



MINUTES
Historic Preservation Commission
7:30 p.m., Wednesday, October 15, 2014
City Council Chambers
809 Center Street

Call to Order 7:48 p.m. by F. Miller

Roll Call F. Miller - Chair; I. Blackwood; D. Hooks; A. Meyer;
J. Steen; R. Barker, G. Schwartz (7:45 pm)

Absent: R. Barker, I. Blackwood and A. Meyer, all with notification

Staff: D. Lauritson, Project Planner and K. Donovan, Senior Planner and
Norma Ellis, Recording Secretary

Oral Communications - It was noted that Commissioner Schwartz had a conflict of interest for Item 2, 116 Taylor Street, and he recused himself from that item.

Approval of Minutes - July 16, 2014, J. Steen moved and G. Schwartz seconded, with the time as 7:45 Chair F. Miller with the addition of N. Ellis as staff and Katherine Donovan was not present at the meeting. The Commission vote was 4/0/3; with R. Barker, I. Blackwood and A. Meyer absent.

Approval of Minutes - August 13, 2014. J. Steen moved and G. Schwartz seconded approval with no changes. The motion for approval was 3/0 with J. Steen, G. Schwartz and F. Miller voting yes and D. Hooks abstaining; with R. Barker, I. Blackwood and A. Meyer absent.

Public Hearings -

1. 109 Sylvar St. CP13-0087 APN 006-172-18
Historic Alteration Permit for a second story addition to a historic residence in the Mission Hill Historic District and the R-1-5 zone district to facilitate the conversion of a single-family residence to a duplex. (Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption) (James and Paul Stanger, owners/filed: 6/13/2013) KD
Recommendation: Approval with conditions.

K. Donovan, Senior Planner presented the staff report. The project would convert a single-family residence into a duplex. It includes a second-story addition at the rear, a rear deck addition, and several window changes. As proposed, the project would

install a parapet wall on the north elevation to match the existing wall on the south side. Since the second-story addition is set back four feet from the side elevations, the parapet wall wouldn't be needed to block any views of the addition. As the existing north elevation is an iconic view of the property, staff is recommending against including the parapet wall on the north elevation. The proposed additions cannot be seen from the street. The project plans show one long deck across the back. The applicants recently requested a change to that deck to provide a divided deck so that each unit would have its own deck.

There are a variety of structural and mechanical improvements proposed with the project including foundation improvements, electrical and plumbing upgrades, and the installation of a new furnace. The project would also include repair and replacement as needed to the siding and front porch. Existing window sashes would be replaced within the existing window frames including window sash replacement. On the south side elevation, one existing window toward the rear would be replaced with two double hung windows. On the north side elevation, one window would be added to match the windows on the south elevation and another window toward the rear would be removed and replaced with three slightly smaller windows. These new windows would provide more light into the remodeled interior of the building.

This project requires an historic use variation reviewed by the Zoning Administrator because the property is in the R-1-5 zone district and they are asking for a duplex. It also requires a historic variation to the covered parking requirement. The single-family use requires one covered and one uncovered parking space, while the duplex would require two covered parking spaces. There are currently three uncovered parking spaces in the driveway. Allowing the variation to the covered parking requirement would allow this project, which would also maintain and rehabilitate the structure significantly. The parking variation would be approved by the Commission. Staff feels the scope of improvements that they are proposing for the property would maintain the historic structure and will lengthen its useable life significantly and that these variations are well-justified for this project.

G. Schwartz asked if the applicants proposed removing the parapet wall at one point. K Donovan explained that the applicants had proposed keeping the existing wall on the south side and adding a parapet wall on the north side elevation. She was recommending that the north parapet wall not be added because this elevation was an iconic silhouette.

J. Steen asked if the other project was in the Historic Overlay District. She stated that the Historic Preservation Commission is involved with this project because it is in the Mission Hill Historic District, which was not noted in the staff report. She also noticed that the other project that will be discussed tonight was also in the downtown neighborhood historic district and asked if this was in the Historic Overlay District as well. K. Donovan stated that both projects are in the Historic Overlay District. She noted that the previous planner had drafted this report.

J. Steen mentioned that the Alzina house on Sylvar Street is not only in the City's Mission Hill Overlay Historic District but is also a National Register Historic District; and it is also one of the 26 designated City landmarks, which wasn't mentioned in the

staff report. She noted that because of the significance of the building both historically and architecturally, it really warrants a DPR being done on it. As mentioned, there was no confirmation of the fact that it was built about 1850. J. Steen indicated that in 1856, Francisco Alzina took out a homestead on that property and stated that he was living there from 1851. She stated that the building definitely existed in 1851. She further noted that there was no mention of the history of the house at all in the staff report. Francisco Alzina was a very noted person in California history. He came to the City of Santa Cruz in 1846. He married Maria Carlotta Gonzalez, from a prominent Californio family. The lumber came from the family's rancho pescadero. Her father was an escolta, a military guard for the mission. She stated that was a very important detail in the California-historic and Mexican and Mission period.

J. Steen stated that architecturally the saltbox style is very limited in Santa Cruz. There are two in Santa Cruz, one on Riverside Avenue and one on Encinal Street. She noted that the staff report doesn't address all of these issues. It was listed in Volume 1 of the Historic Building Survey and designated a City historic landmark. The Appendix of the 2000 City Historic Context Statement by Susan Lehmann has a list of future needs for the City historic preservation program and one was to do 523-A DPR forms for all of the structures that still exist for Volume 1 and 2. J. Steen noted that this house deserves a DPR not only for its architectural style but also to document the people who lived in the structure and for its historical significance. She stated that the Alzina family owned the property from 1850 until 1974 approximately 124 years. She also noted that one of the sons Frank Alzina has a listed property which is also on the cover of Volume III of the Historic Building Survey. J. Steen noted that the Secretary of Interior's Standards were not utilized until the City became a Certified Local Government in 1995. K. Donovan asked if the Commission would like to require a DPR as part of the conditions of approval. J. Steen noted that an after-the-approval DPR's findings may lead to something other than approved may be too late. Senior Planner D. Lauritson noted that staff feels the addition is appropriate and does meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. He noted that the Planning Department does not have the resources to do DPRs on all Volume 1 and Volume 2 properties.

G. Schwartz asked what the function is on the parapet on the south side. Senior Planner Katherine Donovan stated the south side has an existing parapet and it may be original. J. Steen stated it doesn't appear to be a part of the salt box feature. J. Craycroft (project architect) noted that the parapet is similar to a false front on the old commercial buildings. The building used to be on Mission Street and the parapet wall may have been put there to hide the gable and make the building look more commercial. The owners stated that the building had been relocated. The thought was to add the parapet wall on the north side in order to match the other one. J. Steen asked if there was any documentation of the house being moved from Mission Street. The applicants stated that they did not have any documentation. J. Steen believes it was the Gonzalez adobe that was on Mission Street

F. Miller asked if there are going to be two heating systems in the crawl space which will require exterior access doors. The architect stated that there will be two systems and stated that on the south side of the house, it sits high enough to add the crawl space. D. Hooks noted the Marvin sliding French doors with matching custom

windows and asked why they wouldn't do Marvin windows for the entire house. J. Craycroft explained that they found the window frames are all redwood and were in good shape and they can get the sashes made to match the same details. They did this on a house on Locust Street they recently rehabilitated and the custom windows were only slightly more expensive than the Marvin windows. They ended up using the R-rated sashes. D. Hooks asked if they will be thermal. J. Craycroft stated they would be thermal rated.

The public hearing was open.

SPEAKING FROM THE FLOOR

J. Craycroft, architect

Mr. Stranger

Mr. Stanger stated that when the realtor brought them through the house, it was little more than a barn. The floors looked like cedar and possibly redwood and you can nearly see through to the ground below. There is no heating system, just a fireplace. It's in need of some improvements to make it livable. Gretchen Goldstein, the lady that started KUSP radio had lived in that house in the early 70's, with the motivation that they get the historical designation on that property. He felt it was a good idea to make it a habitable dwelling.

The public hearing was closed.

J. Steen stated that Gretchen Goldstein acquired the property in 1974 and owned it until 2001. It is one of 26 landmark structures out of 650 structures listed on the HBS. She stated that if they can't keep the authenticity or the integrity of this structure, it shouldn't be altered. She doesn't know of a house that is more deserving. She stated that she didn't think the structural integrity of the building is being maintained at all. The salt box style will be lost after the installation of the second floor dormers 13 feet over the sloping roof with only three feet of roof remaining at the very end. The extent of window alterations is also a concern - on the north elevation - four or five new windows are proposed and one of the original windows is moved over based on the conversion of a single-family dwelling. She believes that it would be almost impossible and very expensive to put back the original windows and remove the dormers. Secretary of Interior Standards 1, 2, 3 9 and 10 aren't being followed. On the north elevation, there are three new windows and they can be seen from public view. She noted that converting it to a duplex would possibly turn it into a rental which could hamper its long-term preservation. It needs to be preserved in its original state as much as possible.

G. Schwartz stated this house isn't a museum, that people are living there and he disagreed with J. Steen. He didn't think it was practical or fair to expect them to live there without any improvements. F. Miller doesn't have a problem with the windows. The property needs to be preserved and can be made quite beautiful. Changing one window won't make a difference. D. Hooks stated that, while he appreciates J. Steen's research on the house and past residents, one of the roles of the Historic Preservation Commission is to seize the moment. Albeit the project is not perfect, it

will be an investment that will definitely prolong its life through structural upgrades. He noted that investment in windows will preserve the building.

D. Hooks moved and G. Schwartz seconded to approve the Historic Alteration Permit. The motion passed on a 3/1/3; with J. Steen voting NO; F. Miller, D. Hooks and G. Schwartz voting YES, with R. Barker, I. Blackwood, and A. Meyer absent. J. Steen moved and D. Hooks seconded to include her detailed historical comments in the October 15th meeting minutes. The motion passed 4/0/3.

2. 116 Taylor St.

CP14-0105

APN 006-473-13

Historic Alteration Permit for rehabilitation of a single-story residence listed on Historic Building Survey in the Downtown Neighborhood Historic District and the RL zone district. The project includes restoration of windows, construction of a small addition to the rear portion of the side of the residence, and the replacement of a non-historic rear porch with a wooden deck. The permit includes variations to the side yard setback and covered parking requirements. (Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption) (Roger and Yvonne Dunfield, owners/filed: 8/6/14) KD

Recommendation: Approval with conditions.

K. Donovan presented the staff report. The project is to rehabilitate an Italianate residence, with a small addition on the west side toward the rear and replacement of an existing rear stoop with a larger deck. The applicants are also requesting a variation to the parking requirement of one covered and one uncovered space to provide two uncovered parking spaces, one within the front setback, which isn't allowed under the standards for the zone district. The project would also restore the windows to the original double hung style, with original trim to match the rest of the house. The front porch is currently concrete with a wrought-iron railing. The project would include developing a wood balustrade and cover the concrete with wood flooring appropriate to that style of architecture. There is an existing code enforcement case that would be cleared up with this project. There's a nearby house at 235 Walnut Avenue with a very similar architectural style and it is an inspiration to this house. The Secretary of Interior Standards says not to add elements from other historic buildings; however, as there is no history of the original windows, using windows to that style of architecture seems to be very appropriate.

D. Hooks asked about the front porch, and if the concrete steps and concrete porch is existing. He was concerned that laying wood over the concrete would create rot problems very quickly.

The public hearing was opened.

SPEAKING FROM THE FLOOR

C. Schultes, architect

R. Dunfield, property owner

C. Schultes stated that he was not a stranger to this commission. It is very exciting to bring this project to the Commission. Former Commissioner D. Subocz spearheaded variations to standard zoning code provisions. The house has had a lot of cheap work

done on it, including the concrete porch and steps. The house on Walnut Avenue served as an inspiration and he wanted to save the owners the expense of removing that large amount of concrete by wrapping the skirting with wood and adding material to the treads that would look like wood with mosaic tiles. The railing that exists around the porch is very low and doesn't meet the code. While he would like to have railing to be code height, the hand rails need to be a little lower where they will intercept the porch properly.

D. Hooks was concerned that putting wood on the concrete is not a good interface. His preference would be to blast the concrete out and put in the original form with wooden porch and joists. He would be agreeable to tile materials if it has to be tile. He mentioned the risers and how they would fit considering the porch height.

C. Schultes stated that with the right profile and section, tile would work if the porch was down lower than the existing house. D. Lauritson stated that material doesn't sound right. K. Donovan concurred that tile is not an appropriate material for the architectural style. C. Schultes said they were planning to use pressure treated wood or foundation wood.

R. Dunfield, the property owner, requested that the Commission eliminate the condition language related to "prior to occupancy" as they intended to live in the property during construction. He also requested that the landscaping requirement in Condition 11 be removed. K. Donovan suggested that the "prior to occupancy" clause be changed to "final building permit approval." Roger Dunfield also requested that Conditions 13 and 14 regarding excavation and archaeologist report be removed. K. Donovan stated that this is a CEQA issue and can't be removed. She also suggested that since the amount of excavation could probably be done in one day, the requirement wouldn't be too onerous.

F. Miller stated that they did a very nice style for the addition. J. Steen moved approval and D. Hooks seconded approval of the Historic Alteration Permits, subject to the condition of approval noted in the staff report with the above modifications. The motion was approved with F. Miller, J. Steen, and D. Hooks voting YES and G. Schwartz abstained, with I. Blackwood, R. Barker, and A. Meyer absent.

3. Public Awareness Subcommittee Report

F. Miller presented the Final Report of the Subcommittee on Public Awareness. The subcommittee came up with three ideas. The first idea involved improvements and continual updating of the website. He suggested having accurate agendas and also including information on some of their approved projects. They are proposing that the Commission review the website and make suggestions on a periodic basis.

The second idea involves historic-related public events. One such upcoming event is the Symphony League of Santa Cruz's home tour. F. Miller noted that the Rio Vista Suites historic house (611 Third Street) will be visited with 500-600 people during December 6th and December 7th from 12 noon to 5 pm. He noted that DILIP Patel had done a superb job on the interior and exterior of the building. F. Miller would like to have some of the commissioners attend the home tour on December 6th and 7th

(Saturday and Sunday) from 12 noon to 5 p.m. Another annual event in this regard is the MAH Blue Plaque Ceremony and Certificates of Appreciation which occurs each May during Historic Preservation Week. D. Lauritson also mentioned the local architect's tour.

The third suggestion was to get historic-related publicity to the media. He stated that Anderson Productions, local TV, will be available at that Rio Vista property to interview Commissioners and the owner with TV cameras. He stated that he is very good friends with Don Miller of the Sentinel who can write a great article on the event for the newspaper.

Subcommittee member J. Steen had reviewed a lot of historic commission websites, and websites of other organizations involved with historic preservation. She noted they were not at all as exciting as other historic advocacy organizations where they advertise information for restoring such houses. The better websites up-to-date web links to things such as the Historic Building Code, the Secretary of Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties and other guidelines, window information, and technical issues on subjects related to historic preservation.

4. Historic Incentives Subcommittee Report

D. Hooks stated that their Subcommittee is not done with their report. I. Blackwood had some groundwork to do mainly on the Mills Act. K. Donovan worked for the City of Vallejo and was staff to their Historic Preservation Commission for five years. She stated that the department did an economic analysis and found out that it would only affect properties over \$100,000 based on the 1990's analysis.

K. Donovan stated that her experience was that the Mills Act did not really encourage people who did not want to do anything to their property. She was in Vallejo at the peak of property values and felt that was the biggest failure of the Mills Act - that it really did not change anybody's mind. People who intended to improve their properties took advantage of the Mills Act and entered into contracts, but it didn't prove to be an incentive to people who didn't want to maintain their property. The City of Vallejo was careful to figure out how to make the Mills Act as beneficial to the City as possible and not too onerous to property owners.

D. Lauritson stated that Volume 3 of the survey and incentives involved a substantial amount of Planning Department staff time. The department is now focused on implementation of the new General Plan through an extensive review of the zoning ordinance and map; and will not have the capacity to implement a Mills Act program.

The Subcommittee agreed to present their Final Report at a meeting before the end of the year.

Items Initiated by Members for Future Agendas -

Adjournment

9:23 p.m.

The Historic Preservation Commission adjourned to the November 19, 2014 in the Council Chambers.