



DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, May 26, 2015, 4:00 P.M.

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

(Audio recording of meeting is available at <https://soundcloud.com/pg93950/5-26-15-historic-design-review-process-evaluation-committee-recorded-minutes>)

1. Call to Order at 4:00 pm

Meeting was called to order by the Chair at 4:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Committee Members present: Robert Huitt, Chair; Michael Gunby, ARB Representative; Maureen Mason, HRC Representative; Luke Coletti and Anthony Ciani, Public Members

Members Absent: None

1. Approval of Minutes

Minutes were approved with corrections.

2. General Public Comment

None

3. City Attorney Report

David Laredo, City attorney, explained the legal basis for the City's regulation of land use, including historic preservation. The City's General Plan requires both the Planning Commission and the Architectural Review Board to be involved in the process to uphold historic preservation. The General Plan is silent on the role of the Historic Resources Committee, which is authorized in the Municipal Code.

Public Comment

Jeff Becom, PG resident

4. Staff Report, Laurel O'Halloran Assistant Planner

Assistant Planner O'Halloran presented a summary of recent permit activities and described the steps in the process, including initial historic screening for buildings 50 years old or more, Phase I and Phase II reports, and the respective roles of staff HRC and ARB. In response to questions, City Attorney Laredo elaborated on the CEQA process and the basis of the 50-year trigger.

Public Comment

Jeff Becom, PG resident

5. Consideration of alternative structures

The committee reviewed four alternative ways of structuring the City's historic and architectural review processes:

1. Continue the existing arrangement, possibly with minor changes.
2. Retain the two committees, but give the HRC design review responsibilities for historic properties while the ARB continues to review all other properties.
3. Create a new combined Historic and Architectural Review Commission to replace the two existing committees and assume their current duties.
4. Eliminate the ARB and HRC and have the Planning Commission assume their current duties. (Theoretical alternative only)

The committee discussed the relative advantages and disadvantages of the alternatives in terms of:

- a. Effectiveness in achieving program purposes and goals.
- b. Ability to recruit and retain qualified members; workload for members.
- c. Public participation, transparency.
- d. Costs to applicants, including time costs.
- e. Staffing costs.
- f. Eligibility for CLG status.

Public Comment

Jeff Becom, PG resident. Mr. Becom recounted his experience on the ARB and expressed concern about the workload that would be faced by a combined committee.

Following discussion of pro's and con's, the Committee agreed to narrow the options to #2 and #3, and to consider them in more detail at the next meeting.

- 6. Next Meeting: June 30, 2015 4:00 pm**
- 7. Adjournment 5:45 pm**

APPROVED BY HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: