



CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE AD HOC COMMITTEE

4:00 pm, Monday, December 14, 2015

Council Chambers, City Hall, 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA.

Copies of the agenda packet are available for review at the Community Development Department in City Hall at 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove; and on the internet at www.ci.pg.ca.us.

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

- a. Present: Bill Kampe, Robert Huitt, Don Murphy, Mike Gunby, Maureen Mason, Rudy Munoz
- b. Absent: Jean Anton

3. Approval of Minutes

- a. Meeting of 11/30/2015 – Approved, 6-0

4. General Public Comment

- a. Comment by Mr. Tony Ciani showing example of a survey done in San Diego.

5. Review Proposed Wording Change on the Integrity Criterion (Mason/Anton)

- a. Maureen Mason present the results of the work by Mason/Anton. The recommendation was to include wording from and reference to the description of Integrity from the City's Historic Context statement. After discussion, the committee concluded that the seven key aspects of integrity should be itemized by attribute name in the definition of integrity in the PG HPO, with reference to the full discussion of integrity found in the Historic Context Statement.
- b. Based on the discussion, there are implications for how we interpret Integrity, both for historic interpretations and for project reviews. Integrity means much more than "not changed". Especially with respect to character defining features, the context statement links integrity of a single resource to the character defining features of similar resources of a neighborhood or the city. It also implies that integrity can be maintained even if a particular feature, e.g. a window, is moved or altered yet still is consistent with the character-defining aspects of the resource/building.

6. HPO Topics for Discussion

- Multi-tier historicity; What distinguishes tiers? Benefits / constraints / documentation
 - Tony Ciani commented with an analogy to a sieve that separates the most important resources from other resources.
 - We discussed the question of whether some properties are more important than others in representing the history and heritage of the city. The working conclusion was "yes".

- In terms of a top tier of historicity, we looked at the current resources on the National Register. Resources on the National Register are classified as significant at the local, state, or national level. The consensus of the committee was that the National or State Register process would be suitable for selecting top tier resources. We noted that the National Register process uses specific criteria for Significance and for Integrity consistent with the period of significance. A consultant may be helpful for identifying the top tier resources, in addition to our current National register resources.
- An additional suggestion was that we be clear about what we are trying to accomplish with any differential distinctions in level of historicity. For the top level, the suggestion was that our goal is to “Ensure the Preservation of our most important properties (or resources)”
- The committee looked at the implication for remaining resources. The working conclusion is that the local HRI has the goal to “Preserve the character of our city in the character of these locally significant resources.”
- We considered any incentives that might be useful to help insure that property owners actually preserve their historic properties. We do not have a specific menu of incentives to recommend at this point, but are aware that other cities have been able to specify particular advantages.
- Protecting “the collection” – districts, overlays, companion structures, etc.
 - We had a brief discussion on the idea of preservation districts and overlays.
 - Intent is sustainability (needs definition) while allowing renewal and modernization.
 - Mr. Rick Steres, public, described some of his experience in the historic determination and project review process.
- At this point we continued the remaining topics:
- Deletions – Comprehensive survey? Case by case? Who may initiate?

7. Comments on Benchmark Cities

- a. Anastazia has provided a comparison matrix from prior work.
- b. Each share highlights from another city’s approach to Historic Preservation

8. Schedule of meetings; Next Steps

- a. We set January 4 as the date for the next meeting.

9. Adjournment.

- a. We adjourned at 5:30 pm. Happy Holidays!

The City of Pacific Grove does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. City Hall is an accessible facility. A limited number of devices are available to assist those who are deaf or hearing impaired.



MINUTES - DRAFT

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE AD HOC COMMITTEE

4:00 pm, Monday, January 4, 2016

Council Chambers, City Hall, 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA.

Copies of the agenda packet are available for review at the Community Development Department in City Hall at 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove; and on the internet at www.ci.pg.ca.us.

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

- a. Present: Bill Kampe, Robert Huitt, Don Murphy (Planning Commission), Mike Gunby (ARB), Maureen Mason (HRC), Jean Anton (at large), Rudy Munoz (at large)

3. Approval of Minutes

- a. Meeting of 12/14/2015: Approved, 7-0

4. General Public Comment

5. Comments on Benchmark Cities

- a. Anastazia has provided a comparison matrix from prior work.
- b. Each share highlights from another city's approach to Historic Preservation

Anastazia described the matrix and the cities included. We looked at factors such as population, number of properties in the city inventories, use of districts or multiple tiers.

There was public comment by Tony Ciani describing historic districts in San Diego and that districts need not be contiguous; Rick Steres how the close houses and narrow streets in the PG retreat make a streetscape that is as important as the individual structures.

We noted the 4 historic districts in Santa Barbara and that Monterey has an approach that is clear to buyers up front.

6. HPO Topics for Discussion

- Protecting “the collection” – districts, overlays, companion structures, etc.

We explored the possibility of the retreat as a district, and also discussed thematic districts. Thematic districts can be physically distributed but have defining characteristics and some association and feeling. Our discussion concluded that the possibility of districts would be better left at this time as a future discussion, recognizing that effective documentation, the public engagement, and the essential definitions and criteria require extensive work.

- Deletions – Comprehensive survey? Case by case? Who may initiate?

We heard public comment from Joanne T. who was distressed by the change in her own home after a fire and with a new owner.

We explored the question of who can initiate a deletion. The working conclusion is that either the property owner or the HRC should be able to initiate a deletion hearing. If initiated by the HRC, there should be no charge to the property owner.

The preferred approach would be a consolidated survey of properties by a professional, budget permitting. Otherwise, resources can be considered as projects or requests arise. In any case, the criteria for determination should be applied. A property is historic or not because of the defined criteria, rather than by owner preference.

7. Schedule of meetings; Next Steps

The next meeting was scheduled for Jan 25, 2016. We will consider the Next Steps suggested in the Historic Context Statement, as listed below.

8. Adjournment.

9. Pending for Future Discussion

- a. Recommendations/Next Steps as Listed in the Historic Context Statement
 - i. Continue to add or delete individual buildings from the City's Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) on a case-by-case basis;
 - ii. Conduct additional historic resource surveys;
 - iii. Update Historic Preservation Ordinance;
 - iv. Consider potential districts and/or conservation zones;
 - v. Create local preservation incentive program;
 - vi. Expand existing design guidelines for historic resources;
 - vii. Education and outreach;
 - viii. Apply to be a certified location government (CLG).

The City of Pacific Grove does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. City Hall is an accessible facility. A limited number of devices are available to assist those who are deaf or hearing impaired.



MINUTES - DRAFT

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE AD HOC COMMITTEE

4:00 pm, Monday, January 25, 2016

Council Chambers, City Hall, 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA.

Copies of the agenda packet are available for review at the Community Development Department in City Hall at 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove; and on the internet at www.cityofpacificgrove.org.

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

- a. Present: Bill Kampe, Robert Huitt, Mark Chakwin (Alternate for Don Murphy, Planning Commission), Mike Gunby (ARB), Maureen Mason (HRC), Jean Anton (at large), Rudy Munoz (at large)
- b. Absent: Don Murphy (alternate was present), Maureen Mason

3. Approval of Minutes

- a. Meeting of 01/04/2016
 - i. Approved 6-0-1 (Mason absent)

4. General Public Comment

None?

5. Recommendations on Next Steps as Listed in the Historic Context Statement

Key comments from the discussion are added to each item

- a. Continue to add or delete individual buildings from the City's Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) on a case-by-case basis;
Reinforced earlier recommendation that HRC can initiate; keep doing it.
- b. Conduct additional historic resource surveys;
Concur as budget permits. Seek grants/research funding. Consider CSUMB interns. Priorities: HRI deletions, City of Homes core from 1927 to 1945, Earlier outliers' tract(s), Suburbanization, Civic Modernism
- c. Update Historic Preservation Ordinance;
Most of the 7 recommended points have been addressed by this ad hoc committee.
- d. Consider potential districts and/or conservation zones;
Per prior discussion on this topic, use the Historic Context Statement as a point of reference for the character defining features of neighborhoods in review of candidates for the HRI, and for projects on HRI properties.
- e. Create local preservation incentive program;
Our current code offers significant incentives for HRI properties: extension along existing setbacks; some building code exemptions
- f. Expand existing design guidelines for historic resources;
Create appropriate guidelines for commercial properties
- g. Education and outreach;
Public awareness of the objectives, requirements, and benefits of the HPO is

important. For decision makers, there is a need for initial and continuing education, funded in an explicit budget.

- h. Apply to be a certified location government (CLG).

There was a question about control and autonomy – no known downside. There can be material benefits from some grant opportunities, and for possible use of the Mills Act. Recommend implementing recommendations from this ad hoc committee, then taking up CLG status in about 6 months. HRC should review our readiness at that time.

6. 1st Review of Draft Committee Report

- a. Consider key points for a committee report to council

Public comments were received on the concept of collection, multi-tier historicity specially noting that the zoning code is a de facto 3rd tier of control for maintaining character of the neighborhoods. Consider MPC students as interns. It's important to eliminate properties from HRI without integrity or significance; those properties discredit the preservation program.

Additional committee notes on the rough draft report:

- Consider endorsing 5 members for ARB and HRC, instead of 7. Ironically, the HRC nearly fell out of quorum because of a shortage of appointed members. While not a unanimous recommendation, our current situation gives evidence of the need to consider it.
- Concept of "Collection" – We have a collection. It's the HRI. The term was often used more broadly to encompass more of the city. The feeling of the committee was that we have made great strides, and therefore the term is not needed.
- For training of decision makers – can we state some form of requirement and support the requirement with budgeted funds.

Any concurrence by committee is intended to be tentative until a full set of recommendations are developed and reviewed in whole (a suggestion).

7. Next Meeting

Scheduled for Feb 8, 2016

8. Adjournment

The City of Pacific Grove does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. City Hall is an accessible facility. A limited number of devices are available to assist those who are deaf or hearing impaired.