not aware that it would be partially demolished. The most significant issue is the removal of exterior materials including most elements of the front façade. It is the applicant's desire to get the project back on track and to obtain approval via the correct process. The Commission should determine if the structure meets the criteria to be considered a historic resource. The applicant desires that the Commission not find the structure historic and is allowed to continue with the project to its completion. Theoretically, if the Commission finds that the original structure was historic, the applicant can appeal the decision to the City Council. If the City Council were to uphold the decision, the applicant would be required to rebuild the home to its original condition. This action would not be appropriate given the fact that the windows located at the front façade were not original.

Vice Chair O'Brien clarified that in order for the project to be completed, the Commission must determine that the structure which currently exists does not meet the criteria to be deemed historic.

Mr. Gillem said he understands that the primary concern is that the stucco was removed from the front façade. He explained that in order for the project to be completed, the entire front façade was required to be re-engineered, keeping the bones of the house intact, but placing new structural sheer paneling across the entire façade. It was not possible to save the stucco because the structure required sheer paneling and the stucco was deteriorated due to severe water damage in numerous areas. In order to preserve the structure for another 100 years, they determined it was necessary to remove and replace the stucco.

Chairperson Crenshaw stated that this home was a CHA house; it had been historically designated by the Coronado Historical Association. She feels this home could have been deemed historic prior to the partial demolition. She cannot believe that the owner did not obtain the proper approval before proceeding. She believes that the applicant's representative had to be aware that they were conducting a partial demolition of the structure.

Commissioner St. Denis said that had this Chris Cosgrove house been presented before the Commission, she would have required that the windows, tile and all other materials be put back in its original place. She noticed that the entry has now become Moroccan and with other changes that have taken place, the character of the house is gone. She considers the original home to have been historic, but not the existing house as it stands.

Commissioner Jones said she was appalled to see the house. It is a Cosgrove home that is part of the community's history. She understands that the windows had previously been replaced and that the house has had structural issues as well as water damage; however, she feels that the representatives were aware that the amount of demolition they did to an 88-year old house should have been approved by the Commission.

Commissioner Ryan clarified that this house was not historically designated by the Commission although it is an older Coronado home, built by a significant architect.

Chairperson Crenshaw stated the house was recognized by the Coronado Historical Association home, and displayed its historic plaque.

Commissioner Ryan said that it was good news that the house was not demolished. He considers the existing structure to be a very close reproduction to the original house. Mr. Ryan said he understood the reason the home was reconstructed, and feels that the end result is positive, compared to what could have happened. He stated he would support the request and allow the owner to complete the project.

Commissioner St. Denis quoted a former Commissioner member, "Just remember, it's not what you like, it's what is historic that you are preserving." Ms. St. Denis agreed that the end result will be a beautiful house; however, what was historic is the Chris Cosgrove that she would have wanted to protect. She stated that she does not desire that the project be stopped.

Ms. McCaull commented that if the property owner had asked for historic designation and then had subsequently requested approval for an addition, he would have had to return before the Commission. Through the structural engineering review, the owner would have discovered that it was necessary to add the sheer wall along the front of the house to support the weight of the deck and new second story at the rear of the property. The owner would have had to return for approval of a partial demolition. Ms. McCaull says she does not know of any other way that an owner can retain a historic home and update it along certain facades if the sheer wall is required to be added. She said that the Commission may want to take this information into consideration.

Mr. Gillem said that although the owner is not asking for historic designation, there should be more communication between the building/planning departments and Historic Resource Commission during the processing of the permits.

Vice Chair O'Brien said that most builders are faced with an old home that looks solid until it is opened up. The home must look like this at some stage in order to have it meet current codes.

Commissioner St. Denis said she has known builders who have worked on Irving Gill homes and have placed the sheer wall from behind in order to preserve the historic surface. There is something to be said for the existence of the Historic Building Code which, according to the Office of Historic Preservation, supersedes the local and national building codes. Ms. St. Denis would have agreed to the partial demolition but would have asked that some elements be maintained, i.e. arches at the living room windows, doorways, and so on. Unfortunately, this cannot be undone.

Chairperson Crenshaw commented about the significant number of telephone calls she received about this project. She feels that the purpose and intent of this Commission is to preserve what can be preserved if they are given the choice. She said it is incomprehensible, given the age of the home, that the builders continued to demolish the home without prior approval of the Commission. She said that, had they asked, they most likely would have been given approval to proceed; however, she understands that what is done is done and there is nothing to do at this point. Ms. Crenshaw said she was concerned about establishing a precedent today about this

type of action on the builder's part.

Commissioner Jones said she feels that the new home will be very attractive although inasmuch as the front façade has been changed, perhaps the Commission can reconsider some of the accessory items such as the railing on the upper deck. She suggested that some of the elements that gave the original structure its ambiance be replaced.

Mr. Gillem said there are a few options they discussed with the owner regarding the changes needed in order to meet code requirements. For example, the balcony rail at the second floor needed to be raised about 12 inches so it was proposed that terracotta in-fill openings be used. He also informed the owner that the entry way may have to be returned to its original look. Mr. Gillem said the owner's intent is that the house be sound, look warm and inviting and have less of a fortress look.

Commissioner St. Denis said that in working with the Historic Building Code, the Commission has allowed an upper guardrail to remain as is. It is one of the benefits of a historically designated home.

Ms. McCaull stated that the owner does not want the home to be historically designated.

Commissioner St. Denis asked for clarification on whether the Commission is to make a determination on the original or existing structure.

Ms. McCaull said that the Commission should make a determination on whether the structure that has been partially demolished meets the criteria to be deemed a historic resource. Discussion involving design review issues are not appropriate for today's hearing.

Mr. Gillem briefly stated that it was not their intention to demolish the home without the consent of the Commission. They were issued a demolition permit and an approved set of plans and the owner did not request historic designation of the home. He understands that passers-by may have erroneously concluded that the home was being completely demolished; however, this is not the case.

Commissioner Ryan asked for further clarification on whether the Commission is making a determination on the original or existing structure.

Ms. McCaull stated that the determination should be based on the structure that existed before construction began.

Chairperson Crenshaw said there was no doubt that the original structure was an historic structure as it was a CHA home. She said it was a difficult decision.

Commissioner Ryan expressed concern about setting a precedent.

Ms. McCaull said the Commission's action today is not precedent setting. Each case is based upon their own individual merits and circumstances.

Mr. Blair said that a review by the Historic Resource Commission was not required when he first

submitted his project. Unfortunately, the demolition was more than they anticipated and during the plan check review, there appeared to be no issues so they continued with their work. He understands differently now and assured the Commission that this incident will not be repeated again and that there was never any ill intent.

Chairperson Crenshaw commented that it would not make a difference at this point to acknowledge that the original structure was considered historic.

COMMISSION ACTION

VICE CHAIR O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE STRUCTURE ADDRESSED AS 1138 GLORIETTA BOULEVARD (NOI 2-10) 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 DOES NOT EXEMPLIFY OR REFLECT SPECIAL ELEMENTS OF THE CITY'S MILITARY, CULTURAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, AESTHETIC, ENGINEERING, OR ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY;
- B. IT IS NOT IDENTIFIED WITH A PERSON(S), OR AN EVENT(S) SIGNIFICANT IN LOCAL, STATE, OR NATIONAL HISTORY;
- C. IT IS NOT ONE OF THE FEW REMAINING EXAMPLES IN THE CITY POSSESSING DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF AN ARCHITECTURAL STYLE; AND IS NOT VALUABLE FOR THE STUDY OF A TYPE, PERIOD, OR METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION AND HAS BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY ALTERED;
- F. IT IS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NOTABLE WORK OF A BUILDER, CHRIS COSGROVE;
- G. 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).

COMMISSIONER RYAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner St. Denis said the Callahan family lived in the home.

Chairperson Crenshaw said she disagreed with the above motion. She asked if a clause could be added to the motion to further explain the circumstances.

Ms. McCaull said it was very appropriate to include additional information supporting the Commission's position.

The motion was amended to add the following statement:

THE COMMISSION ACKNOWLEDGES THE STRUCTURE HAD PREVIOUSLY BEEN RECOGNIZED BY THE CORONADO HISTORIC ASSOCIATION AND WAS IMPORTANT DUE TO ITS ARCHITECTURAL STYLE, COSGROVE BUILDER AND CALLAHAN FAMILY WHO RESIDED IN THE RESIDENCE; IN ITS CURRENT STATE OF PARTIAL DEMOLITION THE BUILDING NO LONGER RETAINS SUFFICIENT INTEGRITY TO BE CONSIDERED A HISTORICAL RESOURCE.

AYES: Crenshaw, Jones, O'Brien, Ryan, and St. Denis

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

There is a 10-day appeal period.

HRPA 1-10 CITY OF CORONADO – Historic Resource Commission review of Historic Preservation Mills Act applications submitted in 2009 for prioritization and placement on the Historic Preservation Mills Act Waiting List including the following properties: 803 Adella Avenue, 1025 E Avenue, 927 D Avenue, 465 G Avenue, 160 G Avenue, 300 First Street, 921 A Avenue, 731 C Avenue, 1807 Monterey Avenue, 1427 5th Street and 941 J Avenue.

Commissioners O'Brien and St. Denis recused themselves and stepped down from the dais as they each have a financial contractual investment in one of the properties being discussed. They did not participate in the submittal of rankings for the historic homes.

Ms. McCaull introduced the staff report as outlined in the agenda. She added that because there are two Commissioners unable to participate, she would average and calculate the number twice to represent each Commissioner that is unable to vote.

Chairperson Crenshaw inquired as to why the two Commissioners are unable to vote on the remaining homes.

Ms. McCaull relayed the City Attorney's position that the Commissioners could alter the numerical value of other properties in order that their subject property is held in a higher ranking. It is a very conservative interpretation by the City Attorney. Ms. McCaull then collected the ranking sheets from each of the remaining Commissioners, and indicated that the results would be made known at the next meeting.

Chairperson Crenshaw confirmed that the method being used at this time by the Commission whereby the application submittal date is used has made a significant difference in the ranking total. She confirmed this system works.

DISCUSSIONS

Discussion regarding the City Council's action on adoption of a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Coronado approving the issuance of a Historic Resource Alteration Permit (HAP 3-10) for alterations, additions, and exceptions to zoning standards for the historically designated residence addressed as 320 Seventh Street located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone.

Ms. McCaull reported that the item was approved by City Council on consent.

Discussion regarding Historic Preservation Booth for Coronado Flower Show (no report)

The Commission agreed that they would not be participating in the Flower Show this year.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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