



NOTICE OF MEETING

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, May 26, 2015, 4:00 p.m.

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

Copies of the agenda packet and materials related to an item on the agenda submitted after distribution of the agenda packet, are available for review at the Pacific Grove Library located at 550 Central Avenue and the CEDD counter in City Hall at 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove from 8 a.m. – 12 p.m. and 1 p.m. – 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday; and on the internet at www.cityofpacificgrove.org

1. **Call to Order – 4:00 p.m.**
2. **Roll Call Committee Members:** Robert Huitt, Chair; Michael Gunby, ARB Representative; Maureen Mason, HRC Representative; Luke Coletti and Anthony Ciani, Public Members
3. **Approval of Minutes**
 - a. Approval of April 26, 2015 Regular Minutes
Recommended Action: Approve as presented
4. **General Public Comment** – *(Comments must deal with matters subject to the jurisdiction of the Committee and will be limited to three minutes.)*
5. **City Attorney Report**
 - a. Discuss Legal Basis for Land Use Regulation (Planning, ARB & HRC)
6. **Staff Report, Laurel O'Halloran Assistant Planner**
 - a. Recent permit activity report
 - b. Initial Historic Screening Process
7. **Consideration of alternative structures**
 - a. Report from the Chair
8. **Next Meeting: June 30, 2015 4:00 pm**
9. **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 hard of hearing.



MINUTES

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

4:00 p.m., Tuesday, April 28, 2015

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

Copies of the agenda packet, and materials related to an item on the agenda submitted after distribution of the agenda packet, are available for review at the Pacific Grove Library located at 550 Central Avenue; the CEDD counter in City Hall at 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove from 8 a.m. – 12 p.m. and 1 p.m. – 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday; and on the internet at www.cityofpacificgrove/arb.org

1. Call to Order at 4:02pm

2. Roll Call and Introduction of Members

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

Members Absent: None

Robert Huitt, Chair introduced members;

Michael Gunby has lived in Pacific Grove 4 years. He is interested in PG and was an environmental engineer.

Luke Coletti grew up in Pacific Grove and became interested in City government doing his own home project.

Maureen Mason is a realtor who has lived in Pacific Grove for 27 years. She loves historic properties and has served on the Historic Resources Committee for several years. She is a preservationist at heart.

Anthony Ciana grew up in Lajolla, which he feels was similar to PG in the 50's. He is an architect and a historic preservationist consultant. He is an advocate of the citizens.

Robert Huitt currently serves on the City council and was previously on the Planning Commission. He chaired a committee responsible for the original Architectural Review Guidelines and revisions to the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

3. General Public Comment

The public comment period was opened and the following members of the public spoke:

Jeff Becom, resident of PG

Sally Moore, resident of PG

Carmelita Garcia, resident of PG

Inge Lorentzen Daumer, resident of PG

The Chair closed the public comment

The Chair noted for the members and the public to view the printed handouts

The Committee, by consent, moved item 4a after 4c

4. Process and Goals

a. Schedule of meetings

Moved by consent after 4c

b. Background

The Chair explained that the City Manager formed the Committee at Council direction to address alternative structures and duties for the ARB and HRC.

He explained the new Committee's job is to take a thorough look at the way we are doing things and look at alternatives.

Public comment:

Don Murphy, Planning Commission member

Carmelita Garcia, PG resident

c. Purpose and proposed output of the Committee

The Chair explained that this committee has been charged with examining the current procedures and division of responsibilities. The alternative approaches to consider are:

- 1) The planning Commission reviews and approves all projects
- 2) The ARB and HRC retain current responsibilities
- 3) Merge the ARB and HRC into a single reviewing body
- 4) Have the HRC review all historic properties for design review and the ARB handle the rest.

The committee needs to report on our analysis and findings with recommendations that will go back to City Council and any modifications will go to the Planning Commission for approval.

Public comment:

Jeff Becom, resident of PG

Rick Steres, ARB Chair

Carmelita Garcia, resident of PG

Michael Meloy, HRC member

The Chair brought item 4a back for discussion. The committee agreed to meet the 4th Tuesday of the month at 4pm.

Michael Gunby requested the Committee members and interested members from the public send all correspondence to the staff liaison for the Committee, Laurel O'Halloran.

The Chair announced items for the next agenda would include a report from the City Attorney and a report from Planning Staff on the approval process for projects on the historic inventory and not on the historic inventory

5. Adjournment at 5:10 pm

Next meeting is May 26th, 2015.

APPROVED BY HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE:

Robert Huitt, Chair

Date



Permit Report

6a

5/1/2014 - 5/1/2015

Permit Date	Status	Permit Type	Project Description	Historic Resources Inventory	Review Authority
4/30/2015	Set for Hearing	AP	New kiosk/bulletin board and new signage at the Heritage Society Barn	Y	ARB
4/30/2015	In Review	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
4/16/2015	In Review	UP	Bathroom in a detached structure		PC
4/27/2015	In Review	AAP	Enclosing carport to create a single-car garage	Y	STAFF
4/20/2015	In Review	AP	Convert 3 floor of existing building to aptments and 2 commercial spaces on 1st floor a 5 carports	N	ARB
4/15/2015	In Review	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
4/15/2015	In Review	AP	Second story deck & changing all windows existing aluminum upgrade to vinyl	N	ARB
4/14/2015	Approved	AAP	59 sf addition, new roof, new windows, new board and batten siding, new 80 sf covered porch	N	STAFF
4/13/2015	In Review	AP	Renovation of existing rear (first story) and addition of 2nd story.	Y	ARB
4/13/2015	In Review	AP	Addition of a 665 square foot second story	N	STAFF
4/7/2015	In Review	AUP	2nd cat 1 accessory Structure	N	STAFF
4/1/2015	In Review	AUP	5' high fence in the front	N	STAFF
3/26/2015	In Review	LLA	Lot Line Adjustment		SPRC
3/25/2015	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening		HRC
3/4/2015	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
3/4/2015	In Review	LLA	Lot Line adjustment	N	SPRC
3/2/2015	Set for Hearing	AP & HPP	94 square foot addition to the first floor and 778 square foot addition to the second floor.	Y	ARB
3/2/2015	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC

3/2/2015	In Review	ADC	Residential Remodel - reducing garage size and switching a door and a window.	Y	STAFF
2/26/2015	In Review	AP	Remodel existing two-story house, garage and apartment. Rebuild chimneys, add dormer, bay window, skylights, and windows. Change siding on the garage. Change windows to match historic photos.	Y	ARB
2/25/2015	Approved	AUP	Accessory structure in the rear. 2nd category 1 structure	N	STAFF
2/25/2015	Approved	AAP	52 S.F. dining room extension, 34 window seat bay in mstr. brm, 24" S.F. skylights 5 total, 74 S.F. upper level deck extension	N	STAFF
2/24/2015	Closed	IHS		N	HRC
2/23/2015	Approved	ADC	Relocation of rear (east) 2nd story wall to the east to align with the bearing wall below.	N	STAFF
2/23/2015	Denied	Appeal	Appeal of 43 Esplanade ARB approval	N	PC
2/19/2015	Open	UP	To continue the residential use of a fourth dwelling unit to permit multiple dwelling in the R-4 district subject to securing a use permit.	N	PC
2/18/2015	Approved	AUP	application for the on-site sale of beer and wine	N	STAFF
2/17/2015	Approved	AP & AVAR	Garage and bathroom remodel, atrium and window additions	N	ARB
2/5/2015	In Review	AP	Reconstruction of a third-story deck on an existing three-story, five-unit complex. New railings on the existing second story deck.	N	ARB

2/5/2015	Withdrawn	TPD	Request to remove a 9" limb of a Coast Live Oak tree because it interferes with construction of a new roofline	N	ARB
2/4/2015	Withdrawn	AUP	accessory structures category 2	Y	STAFF
2/3/2015	Approved	ADC	Design Change	Y	STAFF
2/2/2015	Approved	ADC	Design Change - Smooth siding to textured siding	N	ARB
1/28/2015	Approved	AUP	Catering Events with wine and	Y	STAFF
1/23/2015	Approved	AP	new residence	N	ARB
1/21/2015	In Review	LLA	lot line adjustment of 7 x 30 feet	Y	
1/20/2015	Approved	AP/AUP	91 square foot addition to the	N	ARB
1/8/2015	Approved	AAP	addition of 177 sf and 220 sf garage	N	STAFF
1/6/2015	Approved	AP	Addition of second story including a small dack, and small additions to the existing single-story footprint.	N	PC
1/5/2015	Approved	AP	1/2 Bath addition to 2nd flr.	N	ARB
12/18/2014	Approved	AP	Minor addition to an existing	N	ARB
12/16/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
12/16/2014	In Review	AP &	Kitchen and master suite	N	ARB
12/10/2014	Appealed	PM	Subdividing one lot into two.	Y	CC
12/9/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
12/4/2014	Set for	AP	Create 2 openings in existing	N	STAFF
12/2/2014	Approved	AAP	Bathroom Addition to a	Y	STAFF
12/2/2014	Approved	AP	2nd story addition	N	ARB
12/1/2014	Approved	AP	Addition to rear of the house on the 2nd story	Y	ARB
11/24/2014	Approved	AP	491 square foot bedroom and	N	ARB
11/13/2014	Approved	AAP	Addition of front porch to an	N	STAFF
11/13/2014	Approved	AP	Main floor expansion of a master bedroom and bathroom	N	ARB
11/4/2014	Approved	AP	357 square foot single story addition to an existing single story residence.	N	ARB
11/3/2014	Approved	AP	Add roof dormer, windows, 2nd story balcony to existing	Y	ARB

10/27/2014	Set for Hearing	UP-A	Pt. Pinos Grill - Beer & wine license to a full liquor license in association with a an existing	N	CC
10/16/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
10/9/2014	Closed	IHS	IHS		HRC
10/9/2014	Approved	PUU	permit of undocumented unit	N	STAFF
10/7/2014	Approved	HPP & AP	New Garage and siding	Y	ARB
10/6/2014	Approved	UP, HPP	Use Permit (UP) and Historic Preservation Permit (AP) 14-524 to allow the construction of a single-story addition to an existing single-family residence	Y	PC
10/6/2014	Approved	VAR	Variance to allow 10 foot encroachment into a 10 foot side yard setback to allow a single story addition to the rear and side of the existing single-	N	PC
10/1/2014	Approved	AP	Construct lower level addition, replace existing deck and stairs, and construct upper level bathroom addition with balcony.	Y	ARB
9/29/2014	Approved	IHS &	Upgrade windows	N	ARB
9/22/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	
9/15/2014	Closed	IHS	IHS	N	STAFF
9/15/2014	Closed	IHS	IHS		
9/11/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	STAFF
9/10/2014	Approved	AP, HPP	Convert existing garage and shop to two-car garage and add 78 sq. foot addition to existing garage for woodworking shop.	Y	ARB
9/3/2014	In Review	AAP	addition of a carport	Y	STAFF
8/26/2014	Approved	AP	Demolish existing rear deck and	N	ARB
8/26/2014	Approved	AAP	Addiiton		STAFF
8/25/2014	In Review	UP, AP	Reestablish restaurant use and	N	PC
8/25/2014	Approved	PM, AP	Subdividing two parcels,	N	ARB
8/21/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
8/14/2014	Closed	AAP	Initial Historic Screeing		STAFF
8/6/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screeing		HRC
7/31/2014	Approved	AAP	Interior remodel, change 1 aluminum window to wood, change 1 aluminum window to a door.	Y	STAFF
7/31/2014	In Review	HDP	Demolition the Sinex/Eardley	Y	ARB

7/30/2014	Approved	AAP	Exterior work including a new deck and entryway in the front and side of the home. The only changes to the main dwelling are changing 2 existing windows to doors.	Y	STAFF
7/28/2014	In Review	AP	New construction of home with	Y	ARB
7/23/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	STAFF
7/23/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
7/17/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
7/17/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	STAFF
7/16/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
7/14/2014	Withdrawn	AP	ARB approval for lower level stone veneer siding	N	STAFF
7/14/2014	Approved	UP, AP	Construct one vivarium approximately 908 square feet in size for permanent placement in rear yard of the Museum of Natural History to be used as a seasonal butterfly pavilion and events and associated site improvements and museum uses.	Y	PC
7/7/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
6/24/2014	Approved	AUP	Beer and Wine sales at Juice & Java		STAFF
6/24/2014	Approved	AP	Agassiz Beach Stair Renewal	N	ARB
6/18/2014	Approved	AP	E-Shop siding and systems	Y	ARB
6/17/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
6/9/2014	Approved	AP, A-VAR	Remodel & Addition of 1445 square feet to create a 2,354 square foot house.	N	ARB
6/9/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
6/5/2014	Closed	IHS	Minor subdivision to convert existing motel units into 2 duplexes and one single family	N	STAFF
6/4/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	STAFF
6/3/2014	Approved	AP	Design Change - Replace stucco with horizontal siding, enlarge front covered porch and place stone facade along the lower level siding.		ARB
5/27/2014	Approved	AAP	New 128 deck in the rear. 41/2 feet above grade	Y	SPRC
5/21/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC

5/21/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	STAFF
5/21/2014	Closed	IHS	Initial Historic Screening	N	HRC
5/19/2014	Approved	AAP	542 sq. ft. addition to the rear, 46 sq. ft. addition to the front of the home, addition of new carport.	N	STAFF
5/13/2014	In review	AP	1,103 SF attached two-story addition in the rear	N	ARB
5/12/2014	Approved	AP	build a hip roof over existing 2nd story deck	N	ARB
5/8/2014	Approved	AP	1st floor addition, new deck, new porch, 2nd floor addition, undergrounding of utilities. Less than 25% of walls demolished.	N	ARB
5/6/2014	Approved	AVAR, AAP	151 sq. ft. garage addition	N	STAFF

TABLE 1. PERMIT REVIEW ACTIVITY, MAY, 2014 - APRIL, 2015

PERMIT TYPE	STAFF	ARB	HRC	PC
AP/AAP (not on HRI)	7	14		1 , 1 appeal
AP/AAP (on HRI)	3	6		
Arch. Design Change, not HRI		1		
Arch. Design Change, HRI	3			
Historic Preservation Permit				
Historic Demolition Permit				
Historic Relocation Permit				
Initial Historic Screening	2		12	
Use Permit/Admin. Use Permit	7			2
Variance/Admin. Variance				1
AP & UP				1
AP & IHS		1		
AP & HPP		3		
HPP and UP				1



CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

Community Development Department – Planning Division

300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
T :: 831.648.3190 • F :: 831.648.3184 • www.ci.pg.ca.us/cdd

Initial Historic Screening Determination

Address: _____ APN: _____

Owner: _____ Applicant: _____

HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE (HRC) RECOMMENDATION:

At the _____ HRC meeting, the Committee prepared the following Preliminary Determination of Ineligibility and forwarded the recommendation to the Community Development Director:

- Determined to be ineligible as an “Historical Resource,” due to the following criteria:
 - 1. The property has undergone significant alterations to the primary or most visible façade, as evidenced through original plans, photographs or Sanborn maps.
 - _____ (description of known alteration)
 - _____ (type of documentation)
 - 2a. The property does not exhibit the architectural characteristics of the styles described in Section 7.3 of the General Plan or Section IV of the Historic Context Statement;
 - or
 - 2b. The property does not exhibit unique architectural, site or locational characteristics.
 - 3. The property is not associated with important persons, events or architecture.
- Determination of ineligibility cannot be made.

HRC Comments:

Maureen Mason, HRC Chair

Date

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR (CDD) DETERMINATION:

Based on the recommendation above, the CDD Director, or their designee:

- Made a determination of ineligibility, which will remain in effect for 5 years from the date of approval.
- Found that a determination of ineligibility cannot be made, and a Phase 1 Historic Assessment is required.

Anastazia Aziz, AICP, Planning Staff (Designee)

Date



CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

Community Development Department – Planning Division

300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950

T :: 831.648.3190 • F :: 831.648.3184 • www.ci.pg.ca.us/cdd

Permit & Request Application

for Initial Historic Screening (IHS)

6b

An Initial Historic Screening (IHS) is a preliminary step that may or may not rule out the need for a Phase 1 Historic Assessment. If the property is considered to be ineligible for listing on the City's Historic Resources Inventory (HRI), a Preliminary Determination of Ineligibility will be prepared by the Historic Resources Committee (HRC). The HRC will forward its recommendation to the Chief Planner as to whether a Phase 1 Historic Assessment should be prepared. The Chief Planner will either 1) issue a Final Notice of Ineligibility, or 2) determine that a Phase 1 Historic Assessment is required. The Chief Planner has final authority as to whether or not a Phase 1 Historic Assessment will be required.

Submittal Requirements:

1. Signed and dated CDD Permit
2. Copies of any original information pertaining to the subject property, available to the owner (original plans, photographs, original deed, name of original owner, name of original builder, etc.). Any information or documentation that you can supply will help minimize processing time.

PLEASE NOTE: If an IHS request is made on or before the 15th of the month, the Preliminary Determination of Ineligibility will be placed on the following month's HRC meeting agenda. The HRC meets on the 2nd Wednesday of each month, as needed.

Determining the Historic Significance of a Structure

Under state law, all structures 50 years of age or older, and not listed on the National or State Historic Registers, or the City of Pacific Grove HRI, must be evaluated as to its historic significance prior to an owner moving forward with exterior alterations to the structure. The City of Pacific Grove has the following methods for determining the historic significance of a structure.

IHS Request

The quickest and least costly method is to request an IHS by filling out the form on the opposite side of this page and submitting it, along with a nominal fee, to CDD. Requests received by the 15th of the month will be scheduled for the following month's HRC meeting agenda. The HRC meets on the second Wednesday of the month. At the HRC meeting, the Committee will make one of two possible decisions:

1. The structure is ineligible as a Historic Resource. No Phase 1 Historic Assessment will be required as part of a subsequent development application; or
2. A determination of ineligibility cannot be made. A Phase 1 Historic Assessment will be required before moving forward with any exterior alterations to the structure.

Historic Determination with Phase 1 Historic Assessment

If the IHS process concludes that a determination of ineligibility cannot be made, a Phase 1 Historic Assessment will need to be prepared, and submitted with either a Historic Determination application – or - if the Phase 1 Historic Assessment for the property indicates that the existing structure is ineligible for listing on the National, State and City of Pacific Grove HRI, you may opt to take the Phase 1 Historic Assessment, along with proposed plans for exterior alterations, directly to the ARB for consideration. However, if the ARB has questions or concerns regarding the Phase 1 Historic Assessment, they have the authority to refer the item to the HRC for a final determination of historic status.

Once a Historic Determination application, fee, and materials have been submitted to CDD, the item will be assigned to a Planner for review. Applications deemed complete by the last day of the month will be placed on the following month's HRC meeting agenda. At the HRC meeting, the Committee will make one of two possible determinations:

1. The structure is eligible for listing on the City's HRI. Action will be taken at the meeting to formally add the structure to the HRI in accordance with Section 23.76.030 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code; or
2. The structure is not eligible for listing on the HRI. A development application may be processed without further historic review.

Pursuant to Code Section 23.76.120, any person not satisfied with an action of the HRC may appeal such action to the City Council. An appeal must be filed with CDD within ten calendar days of the HRC action.



City of Pacific Grove Guidelines for Historic Assessments

Overview

A historic assessment is a survey and evaluation that is used to determine the significance of a building, site, object or structure. The survey contains a description of the building, site, object or structure as well as information about its historical background and surrounding area.

Exemptions from Historic Assessment Requirements

Certain minor exterior modifications to structures that are 50 years of age or older are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and do not need a Historic Assessment. Accordingly, no Historic Assessment is required for projects where the exterior modifications solely consist of one or more of the following:

1. Restoration of existing historic elements (e.g., windows, doors);
2. Emergency repairs that involve in-kind materials or materials that match the historic appearance;
3. Re-roofing and gutter replacement with either in-kind materials or materials that match the historic appearance;
4. In-kind replacement of original historic windows if the City's Chief Building Official determines that the original windows are too deteriorated to restore;
5. Replacement of non-historic windows to match original historic windows in design and materials (if photo documentation is available for original windows);
6. Replacement of stairs/railings, doors and porches if the City's Chief Building Official determines that they are too deteriorated to restore. Replacement would need to be with in-kind materials or, if photo documentation is available, materials and design that match the historic appearance.
7. Repair or patching, with in-kind materials, individual areas of historic exterior siding if the City's Chief Building Official determines that the original siding is too deteriorated to restore.

Initial Historic Screenings

In the event a property is over 50 years old, but is of an undetermined historic status, the property may undergo an Initial Historic Screening hearing held by the Historic Resources Committee. If the Committee decides the property may qualify for the City's Historic Resources Inventory, the California Register of Historic Resources or the National Register of Historic Places, the applicant is required to prepare a Phase I by a qualified historic consultant.

Qualified Historic Consultants

A qualified consultant must prepare the Historic Assessment. The California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) maintains a list of qualified historic consultants. This list is available at <http://chrisinfo.org/>

Phase One Historic Assessment

The Pacific Grove Community Development Department requires an applicant hire a qualified historic consultant to prepare a Phase One Assessment when a project has the potential to affect a building, site, object or structure that is 50 years of age or older. The assessment will determine if a resource is historic by using criteria from the National Register of Historic Places, the California

Register of Historic Resources and Pacific Grove's Historic Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 23.76). If it is determined that a resource is eligible for listing under one or more of the above sources, then a Phase Two Assessment is triggered.

An applicant must submit (3) administrative draft copies of a Phase One Historic Assessment. Submission requirements vary based on the consultant's findings as follows:

- Not Significant - submit a letter stating why the property is not historic, citing local, state and federal criteria to support the finding.
- Significant w/o Integrity – submit a completed DPR 523a and DPR 523b (Primary Record and Building, Structure, Object Record) with a cover letter that addresses the 7 specific aspects of integrity and which of the seven have been lost and why.
- Significant – submit a completed DPR 523a and DPR 523b (Primary Record and Building, Structure, Object Record) with a cover letter stating at what level (local, state or national) the resource is significant and the applicable criteria. On DPR 523b, section B10, address integrity and list the character defining features of the resource.

Phase Two Historic Assessment

A Phase Two Assessment, prepared by a qualified historic consultant, provides a more detailed evaluation of the resource and examines how a project will affect its significance. In addition, a Phase Two Assessment should provide potential mitigation measures for consideration by the City to reduce impacts to a level of insignificance, if possible, or a clear statement that the proposal will cause a significant impact to the resource which cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. If a property is listed or has been determined eligible for listing on the National or California Registers or is listed on the Pacific Grove Historic Resource Inventory, a Phase Two Assessment is automatically required.

An applicant must submit three (3) administrative draft copies of a Phase Two Historic Assessment. The assessment should be written in a narrative tone. All material facts, such as the date of construction, must contain references to sources of information. The assessment must contain subheadings and page numbers for clarity and organization. Maps, photographs and figures should be labeled and integrated with the text of the assessment or assembled in an appendix. Staff will review the administrative draft copies and forward comments to the consultant. The consultant must address the Department's comments before the historic assessment will be accepted and used for environmental review.

Format Requirements

A Phase Two Historic Assessment must conform to the following format:

A. Title Page

A title page is required that contains the (1) name and address of the property, (2) the name and address of the applicant, (3) the name and address of the consultant and (4) the completion date of the report.

B. Table of Contents

A table of contents is required that indicates the page numbers of each of the items from Section C through I below.

C. Introduction

The introduction should include, but not be limited to, the (1) name of property owner and applicant, (2) address of proposed project, (3) Assessor's Parcel Number(s) of the property, (4) description of the proposed project, (5) current use of the property, (6) names of the firm, principal and staff preparing the assessment and each of their professional qualifications, (7) beginning and completion dates of the assessment, (8) description of the research procedures used to prepare the assessment, and (9) current listing of the property on the National Register, California Register or Pacific Grove Historic Resource Inventory.

D. Historical Background

The historical background should contain, but not be limited to, the (1) location map of the property drawn to scale with a north arrow, (2) historical context of the study area, and (3) historical development of the property including facts concerning ownership, subdivision, construction dates, occupants and uses of the property, (4) identify the period of significance. The assessment should concisely describe the historical background of the resource from the Spanish Period (1777-1822) to the present. Omission of facts during major periods is not acceptable.

E. Description of the Historic Resource

The description of the historic resource should concisely describe:

- (1) the physical appearance and condition of the buildings, structures, objects and natural features on the subject site. Small, specific areas of investigative demolition (with prior building department approval) are encouraged in order to understand the areas of concern beneath current finishes. These areas of concern include: Siding, both existing and any siding hidden below existing, wall structure, sheathing and waterproofing, roof structure, condition of architectural features including chimneys, porches and railings, decorative trims and brackets, windows, window trim, and doors. Unpermitted work conducted on HRI structures may have penalties levied on the subject property pursuant to [PGMC §23.76.130](#) and may result in additional public hearings, a stop work order "red tag", correction notice, fines and/or other associated delays.
- (2) the architectural style and character defining features of the exterior of the historic resource. A list of "character defining historic features" of the structure shall be included and will include those features that are intended to be retained, modified, or demolished and replaced. Potentially qualifying elements includes, but is not limited to: Roof structure and rafter tails, wall structure and waterproofing, historic siding and exterior finish materials, historic windows, doors, bay windows, window trims, decorative trims, brackets, braces, moldings, railings, stairways, decking, porches, chimneys and period-defining site features such as retaining walls, fences and trellises. Photographs of each facade of the resources are required.

F. Evaluation for Significance

The evaluation for significance must include completed historic evaluations using the following criteria:

- (1) National Register of Historic Places
- (2) California Register of Historic Resources
- (3) Pacific Grove Historic Resource Inventory

For each set of criteria, the assessment should analyze the historic background and description of the resource to determine if it qualifies for listing on any of the above. In addition, the assessment must evaluate the resource's potential to contribute to a district comprised of similar resources in the area. A district is composed of a significant

concentration of sites or buildings conveying a visual sense of the overall historic environment or an arrangement of historically or functionally related properties. Conclusions should be based on an objective analysis of the information presented in the assessment.

G. Impacts of the Proposed Project

The impacts of the proposed project should describe how the project would affect the historic resource. It should contain a (1) project description, (2) site plan and floor plans, and (3) an analysis of the affects of the proposed project on the historic resource. If the resource is part of a district, the analysis should also discuss impacts to other contributing properties in the district.

H. Mitigation

Mitigation should include feasible measures that would either avoid or reduce the affects of the proposed project. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, use of (1) the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Structures, (2) the State Historic Building Code, (3) project alternatives, (4) documentation using the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) or alternative standards, (5) an educational exhibit for public use, (6) salvage of building elements, and (7) relocation of the structure.

I. Appendices

The appendices must contain (1) bibliography of the literature cited and persons consulted, (2) documents related to the history of the subject property such as historic photos, articles, letters and diagrams, and (3) completed State Historic Resources Evaluation Forms (DPR 523a & b). If the property is listed on the Pacific Grove Historic Resource Inventory and no DPR 523a & b forms were prepared as part of that listing, the documentation used to list the property will suffice.

CEQA and Historic Resources

The proposed project plan set and supplemental reports are used to determine whether a project will have a significant effect on a historic resource as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Government Code Section 15300.2(f).

If a project will not have a significant effect on the environment, the Community Development Department will prepare an Exemption or Negative Declaration for consideration and approval by the appropriate hearing body.

If a project will have a significant effect on the environment, mitigation measures may be implemented to reduce the impacts to the resource to a level that is considered less than significant. The Community Development Department will then prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration for consideration and approval by the appropriate hearing body.

In the event that impacts are so great that mitigation measures cannot be implemented to reduce the impact to a less than significant level, the Community Development Department will require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). A project will have a significant effect on a historic resource if it demolishes, or substantially alters a resource listed or eligible for listing on the National Register, California Register or Pacific Grove Historic Resource Inventory.

TO: Historic and Design Review Process Evaluation Committee

FROM: Robert Huitt, Chair

MEETING: May 26, 2015

SUBJECT: Item 7. Consideration of Alternative Structures

Our committee has been asked to examine alternative structures and assignment of responsibilities for board and commission review of permit applications, particularly the duties of the Architectural Review Board and Historic Resources Committee, and make recommendations to the City Council and Planning Commission.

The main alternatives are:

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.

In assessing the relative advantages and disadvantages of alternatives, we should consider issues such as the following:

- 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.

I recommend that the Committee conduct a thorough discussion of the alternatives, based on objective, identified criteria. My goal would be to achieve consensus on a recommendation, one that represents an optimal solution as judged from the multiple perspectives represented on the Committee.