



NOTICE OF MEETING

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

4:00 pm, Monday, January 27, 2014

Kuwatani Room, Community Center, 515 Junipero 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** – 4:00 pm
2. **Roll Call and introduction of members.**
 - a. Bill Kampe (Chair), Robert Huitt, Bill Fredrickson, Michael Meloy, James McCord, Jean Anton, Mark Travaille
3. **Approval of January 6, 2014 minutes**
4. **Public Comments**
5. **A Model for our Historic Preservation Processes (Robert Huitt)**
 - a. Framework
 - b. Key issues for discussion
6. **Statutory basis for decisions – CEQA, other state law, SOI, building code (Dave Laredo)**
 - a. Classification
 - b. Project approvals
7. **HPO Action Topics Continued– a consolidation (see attachment)**
 - a. Project review process and criteria
 - b. Committee Structure
 - c. Possible “2-tier” or similar distinctions in listed resources
8. **Next Steps**
9. **Timetable for completion and schedule of meetings.**
10. **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.



MINUTES

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

4:00 pm, Monday, January 6, 2014

City Manager's Conference Room, 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** at 4:00 pm
2. **Roll Call and introduction of members.**
Members Present: Bill Kampe (Chair), Robert Huitt, Bill Fredrickson, Michael Meloy, Jean Anton, Mark Travaille (arrived at 4:15)
3. **Approval of December 9, 2013 minutes**
Motion by Member Anton seconded by Member Meloy to approve the minutes. Motion carried 5-0-2 (Members Meloy and Travaille absent)
4. **Public Comments**
None
5. **Report Out**
 - a. **Benchmarking**
The Committee Members discussed the benchmarking data created by staff and Mayor Kampe. The committee members analyzed the differences between the historic process and inventory of Pacific Grove compared to Carmel, Capitola, Eureka, Alameda, Monterey, Pasadena, Ferndale, Palo Alto, Fresno, Carpinteria, Mill Valley, and Sebastopol.

Member Meloy described Ferndale's approach to historic preservation, specifically not individually listing properties, but determining a historic downtown district with contributing properties.

The Committee agreed that this benchmarking should be used to determine where Pacific Grove should fit compared to the other cities, and if it is more important to look at the past or the future. Member Huitt also noted that the benchmarking does not show the attitude of the community towards the historic preservation processes.
 - b. **Historic designation process and criteria**
The Committee discussed the biggest issues to address in the process. Mayor Kampe noted that time and money seems to be the biggest issue in the process. The Committee members discussed the differences between the process of additions/deletions for various cities, as well as any incentives for properties on the list.

6. **HPO Action Topics Continued– a consolidation (see attachment)**

a. ***Possible “2-tier” or similar distinctions in listed resources***

Members noted a consistency of other cities to have multi-tiered or district systems. Mayor Kampe noted a high density of Pacific Grove’s historic properties compared to all other cities. The committee discussed the discrepancies between multiple certified local governments, noting that it is not dictating how a city addresses its historic preservation process.

b. **Project review process and criteria**

Member Huitt proposed that we begin actively deleting properties that should not be on the list. The Committee discussed adding an option during all projects to be considered for deletion from the inventory.

A member of the public asked how CEQA will effect additions and deletions and if volunteers are able to make decisions regarding properties that should be deleted. Member Meloy noted a memo from the City Attorney Dave Laredo regarding CEQA deletions.

The Committee discussed the consistency of many cities to follow the national and state guideline as the criteria for the historic resources inventory.

Member Meloy brought up the question of what would happen if the historic process disengages from the word “integrity.” Member Huitt responded with the idea of viewing the word as a changing variable, and asked the question of how we can incorporate a changing variable into the criteria.

c. **Committee Structure**

Member Anton asked if it is more important to look at the past or the future in regards to benchmarking and cleaning up in the historic resources inventory. Member Frederickson stated the committee needs to identify problems before they can find any solutions.

7. **Next Steps**

Next meeting Monday, January 27, 2014 at 4pm in the City Managers Conference Room, 2nd Floor, City Hall

8. **Timetable for completion and schedule of meetings.**

Member Travialle asked about the future of the committee. Mayor Kampe explained that the committee will report to both the City Council and the Planning Commission before any ordinances are passed.

9. **Adjournment – 5:33pm**

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.

MEMO

To: Historic Preservation Ordinance Ad Hoc Committee
From: Councilmember Robert Huitt
Meeting Date: January 27, 2014
Subject: Historic Preservation in Pacific Grove

Policy

Preservation of historic resources is official PG policy, incorporated in the General Plan and Municipal Code.

Implementation

The policy is implemented by (a) determining which properties should be designated as historic resources and (b) regulating the development of those properties differently on account of their historic designation. A key element of implementation is the Historic Resources Inventory, the list of properties that are deemed historic.

Who Decides

Decisions regarding historic designation and development permits for historic resources are made by Council-appointed citizen commissions. The Historic Resources Commission decides which properties should have historic status; the Architectural Review Board decides what alterations to allow or prohibit, and whether to permit demolition. City staff, paid consultants and the Heritage Society play significant supporting roles.

Basis for Decisions

The Municipal Code dictates that these decisions are to be based on specified criteria, particularly those enumerated in M.C 23.76.025, but also the Secretary of Interior's Standards and the City's Architectural Design Guidelines.

As Experienced by Property Owners

Historic status partly determines what people who want to develop their property are allowed to do, the processes they are required to follow, and the fees they have to pay. Some, but not all, of these requirements are spelled out in the Municipal Code.

For owners of buildings that are on the HRI, restrictions and provisions for special exceptions are in M.C. 23.76.080, Additions and alterations; 090, Demolitions; and 060, Incentive – Exceptions to land use regulations. In the case of buildings not on the inventory but 50 years old or older the City requires a multi-step assessment of historical significance that is not fully specified in the Municipal Code. Buildings less than 50 years old are generally unaffected.

Question for the Committee

Which parts of this need to be changed, fixed, eliminated or dealt with in some way?

Suggested Changes for the Committee to Consider

1. Clarify the statutory basis for policies and practices, such as the 50-year rule and requirements for Phase 1, Phase 2, use of consultants, etc. Incorporate all requirements into the Municipal Code, by reference when appropriate.
2. Make processes, such as historic assessment, less costly and lengthy for applicants.
3. Modify criteria rules for listing on the HRI, resulting in a two-category system:
(1) PG Originals – all structures built before 1927 that have not been substantially altered, and (2) Other buildings that are at least 50 years old, have not been substantially altered, and are deemed significant by at least one of the criteria (in addition to integrity of the original design) listed in M.C. 23.76.025.
4. Assign to HRC all decisions regarding historic properties that are presently assigned to ARB.
5. Authorize HRC to initiate the process of removing properties from the Historic Resources Inventory.
6. Use the City's adopted Historic Context Statement as a guide to decision making.
7. Maintain and strengthen the Historic Resources Inventory as a database to support historic preservation decision making.