

HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting

June 20, 2012

The regular meeting of the Coronado Historic Resource Commission was called to order at 3 p.m., Wednesday, June 20, 2012, at the Coronado City Hall Council Chambers, 1825 Strand Way, Coronado, California, by Chairperson Crenshaw.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Crenshaw, DeNardi, Jones, McGowen, Ryan

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Tricia Olsen, Associate Planner  
Laura Ramos, Recording Secretary, Minutes Preparer

CITY ATTORNEY: Randall Sjoblom, Deputy City Attorney

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of June 6, 2012, were approved as submitted.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

**Historic Resource Commission Election of Vice Chairperson**

Chairperson Crenshaw made a motion to nominate Commissioner Jones as Vice Chair. Commissioner Ryan seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Ms. Olsen announced that City Council will be discussing the Historic District Ordinance at their meeting of July 17.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

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

Chairperson Ryan read the following statement into the record: "After ten years, it is time that the City Council conduct a real income stream audit of the Mills Act parcels to determine the actual income on each parcel before it was dedicated, during the process, and after it was dedicated, of all Mills contracts that are in force."

PUBLIC HEARING

**HAP 2012-04 DAVID AND CAROL WARREN** – Request for a Historic Resource Alteration Permit for alterations to the historically designated residence addressed as 566 B Avenue and located in the R1-A(E) (Single Family Residential) Zone.

Commissioner Jones recused herself from discussions and stepped down from the dais as she lives within 500 feet of the subject property.

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

The applicant's representative, Jan Wilcox, answered questions of the Commission.

Ms. Olsen reminded the Commission that the property has an existing Mills Act agreement at this time.

Commissioner Ryan asked about the number of windows that will be replaced.

Mr. Wilcox said there is a total of three jalousie windows that will be replaced.

Ms. Olsen asked if the garage window will be replaced.

Mr. Wilcox replied that it will not be replaced.

Commissioner McGowen asked about material used on the lower left side window.

Mr. Wilcox said it is an original wood window.

Commissioner McGowen asked if Mr. Wilcox felt it would be more appropriate to use the same material for the other windows.

Mr. Wilcox said he felt it was appropriate; however, the homeowners are adamant about using the new window material because of its low maintenance (it does not expand or contract and it has a simulated wood appearance).

Commissioner Ryan asked if the new windows are located at the front of the house and to the left of the small door.

Mr. Wilcox said yes, and added the new windows will not be visible from the street.

Commissioner Ryan asked if these are the last of the windows that the owner is adamant about replacing with non-wood.

Mr. Wilcox said yes.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

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

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner McGowen asked if these types of windows have been allowed before.

Chairperson Crenshaw said the Commission has never seen these types of windows before. She

added that the Commission may request to view a sample window.

Mr. Wilcox said a sample of the window was unavailable at this time; but would be available shortly.

Ms. Olsen said she was also not familiar with this type of windows; however, the Commission has allowed non-wood windows on elevations other than the front. The Mills Act guidelines are specific about not allowing vinyl windows at all on any elevations, but do not mention fiberglass windows.

Commissioner Ryan said he would support using a non-wood replacement window for a south side that does not show. He recommended that the item should be continued in order to provide the Commission an opportunity to view a sample window.

### COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER RYAN MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE ITEM TO THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 18, 2012, IN ORDER TO PROVIDE THE COMMISSION AN OPPORTUNITY TO VIEW A WINDOW SAMPLE.

CHAIRPERSON CRENSHAW SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Crenshaw, DeNardi, McGowen, Ryan  
NAYS: None.  
ABSENT: None.  
ABSTAIN: Jones.

The motion passed with a vote of 4-0.

Total deliberation time: 11 minutes.

Commissioner Jones returned to the dais at 3:15 p.m.

The Commission was recessed at 3:19 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 3:22 p.m. All members were present.

**HAP 2012-09 BERNARD AND JILL ESROCK** – Request for a Historic Resource Alteration Permit for alterations, including zoning exceptions, for the historically designated residence addressed as 1000 Adella Avenue and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone.

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

Commissioner DeNardi said it was his understanding there will be 14 new windows placed in this residence, six windows will be completely removed, and one door and a patio located on the north side will be removed. He said he wanted to ensure this information was taken into consideration when staff arrived at a favorable opinion.

Ms. Olsen said she was looking at the project as a whole. She said it was her understanding that all of the windows would be replaced with new windows, and was aware of modifications to the door and patio.

Vice Chair Jones asked when the house was moved to the Adella Avenue location.

Chairperson Crenshaw said it occurred in 1906.

Vice Chair Jones asked if changes were made during that time, or at a later time.

Ms. Olsen said it is unknown when stucco was applied to the house but believes it was early on. She believes the original historic windows likely remained until they were all replaced in the 1950s. She said the garage was added in the late 1950s or early 1960s, and the bathroom addition was done in the 1980s.

The applicant's representative, Architect Dorothy Howard, provided a brief overview and answered questions of the Commission.

Commissioner Ryan said he was concerned about 1) the public's perception of the program, 2) comments made regarding the shingle color and texture as viewed by the public and whether it would look historical, and 3) the public view of the muntins and windows and whether the windows would look original or just be energy efficient. He said it is very important that all changes to the house measure up on an historic level. He said that although the color of the shingles are not in the purview of the Commission, the public will express concern.

Ms. Howard said the shingles will be white painted, cedar shingles. She added that new wood shingles, when painted, will have two coats of paint so the wood grain will breathe more.

Commissioner Jones asked if the lower windows, from the street elevation, will go down.

Ms. Howard clarified that the window sills will go down, and the tops of the windows will maintain their current relationship to the sidewalk.

Chairperson Crenshaw asked if the front window will be larger in size.

Ms. Howard said yes.

Chairperson Crenshaw asked why the beautiful Palm will be relocated.

Ms. Howard said the Palm located in the middle of the backyard will be relocated because it is situated in an awkward location in terms of using the rear yard.

Chairperson Crenshaw said it appeared that this request involves the construction of an almost new home. She said the sun porch has always existed and has been a significant part of the structure. Ms. Crenshaw noticed that the applicant will be requesting a Mills Act and mentioned there are some elements, such as the side porch, that Mills Act would prefer not be changed. She asked if the applicant would be willing to save the structure.

Ms. Howard said the structure can be air conditioned as it would be a tremendous cooling load, particularly if one of the things that the Commission finds is that they want the original single glazed appearance to be retained. She said the reason the applicant applied for Mills Act during the same meeting as the alteration permit is that the applicant does not want to get approval for alterations that will make it not possible for the house to get Mills Act. She said that in terms of saving the structure, she is unsure that the structure can be rehabilitated as it may need to be removed and rebuilt because of its much worn condition. She would need to discuss this issue with the applicant.

Chairperson Crenshaw said the Commission's due diligence is to preserve should the house be considered for Mills Act.

Ms. Olsen commented that the house was designated under Criteria A, B, and D (for William Sterling Hubbard), but not C (architecture). She also suggested that the Mills Act application be treated by the Commission as if the Mills Act is already in place as the applicant has already submitted their request. She suggested that if there needs to be conditions on the project in order to approve it, the Commission would make those conditions as the alterations would impact the Mills Act.

Vice Chair Jones asked if the sunroom has windows that open for ventilation.

Ms. Howard said the windows may have opened at one time; however, they are painted shut at this point. She added that the windows are quite large but are very deteriorated.

Chairperson Crenshaw asked if there is an existing basement.

Ms. Howard said there is a small basement in the center of the house that is accessed through an old bulkhead type door.

Chairperson Crenshaw asked if there is air conditioning in the house, and if not, why the applicant is electing to place it outside.

Ms. Howard said no, and stated that the condensing units must be installed outside.

Chairperson Crenshaw asked if the units are noisy.

Ms. Howard said the units that she specifies are some of the quietest available on the market; however, she is suggesting that they be installed in what is technically the front yard as the only other location is the side yard. She felt that placing the units in the side yard would negatively impact the neighbors more so than if they are located behind a four-foot tall fence in the front yard.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Lindsey stated that the designation of the house was due partly to the house being moved from Ocean Boulevard due to the big storm. He said that the house had shingles at that time and suggested if the applicant wanted shingles placed on the house again, the request could be historically tied to this event.

The applicant, Jill Esrock, mentioned that her husband has multiple sclerosis and noted that heat makes his condition worse. She said that air conditioners are a must for this reason.

## COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner DeNardi noted his earlier erroneous comment. He had previously mentioned 14 new window locations, not 14 new windows. He understands there are 46 windows in this project. He said he did not understand the 7-inch window but it is not a point of contention for him. He requested that the applicant speak with staff regarding a possible permit to remove the Palm tree in the backyard.

Ms. Olsen confirmed that no permit was necessary.

Commission Ryan said he supports the shingle look which would bring the structure back to its original appearance. He expressed concern that if this is the intent of the applicant, the appearance should look as original as possible. Mr. Ryan said there are two right-of-ways, which is a challenge. He said the windows on the backyard side and the side going towards the garage are less of a concern because they are not visible to the public. He would suggest stipulating that the windows on the Adella Avenue and Tenth Street side be as close to looking original as possible, perhaps even replicating wood with the original muntins. He would also stipulate that the skylight is removed and two skylights are located on the other side of the ridge, or use a technology that requires the use of a tube that brings light to that specific location. Mr. Ryan also suggested that for energy saving purposes, the applicant consider windows that open in the sunroom.

Vice Chair Jones concurred with Commissioner Ryan's remarks. She said she understood the applicant's need to lower the floor to create a more accessible front entry but suggested that by changing the window openings, it would deviate from the house's original historic appearance. Ms. Jones agreed with the use of the skylight but said she would not be in favor of removing the sunroom because of the Mills Act.

Commissioner McGowen said she considers this project as a total rebuild or re-creation. She said it is wonderful that the applicant is renovating the house back to its original historic appearance. She concurs with Commissioners Ryan and Jones' remarks.

Commissioner Ryan clarified that he supports the Mills Act request for this house if certain stipulations are included because he would prefer to save a home rather than lose it. The stipulations would likely ensure a positive public perception, something that is very important to him.

Commissioner McGowen said it is risky to include both the alteration permit request and the

Mills Act request on the same agenda.

Ms. Olsen commented that if the Commission feels that either of the two items should be continued, it is certainly an option.

Chairperson Crenshaw said the setback requests do not appear to present an issue for the Commission. However, there is concern that the structure maintain its historic appearance reflective of the historic photographs. She said that the draft minutes of the meeting where the house was given historic designation stated that “the site landscaping and miscellaneous improvement surrounding the historic resource shall be adequately maintained to provide for the visibility of the structure from public rights-of-way.” Ms. Crenshaw said she has always believed that when historic designation has been given to structures, the entire property is designated as well.

Ms. Olsen clarified that the parcel is given the designation and the designation is tied to the APN. She said the condition is a standard boiler plate condition that is contained in every Resolution, and it means that the landscaping shall be maintained so that the dwelling is visible from the public right-of-way. It does not mean that the landscaping should be maintained in order that the landscaping be visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Olsen further clarified that the landscaping for this house was not historically designated, with the exception of the Star Pine. She said the Commission does not review landscaping, and in fact, the City does not require a permit to remove trees or shrubs on private property.

Chairperson Crenshaw inquired about the procedural aspect of the possible options available to the applicant at this time.

Ms. Olsen reminded the Commission that it is acting on an historic alteration permit application and as an option, it may choose to include conditions on an approval, e.g. removal of skylight in the project scope. She said if the Commission is uncomfortable acting on the project prior to acting on the Mills Act and it wishes to continue the Historic Alteration approval to a future meeting and act on the Mills Act first, this would be another option. She said a third option would be to act on the Historic Alteration permit and then act on the Mills Act. Ms. Olsen suggested that, since the applicant has applied for a Mills Act, the Commission may wish to make a determination and assess conditions as if the project had been approved for a Mills Act. This way, when the Commission is acting on the Mills Act application, they can feel comfortable knowing that the Historic Alteration permit that was approved is appropriate for a Mills Act property.

Ms. Howard stated that if the motion will set conditions on the Historic Alteration permit, the applicant and she would like the opportunity to state whether they wish to withdraw the application for the Mills Act.

Chairperson Crenshaw agreed.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER RYAN MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE ISSUANCE OF A HISTORIC RESOURCE ALTERATION PERMIT, INCLUDING ZONING EXCEPTIONS, FOR THE HISTORICALLY DESIGNATED RESIDENCE ADDRESSED AS 1000 ADELLA AVENUE AND LOCATED IN THE R-1A (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE:

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.

THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS WERE ADDED:

1. THAT THE WINDOWS THAT ARE BEING REPLACED ON THE TENTH AVENUE SIDE AND THE ADELLA AVENUE SIDE BE MADE OF WOOD MATERIAL AND BE AS CLOSE TO THE ORIGINAL LOOKING WINDOWS AND MUNTINS AS POSSIBLE, AND NOT NECESSARILY DOUBLE PANED.
2. THE SKYLIGHT THAT IS VISIBLE FROM THE TENTH AVENUE SIDE BE REMOVED OR BE MOVED TO A LOCATION NOT VISIBLE FROM THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY.

THE MOTION DIED FOR A LACK OF A SECOND.

COMMISSIONER JONES MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE ISSUANCE OF A HISTORIC RESOURCE ALTERATION PERMIT, INCLUDING ZONING EXCEPTIONS, FOR THE HISTORICALLY DESIGNATED RESIDENCE ADDRESSED AS 1000 ADELLA AVENUE AND LOCATED IN THE R-1A (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE:

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.

THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS WERE ADDED:

- 1. THAT THE WINDOWS THAT ARE BEING REPLACED ON THE TENTH AVENUE SIDE AND THE ADELLA AVENUE SIDE BE MADE OF WOOD MATERIAL AND BE TRUE DIVIDED LIGHT WINDOWS WITH MUNTINS.
- 2. THE SKYLIGHT THAT IS VISIBLE FROM THE TENTH AVENUE SIDE BE REMOVED OR BE MOVED TO A LOCATION NOT VISIBLE FROM THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY.
- 3. THE REQUEST TO DEMOLISH THE SUNROOM AND BE REPLACED WITH A POP-OUT STRUCTURE BE DENIED.

Commissioner Ryan requested clarification on the motion. He asked if the sunroom would remain in its same size but perhaps could be restored.

COMMISSIONER JONES AMENDED CONDITION 3, AS FOLLOWS:

- 3. THE REQUEST TO DEMOLISH THE SUNROOM AND BE REPLACED WITH A POP-OUT STRUCTURE BE DENIED. THE SUNROOM CAN BE RESTORED AND THE WINDOWS REPLACED SO THAT THEY ARE FUNCTIONAL AND CAN BE OPENED. THE SUNROOM WINDOWS CAN BE DOUBLE PANED.

COMMISSIONER RYAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Crenshaw, DeNardi, Jones, McGowen, Ryan  
NAYS: None.  
ABSENT: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0.

Total deliberation time: 1 hour, 17 minutes.

Ms. Howard stated, for the record, that the applicant desired to withdraw the Historic Alteration permit request and the Mills Act application.

Ms. Olsen noted that the Historic Alteration permit request was approved; however, the applicant has the option of returning before the Commission with an alternative request.

Commissioner Ryan asked Ms. Howard which item in the motion was a “deal breaker.”

Ms. Howard responded that the applicant had no issues with applying the single glazed true divided wood windows on both street elevations, or having to remove/relocate the skylights. However, there was an issue in not being able to remove the sunroom as it has to do with accessibility to the rear yard from the house. Ms. Howard said the sunroom was an appendage and never part of the space plan of the house. From a space planning standpoint, the sunroom is awkwardly located and is a very 1905 type of relationship to the exterior of the house.

Commissioner Ryan asked if the applicant would be open to reconsideration if there was a way to work with the sunroom and relocate the sliding doors and windows in such a way to make it more habitable.

Ms. Howard said it was possible; however, she would have to study the design and consult with the applicant.

Ms. Olsen noted for the record that while the Historic Resource Commission had recommended approval of the project to the City Council, the application will not be forwarded to City Council because it has been withdrawn by the applicant.

**HRPA 2011-09 BERNARD AND JILL ESROCK** – Request for a Historic Preservation Mills Act Agreement for the historically designated residence addressed as 1000 Adella Avenue and located in the R-1A (Single Family Residential) Zone.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

THE ITEM WAS CONTINUED AT THE REQUEST OF THE APPLICANT.

Commissioner DeNardi asked staff that, for future agenda items, it not place alteration permit requests and Mills Act applications for the same applicant on the same agenda. He said it was unfair to City Council for the Commission to forward historic alteration permit requests for approval when Mills Act requests have already been approved.

#### DISCUSSION ITEM

**Historic Resource Commission discussion on City Council’s action on March 6, 2012, regarding Commission’s recommendations for improvements to the Historic Preservation Program regarding Historic Districts (continued from June 6, 2012).**

Commissioner DeNardi recused himself from the meeting discussion.

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

Commission discussion ensued.

Ms. Olsen summed up the general consensus among the members, with the exception of Commissioner DeNardi, as follows:

1. Remove from the memorandum the language that requests striking the reference to historic districts.
2. Keep in the memorandum the language that refers to the benefits of historic districts.

COMMISSION ACTION

COMMISSIONER MCGOWEN MADE A MOTION THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCE COMMISSION CONTINUE THIS ITEM TO A FUTURE MEETING.

COMMISSIONER RYAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

AYES: Crenshaw, Jones, McGowen, Ryan  
NAYS: None.  
ABSENT: DeNardi.  
ABSTAIN: None.

The motion passed with a vote of 4-0.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

---

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