

HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

March 2, 2011

The regular meeting of the Coronado Historic Resource Commission was called to order at 3 p.m., Wednesday, March 2, 2011, 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
Martha L Alvarez, Recording Secretary/Minutes Preparer

CITY ATTORNEY: Lisa Foster

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 19, 2011, were approved as submitted.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Olsen welcomed newly-appointed Commissioner McGowen. She also welcomed back Lisa Foster from the City Attorney's office, who is present to provide assistance to the Commission, as needed.

Ms. Olsen reported that updated handbooks had been provided to the Commissioners.

Ms. Olsen also reported that at the City Council meeting of March 1, 2011, the Council continued their discussion of the Historic Resource Program improvements to their meeting of March 15, 2011.

Historic Resource Commission Annual Meeting for Election of Officers

The Commission discussed options for electing its officers.

Commissioner St. Denis made a motion to nominate Commissioner Ryan as Chair, commencing March 16, 2011. Vice Chair Jones seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Commissioner Ryan made a motion to nominate Commissioner St. Denis as Vice Chair, commencing March 16, 2011. Commissioner McGowen seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Commissioner Ryan requested that the following two items be agendaized for discussion at a future meeting:

1. Pre-meetings with applicants.
2. List of demolition permits and Notice of Intent to Demolish (NOI) applications submitted to the City since 1999.

Ms. Olsen confirmed that the items would be agendaized.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOI 2011-01 ELIZABETH J. PARKS FAMILY TRUST – Notice of Intent to Demolish the single family residence addressed as 836 I Avenue and located in the R-1A(E) (Single Family Residential) Zone. *(continued from the meeting of April 7, 2010)*

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

The applicant and property owner, Elizabeth Parks, gave a brief overview of the request and answered questions of the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Ryan said that after visiting the site today, he does not feel that this structure meets the criteria to be deemed historic. He stated he will support the request.

Commissioner St. Denis agreed, and said she would support the request.

Vice Chair Jones concurred.

Commissioner McGowen said she is grateful for the opportunity to serve on the Commission, and noted that this is an easy request to approve.

Chairperson Crenshaw thanked the applicant for her brief presentation, and said she is pleased that only one structure is planned to be built on the property. Ms. Crenshaw agreed that the structure does not meet the criteria to be designated historic.

COMMISSION ACTION

CHAIRPERSON CRENSHAW MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE STRUCTURE ADDRESSED AS 836 I AVENUE (NOI 2011-01) 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 5042.1 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 STRUCTURES.

COMMISSIONER ST. DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Crenshaw, Jones, McGowen, 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.

NOI 2011-02 THOMPSON FAMILY TRUST – Notice of Intent to Demolish the single family residence addressed as 467 D Avenue and located in the R-3 (Multiple Family Residential) Zone.

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

The applicant, Joseph Piepenkotter, provided an overview supporting the request and answered questions of the Commission.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if the applicant planned on saving part of the structure.

Mr. Piepenkotter said he would try to save the existing footprint, if possible, and stated he does not intend to completely demolish the home.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if the structure complies with current setback requirements.

Mr. Piepenkotter said the structure complies with current setback requirements with the exception of the area where the chimney is located.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if the applicant intended to add a second story addition.

Mr. Piepenkotter said yes.

Vice Chair Jones asked if the applicant has considered keeping any of the current design elements, specifically the porch, and if he intends to keep the Craftsman-style look.

Ms. Olsen reminded the Commission that the new structure is not in the purview of the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Panasha Von Harenberg Harrington said the Thompsons are good neighbors and she supports the request.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Chairperson Crenshaw said she is delighted to see a single family dwelling built in an R-3 zone.

Vice Chair Jones said she understands that the structure does not meet the criteria to be designated historic and will support the request. She is pleased that the applicant intends to save the footprint of the home.

Commissioner St. Denis agreed.

Commissioner Ryan said he visited the site and noticed the beautiful crown molding in the

interior of the structure. He stated that he will support the request.

Commissioner McGowen asked if applicants are encouraged to save materials and re-use it on their new structure.

Ms. Olsen said that, as part of the Resolution, it is recommended that the applicant salvage significant or interesting interior/exterior material where possible. Ms. Olsen said that a program called Keep It In Coronado existed in Coronado but is no longer in business. There are, however, other salvage companies in the region.

Mr. Piepenkotter said he planned on retaining as much of the material as possible.

Chairperson Crenshaw agreed that the criterion does not allow the dwelling to be designated historic and encouraged the applicant to retain or salvage materials where possible.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER ST. DENIS MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION MAKE A DETERMINATION THAT THE STRUCTURE ADDRESSED AS 467 D AVENUE (NOI 2011-02) 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 CONDITIONS WERE 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 STRUCTURES.

CHAIRPERSON CRENSHAW SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Crenshaw, Jones, McGowen, 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.

HRPA 2011-02 **FERRAR FAMILY TRUST** – Request for Historic Preservation Mills Act Agreement for the historically designated residence addressed as 723 A Avenue and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone.

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

The applicant, Kathleen Ferrar, provided a brief overview of the request and answered questions of the Commission.

Commissioner Jones asked when the pool was added to the property.

Ms. Ferrar said the pool addition occurred in 1977.

Commissioner Ryan asked when the large overhang at the front façade was added to the property.

Ms. Ferrar said she did not know.

Commissioner Ryan asked if the applicant had any photographs of the house before the carport was added.

Ms. Ferrar said yes.

Commissioner St. Denis commented that Richard Requa significantly remodeled the structure including the carriage house in 1926. She said the garage doors were originally located where the windows at the front façade currently exist. She asked if the front windows and roof above it were designed by Requa at about the same time. She said this was very important, especially if

the applicant is applying for Mills Act designation. Ms. St. Denis also asked if the window material is metal.

Ms. Ferrar said the material is steel.

Commissioner St. Denis asked about the roof material over the window.

Ms. Ferrar said it appears to be a copper metal sheet.

Ms. Olsen noted that the applicant is not proposing to change this part of the structure.

Commissioner St. Denis said she understood; however, she takes into consideration these types of features when considering Mills Act requests.

Commissioner Ryan said it appeared that the same person who built the carport also built the patio cover at the rear of the structure.

Commissioner St. Denis agreed.

Commissioner Ryan asked about the availability of off-street parking.

Ms. Ferrar said the front driveway can accommodate two vehicles.

Chairperson Crenshaw asked what part of the property is included in Mills Act.

Ms. Olsen said the entire property would be included in the Mills Act.

Commissioner McGowen said that if she is to approve the request, the carport and deck above it should be removed as it is glaringly wrong, virtually functionless, and looks like an add-on. Per the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior, the front façade should be as original as possible. Ms. McGowen added that the roof over the front window has a wonderful patina to it and is quite nice.

Commissioner Ryan asked the applicant if a condition for approval by the Commission to remove the carport and deck above it would be acceptable.

Ms. Ferrar said it would be acceptable to her; however, she would need to discuss this decision with her husband. She asked if, should the deck be removed, she can replace it with something else.

Commissioner Ryan asked if the brick located at the rear of the structure is part of the original house.

Ms. Ferrar confirmed that it is. She commented that the mortar was built using beach sand; hence, its current deteriorating condition.

Commissioner Ryan asked if the deck above the first story at the rear of the property is usable.

Ms. Ferrar said it is not usable.

Commissioner Ryan said it appeared that the front and rear additions were done by an amateur carpenter, possibly during the same time frame.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if the divided light window at the rear of the property uses the same material as the window at the front façade.

Ms. Ferrar said yes.

Commissioner St. Denis asked if the balcony located over the front entranceway is original.

Ms. Ferrar said yes.

Commissioner Ryan asked if the applicant would be agreeable to removing the carport and deck above it at the front façade, as well as the rear patio and swimming pool.

Chairperson Crenshaw said Commissioner Ryan's request appeared to involve not only changes to the front façade but also to the rear of the property.

Commissioner Ryan said that he agrees with Commissioner McGowen that the carport and deck above it would require removal as a condition of approval. He agreed that the Commission generally does not discuss the rear façade; however, he would be agreeable to approving the removal of the rear patio and pool if the applicant so desired.

Ms. Olsen suggested that the Commission could condition the Mills Act request should they choose to recommend approval. For example, the Commission could require the removal of the carport and deck above it at the front façade, and could also exclude from the Mills Act valuation elements of the property that are non-historic such as the 1977 pool and deck additions. Ms. Olsen reminded the Commission that the applicant has not submitted an historic alteration permit so the Commission is not at liberty to approve any alteration work at this time. Ms. Olsen suggested the Commission focus their decision on approval or non-approval of the Mills Act, potential conditions of approval, and list of improvements. She asked the applicant if any of the improvements had been completed.

Ms. Ferrar said no items on the list of improvements had been completed.

Commissioner Ryan asked, based on the list of improvements, if the applicant intends to re-plaster the pool and re-tile it back to its original condition.

Ms. Ferrar said that the pool needs to be re-done; however, it is not a high priority for her at this time.

Commissioner McGowen asked if it would benefit the applicant to not remove the pool or rear yard decking.

Ms. Olsen said the entire property is included in the historic designation; therefore, any modifications to the property require an historic alteration permit, whether or not it is included in the Mills Act valuation. By excluding the pool and rear yard decks from the Mills Act valuation, the savings by the property owner may be less. If the assessor includes the pool in the Mills Act valuation and the rear yard decks remain, the property owner will see a higher benefit. The benefit to the property owner is lowered if items are excluded. Ms. Olsen further clarified that by excluding items from the valuation, it does not mean that the items will be excluded from review should the property owner make future modifications to the property.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chris Ackerman said there are certain details in the original structure which were designed by Irving Gill, such as the curved barge boards and the vertical board at the end of the eaves. He surmised that the bay window at the front façade is newer than the Requa addition. He agreed that the carport and deck above it is new and suggested that something could be added in this location which is set back from the façade.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Ryan said this is clearly a property which should be included in the Mills Act, and he would support the request with certain conditions.

Vice Chair Jones agreed.

Commissioner McGowen asked if the carport and deck above it were removed, would it be permissible to replace it with something that contains era-specific materials. If so, she would offer this suggestion as it would be more consistent with the style of the structure.

Ms. Olsen responded that it would be allowed provided that it is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Vice Chair Jones said that the deck above the carport at the front façade detracts from the overall presentation of the house. She suggested that if the Mills Act request is approved, that the carport and deck above it, as well as the pool, be excluded from receiving the tax benefits as these items were added at a later date.

Commissioner St. Denis said that although the windows may not have been designed by Requa, the glass is old and wavy and appears to have been built in 1926. She commended Commissioner McGowen for her suggestion to condition the removal of the carport and deck above it at the front façade. Ms. St. Denis said that the balcony above the front entrance way is very charming and looks like it was designed by either Requa or Gill. She said she was not concerned about changes to the rear of the property.

Commissioner McGowen reiterated that the front façade must be consistently right—it should

not be a Mills Act property otherwise.

Commissioner Ryan agreed, and suggested that the applicant may want to add an original-looking, enclosed parking area where the carport is currently located.

Vice Chair Jones disagreed and stated that any new addition should not be made to look like it is part of the original structure.

Ms. Olsen said additions should meet the Standards.

Chairperson Crenshaw noted that the Commission, with the exception of member McGowen, designated this structure as historic in November of 2010. She noted that no exceptions were made at the time of designation with reference to the add-ons. She agreed that the deck over the carport is non-conforming to the style of the structure. She preferred to condition the approval on excluding the deck at the front façade from the Mills Act valuation rather than requiring the applicant to remove it.

Commissioner Ryan asked how the Assessor Office evaluates pools.

Ms. Olsen said that the Assessor does not assess properties solely on square footage--it is evaluated on how improvements to a property increase the value of a property.

Commissioner Ryan said he would support the request with the condition that the carport and deck above it be removed.

Commissioner St. Denis agreed.

Commissioner McGowen agreed because she believes that consistency is important.

Commissioner St. Denis said the carport and deck above it detracts from the historicity of the structure.

Vice Chair Jones said she preferred not to keep the carport and deck above it, although she does like the deck over the front entrance way.

Attorney Foster suggested that if the Commission is to receive further public testimony, that the public comment be re-opened.

Chairperson Crenshaw re-opened public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENTS RE-OPENED

Ms. Ferrar asked, for clarification, if the Commission was asking that the gate at the property line also be removed in addition to the carport and the deck above it.

Ms. Olsen said the request did not include the gate—the Commission was referring to the railing

located at the top of the carport.

Ms. Ferrar said this request would require the removal of posts. She noted that there is a wooden shed located near the carport which is not visible from the public right-of-way.

Commissioner Ryan asked about the importance of the shed and if it was the same height as the fence.

Ms. Ferrar said there is insufficient storage in the dwelling so the shed is important. She also said that the shed is the same height as the fence.

Chairperson Crenshaw asked if the deck above the carport continues around the side of the structure and to the rear of the property.

Ms. Ferrar said it does not.

Ms. Olsen clarified that the front and rear decks are two separate structures. She said that all building permits on file with the City were included in the staff report at the October 2010 meeting, when the structure was designated historic.

Commissioner Ryan stated there is a significant difference between a historic and a Mills Act designation.

Vice Chair Jones agreed and said there is a greater degree of discernment between a historical and a Mills Act designation.

Chris Ackerman confirmed, after careful review of the photographs, that the deck located over the front entrance way is not original. He said the construction of the deck reflects a 1950's design as does the bay window at the front façade—it is not from the Requa period. He confirmed that the windows are made of steel frame and are held together with putty. Additionally, the inexpensive, flat exterior hinges reflect material that was used in the 1950's and the type of metal roof over the bay window is not reflective of a type of roof that Requa used anywhere.

Commissioner St. Denis said that although it may not have been designed by Requa, the bay window and roof appear to have been built in 1926, possibly during the same time frame that the carriage house was remodeled.

Mr. Ackerman said this would not necessarily mean that the bay window or roof above it was installed during that time frame.

Commissioner Ryan suggested that the item be continued to allow each of the Commissioners an opportunity to conduct an onsite visit.

Commissioner McGowen agreed that a site visit was important prior to making a determination.

Ms. Olsen said that if the Commission desires to continue the item, she would suggest that members review the staff reports that were provided during the historic designation review as well as the permit history. She encouraged the Commissioners to perform a site visit but discouraged a group meeting.

Attorney Foster said it is possible to meet onsite as a group; however, the meeting must be noticed as a special meeting, which would permit the general public to attend. She suggested it may be more practical for members to make individual trips to avoid the complication of having to notice the meeting.

Ms. Ferrar said she would not feel comfortable having the public visit her home.

Commissioner St. Denis said she would be in favor of continuing the item as this would allow her an opportunity to conduct further research.

Ms. Ferrar said that she is ambivalent about the front porch; however, she feels that it is part of the house and may be historic. She does understand that the carport and deck above it was built at a later time.

Commissioner McGowen said it is entirely possible that the vertical square posts that support the front balcony were replacements that were installed at the same time that the carport was built. She said that perhaps the posts had rotted out and needed reinforcement.

Commissioner Jones agreed and said the posts are out of context with the balcony itself.

Commissioner McGowen suggested that this matter could be addressed by looking at other examples, such as the main house, which would give some direction in terms of how the posts could be replaced with something that is more appropriate.

COMMISSION ACTION

VICE CHAIR JONES MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE ITEM TO ALLOW EACH OF THE COMMISSIONERS AN OPPORTUNITY TO CONDUCT AN ONSITE VISIT AND TO ALLOW FURTHER RESEARCH BY THE COMMISSION.

COMMISSIONER ST. DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Crenshaw, Jones, McGowen, 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.

HP 2011-01 **CITY OF CORONADO** – Results of the Mills Act Agreement Prioritization process for applications submitted in 2010: HRP 2010-02 McWaters (754 B Avenue) and HRP 2010-03 Marilyn Fulton (1000 Glorietta Boulevard). *This item is continued to the next regularly scheduled meeting of March 16, 2011.*

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER ST. DENIS MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE ITEM TO THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING OF MARCH 16, 2011.

COMMISSIONER MCGOWEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Crenshaw, Jones, Ryan, McGowen, 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 5:18 p.m.

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