

HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

August 18, 2010

The regular meeting of the Coronado Historic Resource Commission was called to order at 3:02 p.m., Wednesday, August 18, 2010, at the Coronado City Hall Council Chambers, 1825 Strand Way, Coronado, California, by Chairperson Crenshaw.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Crenshaw, Jones, Ryan, St. Denis

MEMBERS ABSENT: O'Brien

STAFF PRESENT: Tricia Olsen, Associate Planner
Martha L Alvarez, Recording Secretary/Minutes Preparer

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of July 7, 2010, were approved as amended.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

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

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Martha Jay, 700 B Avenue, reported that the historically designated residence addressed as 721 B Avenue contains a large air conditioner at rooftop level which is visible from the public right-of-way. She said she reviewed the approved renovation plans and it does not depict any such apparatus at any elevation. She displayed photographs and asked that the Commission look into this matter.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if this item can be placed on the agenda for discussion at the next regular meeting.

Ms. Olsen said that the Commission can consider public comment today. If a Commissioner wishes to place a topic on the agenda for discussion, the process is as follows: The Commissioner may voice his or her request during Oral Communication, or may contact staff outside the public forum. At the next meeting, staff will formally agendaize a Commissioner Request for a Discussion Item, at which time the Commission will vote to determine if the item should be placed on the agenda for discussion. A majority of the Commission must agree to agendaize the item in order for it to be placed on a future agenda for discussion. Staff will then place the discussion item on the next available agenda. Ms. Olsen commented that Ms. Jay met with staff and an onsite visit was conducted by Senior Planner McCaull and Ms. Olsen. After speaking with the architect and contractor, they determined that the forced air unit (FAU) is not in its final position. Additionally, the City does not regulate visibility from private views or visibility of mechanical equipment in residential zones. Ms. Olsen stated that for historic

properties, mechanical equipment should not be visible from the public right-of-way; however, although not represented on the elevations, the subject FAU is under the required height limit.

Commissioner Ryan requested that two items be placed on the next regular agenda:

1. Discussion of complete disclosure on proposed construction and/or additions to properties.
2. Discussion regarding the amount of Mills Act savings that a property receives based on the amount of alterations.

(Discussed at the end of the meeting)

Chairperson Crenshaw requested that an additional item be placed on the next regular agenda:

1. How to address significant homes under the age of 75 years with regard to designation and demolition.

PUBLIC HEARING

HAP 2010-06 LUKE AND STACI BUSE – Request for Historic Resource Alteration Permit for alterations to the historically designated residence addressed as 1125 Flora Avenue 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's representative, Dorothy Howard, Architect, 420 H Avenue, gave a presentation and answered questions of the Commission.

The applicants, Staci and Luke Buse, introduced themselves to the Commission.

Commissioner Ryan asked if the applicant would consider adding tandem parking.

Ms. Howard replied that she did not consider making any changes to the garage because it is located in the setback and the garage wall is shared with neighbors.

Commissioner St. Denis asked about the measurement of the open area adjacent to the garage.

Ms. Howard said it is about 14' x 10' to the property line based on the surveyor's drawing.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if the garage could be left as-is and the carriage doors set back about five feet to allow sufficient space for a parking space in the driveway and a small storage area on the side of the garage.

Ms. Howard said the applicants would welcome more parking; however, the proposed parking area may not accommodate their large vehicles. In addition, Ms. Howard said she is concerned about moving the garage doors because the structure is very old.

Commissioner Ryan suggested that the applicants would benefit from tandem parking.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

Commissioner St. Denis said she was agreeable to repairing-in-place the second-level, front façade window although her second choice would be to have it replaced in-kind. She is also amenable to the proposed rear addition (even though there will be a loss to historic materials) and the new basement and side yard gates. Ms. St. Denis noted that staff has added the condition that care be given to historic materials and replacement in-kind be made if any material is damaged. Ms. St. Denis said she will not support the request for the second story deck as the Mills Act program states that the “front façade is sacred.”

Commissioner Jones expressed safety concerns about the proposed 24-inch rail height of the proposed second story deck. She said she would not support replacement of the historic windows.

Commissioner St. Denis suggested possibly preserving the original materials by placing vertical members behind or on top of the railing.

Ms. Howard said the proposed railing meets code requirements and feels that the placement of additional material to address safety concerns will be very noticeable. She said the applicant is proposing a “low, shingled wall with the existing wood cap at its current height” and is addressing safety concerns by “simply adding the necessary open railing to bring it up to 42 inches.”

Commissioner Ryan said he agrees with the proposed treatment of the front windows, the addition of the second story deck, and the rear setback proposals including the guest house. He strongly recommends the addition of a tandem, two-car garage by bring out the garage another six or seven feet.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if an uncovered parking space would be acceptable.

Commissioner Ryan said no, as he does not feel it would be used.

Chairperson Crenshaw said this is a gorgeous historic home and she is very pleased that a young family will be moving in. She strongly believes that an individual’s house should be their home and understands that compensations must be made. She does not have any issues with any of the proposed changes; however, suggested that the front façade could be less busy. She also hopes that the applicant will choose to add additional garage space because it is one of the exceptions made for historic homes.

Commissioner St. Denis noted that the applicant is not asking for an exception to the garage as it is grandfathered. She said that when the applicants purchased the home, they were fully aware of parking issues affecting homes that are located one block from the beach.

Chairperson Crenshaw reminded the Commission that they are being asked to consider zoning regulations related to parking.

Commissioner Ryan also reminded the Commission that they are being asked to consider a major renovation to a Mills Act house that is receiving a full tax benefit.

Commissioner St. Denis asked why the applicant is required to ask for an exception.

Ms. Olsen responded that the possibility exists for a tandem parking space. By building the guest house near enough to the garage such that tandem parking cannot be added, a non-conforming condition is created.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER RYAN MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE REQUEST, AS SUBMITTED, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. THE WINDOWS SHALL BE REPAIRED AND, IF DETERIORATED BEYOND REPAIR, SHALL BE REPLACED IN-KIND.
2. ANY DAMAGE TO EXTERIOR FINISH OF THE HISTORIC RESOURCE DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PROCESS SHOULD BE REPAIRED IN-KIND.
3. ALL EXTERIOR FINISH SHALL REMAIN IN PLACE UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED ON THE APPROVED PLANS.
4. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT SHALL NOT BE VISIBLE FROM PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY.
5. PROJECT SHALL BE REVISED TO MODIFY THE DESIGN OF THE GARAGE TO INCLUDE TWO COVERED TANDEM PARKING SPACES.

THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS WERE MADE:

- A. 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 JONES SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

The motion passed with a vote of 3-1.

There is a 10-day appeal period.

NOI 2010-08 MARTIN AND PAULINE AVERY – Notice of Intent to Demolish the single family residence addressed as 550 Marina Avenue and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone.

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

The applicant and/or their representative were not present in the audience.

Ms. Olsen noted for the record that the Commission has the option of hearing the item, or continuing the item to a future meeting when the applicant and/or their representative are present.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Jones said she has visited the residence several times and although the structure is very modest, it does not show its historic age. Ms. Jones said a much more livable house could be built on this size lot. She said she would support the request.

Commissioner Ryan said he has visited the site and will support the request.

Chairperson Crenshaw said she visited the site but was unable to view the house as it is a very private facility. She stated she would also support the request.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER ST. DENIS MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE STRUCTURE ADDRESSED AS 550 MARINA AVENUE (NOI 2010-08) 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;
- 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, Ryan, St. Denis.
NAYS: None.
ABSENT: O'Brien.
ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed with a vote of 4-0.

There is a 10-day appeal period.

NOI 2010-09 ANTHONY AND KAREN RODGERS – Notice of Intent to Demolish the single family residence addressed as 510 I Avenue and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone.

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

Karen Rodgers, 535 I Avenue, answered questions of the Commission.

Chairperson Crenshaw asked if the applicant is presently living in the house.

Ms. Rodgers said she purchased the home as a rental and although she considered living in the house at one time, she has been advised that it is not habitable.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if the house has a second story.

Ms. Rodgers said the house is a one-story dwelling and contains an attic with pull-down stairs. She said she considered converting the attic into a bedroom; however, she was advised that the foundation is not strong enough to support a second story.

Commissioner Ryan asked about the size of the lot.

Ms. Rodgers said the lot is 35 feet wide.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner St. Denis said she would prefer not to see small cottages demolished; however, she will support the request.

Commissioner Jones agreed.

Commissioner Ryan concurred.

Chairperson Crenshaw said the house is very cute but it probably has seen better times.

COMMISSION ACTION

CHAIRPERSON CRENSHAW MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE STRUCTURE ADDRESSED AS 510 I AVENUE (NOI 2010-09) 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;

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.

COMMISSIONER JONES SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Crenshaw, Jones, Ryan, St. Denis.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: O'Brien.

ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed with a vote of 4-0.

There is a 10-day appeal period.

DISCUSSIONS

HR 2010-05 **CITY OF CORONADO** – Discussion regarding historic options for historic districts. *(continued from the meeting of July 7, 2010)*

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

Chairperson Crenshaw thanked staff for such a comprehensive outline.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if contributing, non-contributing or both resources are eligible to vote.

Ms. Olsen responded that every property in the boundary of the district is eligible to vote because both contributing and non-contributing resources would essentially be affected by the formation of a district, and the entire district would be regulated as an historic resource. Even if regulations for non-contributing resources were non-existent, or if non-contributing resources were not held to any design overview, the district as a whole would be treated as an historic resource. If a non-contributing resource were to be demolished, the new structure would need to be reviewed for its impact to the district by the Commission.

Commissioner St. Denis asked about the properties that would have a vote on what type of building can be constructed in the district.

Ms. Olsen said this type of issue would be addressed in either a district-specific Design Guideline or the Secretary of the Interior Standards. She said it is acceptable for members of a district to hold a joint workshop with the Commission in order to create design guidelines that could be applicable to contributing resources, or non-contributing resources on a lesser scale.

Commissioner Jones asked if discussion would also focus on the property rights of non-contributing resources.

Ms. Olsen said yes.

Commissioner Jones said this could become a fairly serious issue. She asked how a new owner (non-contributing resource) would be treated with regard to following the guidelines if they desired to build a structure that was completely out of context.

Ms. Olsen said the matter would be treated in the same way as a person who buys an historically designated home. The fact that the property is a non-contributing resource would be information that should be disclosed upon the sale of the property; however, it would be the prospective owner's responsibility to conduct due diligence at the time they purchase the property in order to verify restrictions on the property.

Commissioner Jones asked if the original property owner and/or their realtor would be required to disclose this information, i.e. the Historic District.

Ms. Olsen replied that this would be a requirement because the property is located within a designated historic resource.

Commissioner St. Denis asked about Coronado's consent requirement that 75 percent of contributing resources is needed to form a district.

Ms. Olsen said the definition of a contributing resource in Coronado's Historic District Ordinance, or Historic Regulations, is that a contributing resource is a designated resource. It is very difficult to achieve the required percentage of contributing resources if the resources must be designated prior to the district formation. The definition of a contributing resource must be modified so that it has the same meaning as those of other jurisdictions, including the Office of Historic Preservation.

Chairperson Crenshaw asked if some jurisdictions do not have a consent requirement or a contributing percentage requirement written into their Ordinance.

Ms. Olsen replied that some jurisdictions do not have either requirement written into their Ordinance. She said that per her email exchange with Marie Nelson of the Office of Preservation, their office does not recommend that cities set minimum consent requirements or contributing percentages. Ms. Nelson gave the following example to clarify why the contributing percentage component is not written into many ordinances: "For example, say you

have a district which includes 100 properties, 75 of which are considered contributors. 25 non-contributors scattered throughout the district would have a different impact than 25 non-contributors concentrated in the middle of the district.” Ms. Olsen said some jurisdictions would prefer to look at the number of contributing resources vs. non-contributing resources on a district-by-district basis. With regard to the consent percentages, the Office of Preservation feels that it is the responsibility of the Historic Resource Commission to identify and protect historic resources independent of consent percentages.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if a non-contributing resource would receive the same benefits as a contributing resource.

Ms. Olsen replied that in all cities she reviewed, contributing resources can apply for Mills Act because they are designated resources. A contributing resource in an historic district is not only eligible for designation, but is in fact a designated historic resource as a contributing resource to the district.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if the Commission is the decision-making body that determines who is eligible to become a contributing resource.

Ms. Olsen said yes. The applicant would submit an initial district application package which would identify potential contributing and non-contributing resources. Staff would provide the Commission with a report, and the Commission would review the information and make a determination as to the eligibility of contributing and non-contributing resources.

Chairperson Crenshaw asked if a contributing resource would automatically be eligible for historic designation.

Ms. Olsen said yes, and added that if the Commission adopts and designates an historic district, the contributing resources automatically become designated historic resources.

Commissioner Ryan asked about the non-contributing resources in a designated district.

Ms. Olsen said non-contributing resources would not be designated but are still regulated as part of the historic district.

Commissioner Ryan said this may be an issue for Coronado with respect to property rights. He said he would be in favor of making the requirements a bit more flexible to provide options to property owners who do not wish to be part of an historic district or be a contributing resource, and who desire to “exist normally.” Mr. Ryan anticipates that the process of starting a district will be slow, but will eventually gain momentum as it becomes more of a “thing to do” in a district. He commented that “forcing” a district on property owners is not sellable.

Commissioner St. Denis asked about the point of having a district.

Commissioner Ryan responded that 25 years ago, the same argument could have been made with regard to why we should have an Historic Resource Commission and historic preservation program. At that time, it became a “thing to admire,” a “thing to do” and although it started slow, it gained momentum and took off.

Commissioner Jones said that being part of an historic district also becomes a pride of ownership.

Commissioner Ryan quoted Commissioner St. Denis as follows: “People come to Coronado and they want to live right next door to the cute little house in the cute little village of Coronado.” Taken to the district level, this would be reducing the village down to an area. People will be drawn to the neighborhood because it is what it is, and they will want to be a part of it. Hopefully, the non-contributing resources will eventually sell and leave and the new property owners will be apt to build a structure that looks more apropos. He advised that if the City makes a very restrictive Ordinance, it will not work.

Ms. Olsen said that this concept makes the Commission’s job more difficult. For example, if 26 percent of property owners want to form a district and 74 percent are opposed to it, it would require that the Commission make a decision as to whether 26 percent of the property owners should decide for the entire district.

Commissioner Ryan said this is why the percentage should be 50 or greater.

Ms. Olsen said that, in response to the comment regarding opting out of an historic district in order to make it more appealing, the Commission has the authority to make a policy decision to include this option in the Ordinance. However, she noted that the Office of Historic Preservation does not support districts that are set up on a voluntary opt-in / opt-out basis. She also noted that the current Ordinance states that if 75 percent of property owners in a district become historically designated voluntarily, that area becomes a district.

Commissioner Ryan suggested that the program should be harmless to the non-contributory resource.

Ms. Olsen responded that a program that is harmless to the non-contributing resource is essentially a voluntary designation program, which is currently in place.

Chairperson Crenshaw asked if the City has a Preservation Plan.

Ms. Olsen said the City has a Preservation Element of the General Plan, but this is not what is meant by “Preservation Plan” in a district sense. She explained that a Preservation Plan vs. Designed Guidelines is essentially the same. It means that each district is regulated using the Secretary of Interior Standards and has a district-specific Preservation Plan or Designed Guidelines—the only difference is the terminology.

The Commission agreed that this item should return before the Commission for further discussion when a full quorum is present. With regard to the components that make up the “skeleton” of the Historic District Ordinance, the Commission agreed to the following:

1. Percentage of owner consent required to form a district.
Majority. (All properties)
2. Percentage of properties required to be contributing resources.
Majority.

3. Regulation of Contributing Resources.
Staff will return with additional information regarding the best practices.
4. Regulation of Non-contributing Resources.
5. **Staff will return with additional information regarding the best practices.**

Discussion regarding the City Council's action on adoption of a Resolution with Conditions approving a Historic Alteration Permit for alterations and an exception to zoning standards for the historically designated residence addressed as 1043 Ocean Boulevard and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone (Emerald Isle LLC, HAP 2010-05)

Ms. Olsen reported that the City Council continued the item, per the Mayor's request, in order to allow the applicant to prepare a second evaluation of the windows using one of two window specialists recommended by staff.

Chairperson Crenshaw stated for the record that the Historic Resource Commission unanimously recommended to the City Council approval of the Historic Resource Alteration Permit request for the property located at 1043 Ocean Boulevard (HAP 2010-05). Ms. Crenshaw addressed her specific concerns on how the Commission should use its forum, and whether the Commission is acting as individual entities or if they are working as a unit. She understands that each member may have issues they feel strongly about but stated that she does not feel individual members should have the ability to challenge the Commission's unanimous vote. She commented that having the opportunity to speak before City Council on the same issue provides yet another forum to communicate the same information to five different people, and the Commission must consider their actions as a unit. In this case, the City Council expressed concerns with the installation of French doors on the front façade. This part of the project was approved by the Commission with a vote of 4-1; however, the overall motion for approval by the Commission was unanimous. Ms. Crenshaw stated that if the Commission desires to work as a unit and be a source of community pride, a member should not attempt to undo the Commission's actions on a whim. She stated that the Commission must address having some type of criteria on this matter.

Commissioner Ryan agreed. He stated that two Councilmembers have commented that they enjoy reading the Historic Resource Commission minutes, and feel that the minutes really get the job done. On this particular issue, Mr. Ryan feels that the Commission arrived at a decision and that the group should not be splintered. He said that unless the Commission is participating in an Administrative Hearing, when the Commission makes a decision, it should be final. He agreed that the Commission should be careful so that individual members do not undermine the Commission's authority.

Commissioner Jones agreed.

Commissioner Ryan suggested that if a Commissioner wants to be clear on a point, they should request that their comment be included on the minutes "for the record." He stated that the majority of the Council reads the Commission's minutes.

Chairperson Crenshaw stated for the record that she will notify the City Council that the Commission's motion for approval was unanimous. The fact that the Commission voted separately on specific areas which comprised only a part of the overall project had absolutely

nothing to do with the end result of the Commission's final motion for approval. She strongly disagreed with Commissioner St. Denis' account given to the City Council on how the Commission arrived at its decision. As stated earlier, the Commission's final motion was articulated very well in the minutes and it was a unanimous vote for approval.

The Commission commended Recording Secretary Alvarez on providing excellent minutes.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

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