

DRAFT

HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

July 7, 2010

The regular meeting of the Coronado Historic Resource Commission was called to order at 3 p.m., Wednesday, July 7, 2010, at the Coronado City Hall Council Chambers, 1825 Strand Way, Coronado, California, by Chairperson Crenshaw.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of June 16, 2010, were approved as submitted.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Olsen reported that written correspondence had been received and was provided to the Commission for the properties addressed as 1112 Isabella Avenue and 1043 Ocean Boulevard.

Ms. Olsen also reported that the meetings of July 21 and August 4 have been cancelled due to a lack of quorum. The next regular meeting will be held on August 18.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Phil Monroe, 28 Bahamas Bend, said he was concerned about 1043 Ocean Boulevard. He read into the record some comments that were made by Senator James R. Mills when the applicant submitted an earlier application, "I do have opinions about the Spreckels house. The purpose of the Mills Act was to preserve the architect of times past. It wasn't to preserve the interiors but to preserve what buildings looked like, preserve the works of architects that is specifically what was intended...and the changes that are being proposed for the Spreckels house do not preserve the architecture. They disparage the architecture of the building. They disparage the work of the noted architect. I think it is a horrendous precedent if you do it. If you do it, people will sign up for the Mills Act, enter into an agreement, sign a contract to keep the building, preserve its historic appearance and figure that here in Coronado, it doesn't mean anything." Mr. Monroe said these comments were still appropriate for the proposed changes as presented today.

Reg Finch, 1051 Ocean Boulevard, said he lives south of the property located at 1043 Ocean Boulevard. He displayed a photograph of the current ocean view from his master suite, and a similar photograph which showed the limited view of same if a second floor master bedroom addition is allowed at the subject property. Mr. Finch asked that the Commission not approve the request.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI 2010-07 JOAN ADESSA – Notice of Intent to Demolish the single family residence addressed as 1112 Isabella and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone.

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

The applicant, Story Vogel, Pine Valley, provided an overview of the request and answered questions of the Commission. Mr. Vogel said he visited the Historical Society and examined the original permit for this structure. He discovered that someone had written in modern script the incorrect address for this property as “1132 Isabella,” which was not the address of the structure that was proposed to be built at that time. Mr. Vogel said he believes that the six-room cottage that Major Colin Ross wanted Sidney Chapin to build was in fact not this structure. He believes that the permit was not for the simple, wooden cottage that is now addressed at 1112 Isabella Avenue as there is no proof that shows the six-room structure was ever built. A 1932 real estate brochure describes the property as containing 20 rooms including a two-room structure referred to now as 1112 Isabella Avenue. The structure is described as a garden cottage containing two rooms and a bath. This certainly is not a six-room structure.

Chairperson Crenshaw commended Mr. Vogel for submitting a very well written report. She reported that the Commission received a letter from Mr. Libenson who describes the single-car garage at the rear of the property as having a joint and adjoining wall. She asked about their intent in demolishing half of the garage structure.

Mr. Vogel said that in 1932, a two-car garage was built. In 1949, the property was split and a large wall was built through the center of the garage. He said he is unclear on future plans for the garage.

Ruth Ann Fisher, said she represents Ms. Adessa in the sale of her property. She stated that per an agreement on file, either property owner can remove their side of the garage structure; however, there is an obligation by that party to add retention or additional structure to keep the remaining part of the garage intact.

Commissioner Ryan referenced the 1949 and 1988 Sanborn Maps. He asked if there is a lot line that runs through the garage to the alley from the subject property.

Ms. Olsen replied that the current Assessor Parcel Map reflects the current lot line situation. The Sanborn map focuses more on the structure itself and not necessarily the lot lines.

Commissioner Ryan stated that if the property is demolished, the RSIP will require side sets and a 10-foot garage. He asked about the width of the lot in its current configuration from the Isabella Street side.

The property owner, Joan Adessa, said she has lived in the home for 35 years. However, she must sell her property because of both legal and health issues. She said the home was not originally built as a dwelling and because of its unusual design is considered by the county

assessor's office to be a one-room dwelling. In addition, prospective buyers would prefer to purchase a home that is maintained, which would require significant electrical and plumbing upgrades. She feels it is a reasonable request by any prospective buyer that they should be allowed to demolish the current structure and build a new home. Ms. Adessa added that at one point, she attempted to have the home designated historic; however, after much discussion between her attorneys and the attorneys of the opposing party, it was determined that the home did not meet the criteria to be considered historic. She mentioned that, per her conversation with Senator Mills in 2006, it was agreed that the home did not have any historic value. In response to Mr. Ryan's question, she had a survey done a few years ago and it was determined that the lot size is 11,325 ft.

Commissioner Ryan asked if there are curb cuts on Isabella Avenue.

Ms. Adessa said that all homes on Isabella Avenue have a curb cut with the exception of two homes.

Commissioner St. Denis asked about Ms. Adessa's attempt to have the home designated historic.

Ms. Adessa said that the Coronado Historical Association assisted in the research of information which was presented at the trial. After two-and-one-half years, the outcome was not favorable.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Gerry MacCartee, 836 D Avenue, said that based on her many years of preservation experience, she understands that it is unlikely that the home will qualify as historic. She commented, however, that Ms. Adessa's neighboring property owner, Nancy Cobb, will be negatively affected by a future structure that may be built on the property.

Ilene Oya, 1033 B Avenue, read into the record her letter, "Joan Adessa listed the property with me in September 2008 for land value. The County Assessor's records showed a legal description of the property as Lot Nos. 10 and 11, Block 19, with 11, 325 sq. ft. of land. The structure is built approximately 98 feet away from Isabella with alley access. I found the value of the grounds of significant value while the house inadequate in design and its internal mechanical systems...were in poor condition, as they probably are today. The floor plan of the house was definitely built without planning or professional design. It was difficult for me to do the marketing piece for this house. She did make it look very cute but it was not a good house. The minimum lot size according to the City of Coronado for this area is 5,500 sq. ft. We kept a plan on file for a lot split of a lot and one of them would be 5,615 sq. ft. and the other would be 5,501 sq. ft." Ms. Oya said that the measurement from her garage to the house next door to the east side is 28.38 ft. in the skinny part of the flag. She continued, "During the marketing period, we had many potential buyers with much interest in the land with the added potential of ocean views, but the house was considered uninhabitable even as a rental property. Clearly the Historic Resource Commission is important to the City for the role it plays. I respect your passion for your preservation but in all due respect, 1121 Isabella is not a structure of significance but only a memory of the grounds."

Stephanie Davis, 854 H Avenue, said that Nancy Cobb's (neighboring property owner) home sits on the lot line. It is unfortunate because the neighbor will lose landscaping which is a very

important part of the property. Ms. Davis stated that Ms. Cobb was not noticed about this hearing.

Liz Forsythe-Levell, 1032 Flora Avenue, said she does not understand the position on the garage issue because many of the older estates have shared property lines, storage areas, and so forth. With regard to the garden cottage, she does not feel this equals to a single family dwelling. She stated that Ms. Adessa's home is not historical, and she understands Ms. Cobb's situation; however, she also understands that in order to preserve a property, you must purchase it. She asked that the Commission support the request.

Ms. Adessa responded to the comment that Ms. Cobbs property is on the lot line. Ms. Adessa said that her house is ten feet from Ms. Cobb's property. If a future buyer does rebuild because of the size of the lot, they must meet the setback requirement for a single lot.

Ms. Adessa-Smith, Joan Adessa's daughter, stated that her mother would have been more than happy to continue living in the residence; however, she must sell the property because of personal issues. She also clarified that the neighboring property owner, Nancy Cobb, was a good friend of her mothers and was aware of today's meeting.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Ryan said the Historic Resource Commission acts at the pleasure of the City Council. He stated that in addition to determining whether the structure in question is historic, future potential land use will also be determined by today's action. He noted for the record that, although not in the purview of the Commission, the property is a flag lot with a common wall, and there is a contiguous owner with a zero lot line and a common wall, roof and building. An 11,000 sq. ft. lot means that a prospective buyer can split the lot into two 55's, which means that a future structure may consist of two billy-boxes with a one-car garage at the rear of the property, and a potential request for a curb cut on Isabella Avenue. Instead of the 10 ft. setback as mentioned by Ms. Adessa, a 4 ft. setback will be most likely required with two long tall narrows. Mr. Ryan said this information will be considered by the Commission today if the structure does not meet the criteria to be considered historic. In addition, Mr. Ryan commented that the structure is located in a potentially historic district.

Vice Chair O'Brien asked Ms. Adessa if the marketing brochure includes information on restricting the property to a single lot.

Ms. Adessa said she had met previously with City staff, who determined that the property is not allowed to be split or have a curb cut added. Prospective buyers, however, are allowed a tandem garage. She stated that the buyer desires to build a home on one lot.

Commissioner St. Denis asked why there are two homes without a curb cut.

Ms. Adessa said that, per the City's ordinance, homes which have alley access are not allowed a curb cut.

Commissioner Ryan asked for clarification on the lot split allowance.

Ms. Olsen clarified that although the property does have the square footage needed for a lot split, there are other elements which prevent the lot split and curb cut.

Commissioner Jones said her concerns involve a potential lot split and curb cut, as well as the landscaping. However, she reminded the Commission that construction of future structures on properties is not in the purview of the Commission. She stated that although the building is over 75 years of age, it is not historic.

Commissioner St. Denis agreed that the home is not historic, and it would be difficult to find the criteria to deem it as such. She asked if it is in the Commission's purview to recommend a zoning code exception to City Council if the request is approved today with a lot split restriction.

Ms. Olsen responded that the lot split issue is not in the purview of this Commission. She clarified that the Commission must make a determination today as to whether the structure intended to be demolished meets the criteria to be deemed an historic resource. The issue does not involve future potential development of the property.

Chairperson Crenshaw stated that the home is not historic but would certainly prefer that the trees be saved.

Vice Chair O'Brien said that, as a developer, the likelihood of splitting the lot is most likely zero. He said he feels comfortable that a potential buyer would be unsuccessful in effecting a lot split.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE STRUCTURE ADDRESSED AS 1112 ISABELLA AVENUE (NOI 2010-07) 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;
- 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 SECTION 5024.1 OF THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE.

THE FOLLOWING CONDITION WAS ADDED:

1. OWNER SHALL NOTIFY THE CITY AT LEAST 10 DAYS PRIOR TO DEMOLITION TO ALLOW CITY AND/OR THE CORONADO HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION AN OPPORTUNITY TO PREPARE A PHOTOGRAPHIC, FILM, VIDEO, OR OTHER APPROPRIATE RECORD OF THE EXTERIOR/INTERIOR OF THE STRUCTURE.

CHAIRPERSON CRENSHAW SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

There is a 10-day appeal period.

HAP 2010-05 EMERALD ISLE, LLC – Request for Historic Resource Alteration Permit for proposed alterations to the historically designated residence addressed as 1043 Ocean Boulevard and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone. The alteration permit also requests relief from zoning standards.

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

The applicant, Jonah Shacknai, thanked the members for their time and attention and commented that it is his third time before this Commission. He thought it noteworthy to mention that the Commission has twice approved alterations to the 1043 site that were significantly larger in scope than the proposal before the Commission today. He stated that, on an entirely voluntary basis and taking into account community perceptions and historical issues, they have altered their expectations of rehabilitation of the property to be limited to those aspects that he feels are completely necessary to achieve livability and modernization within the walls of a clearly historic structure. Mr. Shacknai said that this has become an extraordinarily controversial question within Coronado and he certainly appreciates that there are legitimate differences and views that may exist within the community, the Commission, and even City Council. He communicated his disappointment with the last two reiterations in that discussions turned into an almost vitriolic personal aspect among some citizens that had a point of view that was different from his and the majority of the Commissioners. He would hope that any discourse today would be lively but lack the exaggerated characteristics of the issue before the Commission today. He stated that words such as “unconscionable” and “travesty” do not necessarily serve a useful purpose in a debate that is appropriate in a democratic society, and certainly at the City level.

Mr. Shacknai stated that the issue before the Commission today is a fundamental question: Is the owner of the property that has invested significant capital to acquire and retain that property able to modernize that property in such a way that it may be livable for his or her family going forward? Mr. Shacknai said he is currently a resident of Scottsdale, Arizona, and has been in Coronado as a homeowner for over a decade. He said it is fully his intention to relocate his family to Coronado within four to five years in order to allow him to make business and personal plans to afford him that opportunity. Although he is technically not a resident who votes within Coronado, he certainly is a tax-paying resident and someone who intends to become an important member of the community. Mr. Shacknai said he does not expect to be treated any differently from someone who may have lived in Coronado for thirty years. He said they are all on the tax rolls together and have similar rights at law and equity within the City. Mr. Shacknai said he is twice an owner of historic properties, and though he had the financial capacity to purchase a home that was newly constructed with many of the modern amenities, he twice demonstrated with his money that he favors historic preservation and has occupied premises that are indeed historical and are absolutely worthy of rehabilitation. Mr. Shacknai stated that he has stepped forward, not to demolish or significantly alter but to preserve and be a factor in the rehabilitation of structures that have been clearly significant to a community, and clearly are significant to him. He said he feels in many ways that, although the Spreckels Mansion is not a museum and therefore not owned by the public, the public has a right to pass by, to understand the historic significance of the home, and to appreciate the contributions that the Spreckels family has made to Coronado and the greater San Diego area. He said that all of these things are important to him, and he would like to offer every assurance that he has no less respect for the sanctity of the structure than any member of the Commission or of the community.

Mr. Shacknai explained that one of the differences in view may pertain to whether or not it is appropriate to add a master bedroom over an area that is considered "dead" space. He said that the area serves no useful purpose whatsoever and the addition will not meaningfully obstruct anything within the neighborhood. He also said that the addition will very immaterially change the already asymmetrical view of the property from the street and would clearly be demarcated as a modern addition to the historical home. Mr. Shacknai said the remaining requested alterations relate to taking decrepit windows, which have been described by a window expert to be "beyond repair," and repurposing those in two instances to French doors that would allow egress to the beautiful front part of the property. The remaining alterations have absolutely no effect on the public as they are at the rear of the property and do not purport to alter anything of historical significance; these changes would be imperceptible to anyone. Mr. Shacknai said that for members of the community to rail against those alterations are clearly inappropriate because they are not visible from the public right-of-way. He said that his representative, Mr. Gardon, would present a very circumscribed wish list, and communicated that the idea is to preserve and protect, wherever possible. In those instances where items are beyond repair, as described by experts recommended by the City, they certainly will make an absolute representation that the items will be replaced in identical kind to modern wood materials rather than materials which were sold over 100 years ago. Mr. Shacknai said it is important to note that the house as viewed from the street is really three different homes. It is a home that had an original presentation, which will be shown, and was twice altered not by the original architect but by successive owners. Some of the matters under consideration such as the kitchen windows, which are not visible from the right-of-way, are not in any way part of the original structure of the building and cannot reasonably be described as being historically important. Mr. Shacknai thanked the Commission for their time and for enduring such controversial matters.

The applicant's representative, Dale Gardon, Dale Gardon Design, 20885 North 90th Place, Suite 100, Scottsdale, Arizona, gave an overview of the request via a PowerPoint presentation, and answered questions of the Commission. He stated that he and his client have been working on this project for almost three years in terms of discourse and discussion with the public, City, and the Commission. Mr. Gardon said that the prominence of the home is what attracted Mr. Shaknai to purchase the property. He displayed a photograph of the original structure and commented that both reverence and discourse about Harrison Albright's work can be seen in same. He noted that subsequent alterations in 1911 are significant when compared to the proposed alterations presented today in terms of altering what is considered to be the characteristic elements of the original structure. Mr. Gardon clarified that to constantly refer back to Harrison Albright's work is incorrect. He said the structure stayed in the same condition from the 1980s through today, with the exception of the removal of the awnings that were evident in a 1911 photograph. He also noted that discussion has revolved around symmetry and asymmetry. They are cognizant that the original design was fully symmetrical and that the asymmetry began in 1911 and is represented and current today. The notion that the house is completely symmetrical is untrue. He pointed out that the balustrade located at the side of the home is far less significant from the public view than the front balustrade; this was taken into consideration in the design.

Mr. Gardon stated that 11 elements have been identified by experts they have hired as historic references to look at the Standards of Rehabilitation. Alterations are one of four very distinctly described elements in preservation. Rehabilitation allows for alterations because of livability issues, i.e. lack of indoor/outdoor connectivity. The home does not take advantage of the asset of the site and the convenience of access to the front porch from one of the main areas of the home. Mr. Gardon displayed photographs of the main front rooms where the subject of proposed French doors has been requested. The proposal is not to increase, relocate, or otherwise alter the opening other than ask for a division down the middle to make it accessible to light, air, and ventilation, and to allow connectivity to the outdoors. French doors currently exist in other areas of the home, such as the sunroom conservatory and upper master bedroom's roof terrace. There are inconsistencies throughout the home about how the windows are designed, and what provisions of style, rail and character it reflects. The applicant has been specifically requested during past discussions to consider no divisions in the windows so that they look similar to the windows at the front of the property, and they have agreed to comply with this request. The kitchen window, per their window expert Bud Anderson, was identified as having uncharacteristic details unlike any windows in the home and since the corbels do not align with the elements, the window was placed at a different point in time from when the corbels were placed. Mr. Anderson has specialized in historic renovation of windows for a considerable amount of time. His company was formed in 1994 and he has worked on some very significant historic properties. While his report is the only written documentation submitted to the Commission for their review, they have received the same conclusions from at least three other window experts. However, the most significant conclusion is that there is no way of knowing the true condition of a window until it is removed, stripped of its paint, examined. Only then can a determination be made on how to best repair the window. The applicant is fully compliant with the Secretary of State's standards for renovation of windows and will have samples made to prove that a window has been deemed irreparable. In the event it cannot be repaired, a window in like-kind will be installed.

Mr. Gardon stated that two elements characterize their request:

1. Additional provisions for a master suite they feel is commensurate with the size and value of a home of this type of property.
2. Connectivity to the outdoors.

Mr. Gardon said that, with reference to the site plan and request for setbacks, to suggest that they should not make these requests would be to suggest that the element within the Code is not written to encourage rehabilitation and relief for homes that are otherwise intended for rehabilitation that may need to build, as this home does, on an existing wall line that is non-compliant with current standards. It is difficult to stay on the 18 foot line and also create a beam that would be bearing on the front conservatory window or the back French doors—the front façade would need to be significantly altered to create a wall that is supported at this location. By building to the exterior line, they have the structural ability to span wall-to-wall. It is a very significant condition. They considered not asking for relief and trying to build on the side; however, the height of the structure was compromised. The applicant would rather keep the heights to the minimum standards. The master suite was shifted back in order to differentiate this element from the conservatory. They have fully abided with the request.

Mr. Gardon noted that the main level floor plan showing the proposed French doors is reversible, which is a very significant topic within the Standards of Rehabilitation. The extension below the sill is hidden below both the balustrade and shrubbery that has been there for many years and is indiscernible from the street and public view. He said the upper level addition is conceptual at this time. They have been seeking for two-and-one-half years direction that they can follow and they look forward to that guidance today to refine the interior plan. This involves the master bedroom, bathroom, closet, and amenities that are the size commensurate with the value of a home of this size. This includes the proposed awnings at the second level. Mr. Gardon clarified that their intention is not to increase the FAR. By calculation, it is .62. The applicant was able to maintain the same FAR by reducing the third floor area. They are proposing to build the walls to a more commensurate height, thereby equalizing the square foot reduction with the square foot addition at the second level. Their calculations show an increase in square footage because they netted out the .62 FAR. Mr. Gardon said that the home has always exceeded the 30 foot height limit by being built to 33 feet, 9 inches. They are not requesting the height of the roof at the rear of the property be increased. What they are proposing is a roof slope change to access daylight, air and egress. The roof slope at a minimum slope does slightly exceed 30 feet; this is one zoning exception that has been requested. He stated that they have followed the Secretary of Interior Standards and the 10 points within Rehabilitation and it is important to understand the meaning of the word “preservation.” Preservation includes four distinct elements within the Secretary of Interior Standards. The significant difference is the flexibility within rehabilitation for additions that are provided and whose locations are not being altered beyond its recognizable form or obscuring the primary façade. Further, the addition is being placed in a stepped-back position that makes it clearly discernible as an element that subsequently added.

Mr. Gardon said there has been much discussion about the balustrade. They are very flexible about how to treat the balustrade. They are intending to preserve while meeting the Code requirement. They have proposed to raise it to 44 inches which is a code compliance height but intend to keep the size and proportion of the balustrade exactly as it appears today. The other alternative is to leave it as is and place glass on top of it in order to meet code compliance. He

commented that Preservation Brief 14 cites “changes are inevitable in buildings and neighborhoods as it is in individuals. Never static, buildings and neighborhoods grow, diminish, and continue to evolve as technical advances bring conveniences, or as additional family living spaces alternatively are needed.” He continued, “Preservation Brief 2 states, “Preservationists generally agree that the history of the building includes not only the period of the original construction but frequently later alterations and additions.” In this case, there were additions made that would not be considered to be in violation of the historic significance of this home. In addition, while this property is not listed on the National Register, the Brief indicates that because a home is listed on the National Register, it does not mean that it is frozen in time and changes cannot be made without compromising its historical significance. Some changes are anticipated within each rehabilitation of a building.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jeff Alison, 1057 Ocean Boulevard, said he lives two houses down from the proposed alteration site. He said it appears that the current owner has disregarded the fact that this is a Mills Act home and that there are rules and regulations as it relates to zoning and construction. He agreed that some of the proposed alterations have possibilities and do enhance the property; however, he asked the Commission to not support the request.

Courtney McGallan, 1140 Alameda Boulevard, said she understands that a comprehensive revision of the Mills Act was done this past year. She referred to the revised Mills Act language which states, “the front façade is sacred.” She asked why consideration was being given in allowing changes to the front façade.

Gerry Greenspan, 1125 Star Park Circle, said his house is located behind the property in question. He asked if the proposed roof height of the master suite will be 9 feet or higher, as this will impact his home’s primary view.

Vice Chair O’Brien said he understands that Mr. Greenspan has had discussions with the applicant to the extent that 9 feet was a fixed number that was of some satisfaction to him.

Mr. Greenspan replied that it is not what he would like but understands that this is something the applicant wishes to do.

Caroline Murray, 770 Coronado Avenue, read into the record a letter from David Marshall, President and Senior Partner of Heritage Architecture, regarding the windows: “I have reviewed the Window and Door Condition Report by Anderson Woodworks dated June 2010. I have not seen the windows and the doors up close but based on the photographs provided, in my 20 years of working as a preservation architect, I do not agree with the recommendations in the report. Three condition levels were identified: 1) Repair in place; 2) Remove and repair; and 3) Replace entire unit. The report concludes that none of the 69 plus windows can be repaired in place, and the majority would require complete replacement. The photographs in the report do not support these conclusions. Since there is no narrative or diagram that describes the damage, all I have to go by are the photos. Most of the damage visible in the photos appears to be cosmetic and common rather than irreparable damage to the underlying wood. Granted, there is little doubt that there is some wood damage that will require repair and selective parts replacement. But the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation requires that deteriorated historic features such

as windows and doors be repaired rather than replaced. Removal of sashes and doors may be required to perform such repairs but the frames that are often embedded in plaster should be repaired in place to avoid damage to adjacent surfaces. The Standards also state, 'Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.' In my opinion, replacement of historic windows is not justified. As an example of repair, rather than replacement, my firm was responsible for the restoration and reconstruction of the House of Hospitality in Balboa Park...that building had over 250 wood doors and windows that date from 1915 to 1935, and have been poorly maintained. Some required major repair but every single original window and door was restored and re-used. Only the missing units were replaced. Lastly, I don't support the practice of assigning the duty of assessing the condition of historic materials to companies that have a vested interest in selling the replacements for those same features. The window and door condition assessment should have been performed by an expert in preservation who was independent and non-biased. Please understand, I am not accusing Anderson Woodworks of any impropriety; I don't know them and they may be experts of what they do. I am just noting the appearance of a conflict that clouds the issue of condition of the windows and doors at 1043 Ocean. I hope the Historic Resource Commission will take this into account when they consider this important issue." Ms. Murray commented that with a significant historic resource like this, our homes and our ordinances need to be respected.

Terese Finch, 1051 Ocean Boulevard, agreed with the previous speakers and added that granting zoning relief for this historic mansion would set a precedent of allowing the setbacks and FAR to be exceeded.

Gerry MacCartee, 836 D Avenue, read the following statement into the record: "When the Hotel del Coronado first opened its doors in 1888, it was in many ways a vastly different looking building. The great encircling promenade walk, the massive chimneys, glassed-in balconies, east-facing front entrance all have succumbed to 122 years of time and human experience. Still, the hotel is both a national historic site and a universal treasure because so much does remain and so much of the American story is forever enclosed inside. Across the street from the hotel, the Italianate mansion that John Spreckels had built for himself survives today because severe alterations permitted it to become an inn, but we do not look at these changes. We look at the house itself and we know its walls still hold all the tales of the man and his time. 1043 Ocean was not built to be a museum—it was built as a home—a place where different people in different seasons lived their lives, yet where the history of our island has found sanctuary while so much that was once beautiful has disappeared around it. The requested alterations are just a part of that history. Times change—we change—and we seek ways to preserve the past. The Mills Act should be an instrument used to help an owner reach a solution that successfully joins the old with the new. It should not be an instrument to use strictly to prevent. It should not be a punishment for preservation. I consider it a "thank you" from a community to an individual who has the means and, more importantly, the resolve to take care of a treasure. I see no changes requested for this home that could not be removed if desired. I see the spirit of the architecture still intact, a special compromise that ensures the home for another century of life and living. For 38 years, I have led historical tours by this house. And always, I stop and tell the story of how young Mrs. Spreckels changed the entire appearance. If the requested alterations are granted by the Commission today, I will add this to her tour. I understand that without destroying a home, it is possible to bring it into the future and along with it our heritage, our history, and a unique story of all of us."

Chris Ackerman, Architect, said that this home is one of the most historic properties in town. It is Mills Act designated consisting of one assembled property with two dwellings and two renowned architects—Harrison Albright and Richard Requa. Having worked for the Secretary of Interiors Standards for Historic Preservation since their inception, he can unequivocally confirm that this proposal, despite what the applicant's hired experts with their contorted interpretations advise, does not conform to the Standards. He said that the Historic Resource Commission has recently revised our historic ordinance, holding the Mills Act funded resources to a higher level than non-Mills Act properties. Mr. Ackerman stated there are two elements which he considers egregious: the second floor east side front addition (he would proposed a modified conforming addition) and, the proposed covering of the exterior plaster-face concrete structure with stucco (he suggests this be prohibited). The proposed 700 sq. ft. addition increases the width of the front second floor by almost 40 percent. It greatly changes the front façade and destroys the grand symmetrical palladium form at the center of the structure which is flanked on both sides at the front with low single floor subservient asymmetrical arms. It violates the City's RSIP 18 ft. side yard setback by demanding a setback measuring less than eight feet. It violates the community's efforts to encourage historic preservation by allowing discretionary zoning exceptions only to historically designated properties as a way to encourage its preservation. Here, the exception would be to radically degrade the balanced symmetrical palladium core, hiding it and throwing it dramatically off balance. However, with approximately 12,000 sq. ft. of existing structures, there is another solution that would conform to the Secretary's requirements—a second floor east side addition that 1) is no closer to the front façade than the rear one-third of the conservatory's roof, and 2) conforms with the City's RSIP required 18 ft. side yard setback. This would produce a pyramid-type of effect with the second floor addition being smaller than the first floor arm on one side. This would retain the prominence of the structure's central historic palladium inspired core as well as a single story, subservient arms. It should also respect the neighbor's use. Mr. Ackerman said there is also a need to retain, repair, and replicate in-kind the existing plaster finish to the exterior concrete walls. Too often, especially with the unfortunate and misguided wholesale replacement of historic windows, the exterior walls are encased in stucco—a non-historic product that dramatically changes the structure's historic looks. This is not in conformance with the Secretary of Standards. He added that there are many clearly absurd proposed changes have thankfully been deleted from this proposal. For example, there is no longer a proposed stealth, front-facing, third floor operable deck or interior wall running into the middle of the central second floor window, dividing one existing bedroom into two, and so on. All of these proposals were lauded by the owner's hired experts as conforming to the Secretary of Standards. With obvious expert disagreement including that of Senator Jim Mills, the author of the Mills Act, one thing that the Historic Resource Commission and/or the City Council may want to consider is to consult with the Historic State Architect for determination of his opinion of compliance with the Secretary of Standards, as this is one of his responsibilities. Mr. Ackerman said he has not contacted the Historic Architect regarding this project but he does respect his opinion.

Story Vogel, Pine Valley, said that ten years ago, when the Historic Resource Commission was created, many members like Gerry MacCartee, Susan Keith, Nancy Cobb, struggled valiantly to preserve our historical fabric. Over the years, he has watched the Commission become more professional and adherent to the Secretary of Standards and more concerned with the main stream of historic preservation. He lauds the changes. Mr. Vogel said he worked for the Historic District's Landmark Commission in New Orleans. Across the nation, the most important

element involves the front elevation as it is in the public view. When considering any changes to perhaps one of the most dominant homes in our community, he feels that significant consideration must be given to the front elevation and the appearance of changes. He agreed with Ms. McCartee that times change and uses change and the world changes with it. However, with a structure such as this, albeit it is not Harrison Albright's original structure, it has gained its own historicity since the 1911 change. To change the front elevation, even if it is reversible, is to use the loosest interpretation of the Standards which modify and enable persons to retain some historic fabric but at the same time upgrading to the modern lifestyle. It would appear to him that the greatest degree of examination should be given to the front elevation.

Bruce Coons, Executive Director, Save Our Heritage Organization (SOHO), 2476 San Diego Avenue, said he agreed with staff's recommendation about the French windows at the front of the home. Even the applicant's report called out the windows as a character defining features. To change those windows to French doors would not only remove the irreplaceable historic fabric, which is not reversible because it would remove the materials below the windows, but it would significantly change the appearance of the front. He does not feel that a finding could be made which would indicate changing the front windows would meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. Additionally, he agrees with David Marshall's report about the windows in general. He would suggest that an expert that is in the business of repairing rather than replacing sashes provide an evaluation. He suggested hiring San Diego Sash Company, which worked on the buildings at NCRD and the Balboa Theatre. With reference to granting the setbacks and increasing the FAR, he does support this request as this is probably one of the largest Mills Act homes he has seen in the state.

The Commission went into recess at 5:10 p.m.

The Commission re-convened at 5:15 p.m. All members were present.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner St. Denis said she has spent much time, effort and energy preparing for this meeting, as have her fellow Commission members. She has participated in five Commission hearings and four City Council hearings. One of the hearings was continued by the City Council due to a lack of quorum, and three hearing requests were either continued or withdrawn by the applicant at the last minute. Commission members were directed via the staff report to treat today's item as a new application and not a revision of previous applications. She mentioned that there are two new Commission members and requested that staff include at least two previous minutes: the Historic Resource Commission minutes of October 15, 2008, and the City Council minutes of February 3, 2009. These minutes are important because the Commission was directed by City Council to obtain more specific information about what the Commission would allow on a Mills Act house. After the February 3 meeting, the Commission spent about nine months conducting public workshops, participating in a joint meeting with City Council, and eventually making a determination that they would support having two tiers of historic preservation in Coronado. One tier would consist of historic resources that would be more lenient in allowing changes based on the Secretary of the Interior Standards. The second tier would include Mills Act properties that would be the absolute "cream-of-the-cream."

Commissioner St. Denis read into the record an excerpt of the Commission's Ordinance revisions: "The front façade is sacred. Changes to the front façade should be avoided. Alterations to the front façade, i.e. replacing windows with French doors or adding a visible second story to a one-story element may make that house ineligible for the Mills Act. Preserve and retain original wall and siding materials. Preserve historic architectural features and details such as balustrades." Ms. St. Denis said they were very clear about requiring that the windows be preserved rather than replaced, not having windows replaced with new entrances cut on a primary façade, and making sure that additions were not visible from the public rights-of-way. With reference to David Marshall's letter about windows, Ms. St. Denis said that Mr. Marshall is a very well respected preservation architect. Commissioner St. Denis said she also has a letter from Dave Gillingham, who is one of the owners of the 1906 Lodge in Coronado. Mr. Gillingham's house had been condemned by the City and the windows were in far worse shape than the subject property. Mr. Gillingham is applying for national designation and was told that historic windows are one of the most important elements of an historic resource. Because of that, they went through great expense and time to restore each and every window and did not replace one single window. This holds true for the 200 windows restored at El Prado, per David Marshall's letter. Ms. St. Denis said she has the same issues with the applicant's application as she has had with the previous requests. She believes that the front façade windows are very important. Ms. St. Denis added that the addition of the second story bedroom completely changes the front façade and causes an imbalance to the symmetry. With 12,000 sq. ft. of living space, Ms. St. Denis said the applicant has a sufficient amount of space to work with. Ms. St. Denis said she would not support the request.

Commissioner Ryan thanked the applicant for attending today's meeting. He said that any type of rear yard façade improvements should be allowed provided that it does not impinge on neighboring property owners. He said the awnings make sense for sun protection and agrees in approving the request for the French doors that open up to the front of the house because they make use of the location's enjoyment factor. He does, however, have an issue with the overall requests because this is a Mills Act home and was placed at the top of the waiting list. He agrees that the front façade is sacred, and stated that he is not in favor of the application. He added that the City's overriding building code, RSIP, lists neighborly consideration and the impact of the side yard and rear yard setbacks as important issues.

Mr. Shaknai, 1043 Ocean Boulevard, said everyone respects differences of view. At some point in the future, he would like to address the Mills Act questions because his role has been dramatically misrepresented. Mr. Shaknai noted that the previous owner negotiated the Mills Act agreement. From his point of view, it is simply an economic matter and was a way for the previous owner to gain a greater value in the sale of the home. Moreover, when he entered into the Mills Act agreement, he made specific inquires of the City as to whether this would prejudice him in any rehabilitation or modernization of the facility, opining that he would not enter into an agreement if there was any such restriction. He was assured in absolute terms that he would be treated equally with or without the Mills Act agreement. He understands that the representation was made in good faith by the City; however, he feels slightly victimized. He is agnostic about the windows and understands it is economically and otherwise advantageous to save them. He noted that he was asked to provide a window report as part of his presentation and did so with a reputable provider who invested many hours in a physical inspection of each window as opposed to examining photographs of the windows. He pointed out that no one wants to unnecessarily remove windows from their casings as it is both expensive and "not historical" to the extent that

this is a concern. Windows should be and will be saved when it is physically possible to do so; however, physical conditions do exist that determine whether something can or cannot be saved.

Vice Chair O'Brien said he joined this Commission under the same attitude as that of former Chairperson Gerry MacCartee, which is, "We're here to help." He feels that the Commission, in some respects, has lost track of this somewhat. Mr. O'Brien said this is not the house that started the formation of the Historic Resource Commission. When the Commission was formed, the goal was to preserve those assets in Coronado that were particularly important and to assist people that looked towards the Commission to declare their home historic. The Commission was able to grant benefits to help them. This is a classic home among a handful of four or five in town; the Commission should be available to help. The applicant has made a significant investment and has been as cooperative as can be expected from any applicant, given the circumstances. Mr. O'Brien was very intrigued by the comments made by the resident who lives directly behind the applicant. This resident had met with Mr. Shaknai and they both agreed on a 9-foot ceiling. Mr. O'Brien says this is an example of the applicant going beyond what is required. He also feels that the adjacent neighbor, whose bedroom window is blocked by a telephone pole, will not be happy regardless. Nonetheless, the applicant has made it a point to move the master bedroom window back in order to preserve the historic façade of the house and to provide additional light and visibility for their neighbor. Mr. O'Brien said he is here to encourage the Commission to help the applicant who has in fact saved the house, and allow him to build a master bedroom. As it applies to Mills Act, he confirmed that this house has a Mills Act agreement in place. However, it may be helpful to understand that even with the Mills Act, this home rates as the number two residence in Coronado that pays a significant amount of taxes. To say that the applicant has taken advantage of the Mills Act process is a false assumption as this house still pays significantly more in taxes than it generates in services. To the extent that the Commission has become more restrictive on the Mills Act requirements, as it relates to doors and windows, he does know of houses in town where second stories have been added and have received Mills Act recommendations from the Commission in the past. Mr. O'Brien stated he would support the request.

Chairperson Crenshaw commended the applicant for providing a presentation which is illustrative of their creations and their desire to keep the changes within reason. She stated that the Commission offers designated homes the opportunity to receive exceptions in order to make a home more livable and comfortable. She does not have an issue with the request for the FAR because the home already exceeded the FAR. She would encourage deviation for the terrace railings due to safety concerns. She really likes the awnings and the front wall as it adds a great deal to the home. She is not opposed to the windows as a very comprehensive report was provided to the Commission. She also is taking into consideration that the applicant is open to having other experts evaluate the windows and is willing to abide by that decision. She does not have an issue with the French doors at the front façade because she feels it looks exactly the same from the street view. She has visited the property and agrees that the windows need to be repaired. She does take an issue with the request for the side setback as it is a significant deviation and an exception that she is uncomfortable approving at this point in time. She also stated that she could definitely approve the addition of the second-story bedroom, and asked that the applicant take into consideration suggestions offered by architect Chris Ackerman.

Commissioner Jones agreed that the French doors are not an issue although she would prefer to see the original windows kept. She said she understands that the structure should be brought up

to today's standards of living which include allowing for the enjoyment of the front yard. She feels that the window issue should be addressed and if at all possible, the applicant should try to restore all of the windows. She understands that the applicant has invested much effort to make the house work for his family, and agreed that the applicant has been victimized by the Mills Act. Ms. Jones said she does not have an issue with the addition of the second story master bedroom although she opined that it could probably be smaller in size. She said the applicant has been very responsive to all comments received by the Commission.

Chairperson Crenshaw said the applicant is asking for approval in five different areas:

1. Master bedroom addition.
2. French doors on the main level.
3. Awnings at four windows or French doors, and one in the master addition.
4. 30 inch high low wall and gate near sidewalk
5. Roof slope shed roof change with a French door and railing.

Ms. Crenshaw said the applicant is willing to do his best in finding a window expert who will do his best to preserve the windows.

Mr. Gardon summarized that they are willing to obtain another expert opinion and repair the windows. He noted that they had originally asked for a recommendation from the City but did not receive a response. The expert they hired is familiar to others and has worked on reputable homes including two Richard Requa houses. With respect to the request for French doors, they would like to install two French doors at the rear of the property and one at the front façade.

Chairperson Crenshaw asked if all of the French doors will be located at the main level, as stated in the application.

Mr. Gardon said yes, with the exception of the third level, which is part of the roof slope modification that includes windows and doors to allow egress, daylight, and access.

Commissioner St. Denis said she disagreed with the comment that replacing the historic windows with French doors at the front façade looks exactly the same from the street.

Chairperson Crenshaw said she stood corrected.

Mr. Gardon commented that they respect each individual opinion in that some people take more note of and are more sensitive of certain changes than others. He also asked that the Commission consider the reversibility of removing and adding back elements such as window sills, because it is a legitimate strategy within rehabilitation. He added that they have analyzed the master bedroom indefinitely in order to keep it as part of the requested changes; they would, however, prefer to minimize the number of requests that must be approved by the City Council. Mr. Gardon said the structural implications are significant, i.e. the notion of making an area smaller and controlling the height brings about significant difficulties. They are greatly seeking to utilize the provisions within the code that encourage exceptions; this exception is encouraged in order for the FAR to be a non-issue.

COMMISSION ACTION

VICE CHAIR O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE REQUEST, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE MASTER SUITE, AS FOLLOWS:

1. Roof slope shed at the rear of the property. (Vote 5-0)
2. 30-inch high wall and gate located at the front of the property. (Vote 5-0)
3. Awnings throughout the property. (Vote 5-0)
4. French doors at the main level at the front of the property. (Vote 4-1, no St. Denis)
5. French doors at the main level at the rear of the property. (Vote 5-0)
6. Master bedroom addition, as submitted. (Vote 2-3, no Crenshaw, Ryan, St. Denis)

CHAIRPERSON CRENSHAW SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

DISCUSSIONS

HR 2010-05 **CITY OF CORONADO** – Discussion regarding historic options for historic districts. *(continued from the meeting of June 6, 2010)*

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER RYAN MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE CONTINUE THE ITEM TO THE MEETING OF AUGUST 18, 2010.

COMMISSIONER JONES SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6 p.m.

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