



MINUTES

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE AD HOC COMMITTEE

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. **Called to Order** – 4:05 pm

2. **Roll Call.**

Present: Bill Kampe (Chair), Robert Huitt, Bill Fredrickson, Michael Meloy, James McCord, Jean Anton, Mark Travaille

3. **Approval of January 6, 2014 minutes**

Motion by Member Huitt, seconded by Member Travaille to approve the minutes with minor corrections. Motion carried 7-0-0.

4. **Public Comments**

A member of the public asked for clear identification of the problem(s) the Committee is attempting to address.

5. **Statutory basis for decisions – CEQA, other state law, Secretary of the Interior Standards, building code (Dave Laredo – City Attorney)**

City Attorney Laredo stated that CEQA statute is the core basis for evaluating historic resources and their potential significance. Awareness of the historic resource, and how it would be potentially affected needs to inform decisions and findings to support decisions.

The 50 year evaluation threshold appears to arise out of case law. In CEQA, if a resource, including a building, structure, or object is greater than 50 years old, if it presumed to have historic elements that need to be evaluated, documented and addressed.

Substantial evidence should support the evaluation of the specific potential resource. Any decision affecting the resource should take into account the evaluation and base the decision on credible facts and evidence. Each agency, or local government can have local guidelines to aid decision making.

Member Meloy stated the 50 year threshold is possibly derived from the 1906 Antiquities Act and that it indicates a potential or presumptive historic resource.

Member McCord reviewed the current Initial Historic Screening process and stated it was a fair, equitably applied, efficient mechanism to provide a defensible record of evaluation.

Member Fredrickson stated it puts on additional burden on the property owner and suggested additional staff or Historic Resources Committee training may be effective to streamline the process.

Member Kampe suggested reliable sources of information and trained staff to conduct the review may be helpful to streamline the process.

Member Fredrickson stated that the ordinance does not appear to require notification of the property owner for addition/deletion from the Historic Resources Inventory and the City should consider requiring notification of property addition/deletions as a courtesy.

Member Meloy noted that the City's local criteria for listing on the Inventory does not conform to the National Registry criteria, which is broader in definition and includes the terms object, structure, amongst others. He asked what could be included in the Inventory that is currently missing if the local definition was broadened and would outcomes differ? He suggested having a fuller discussion about bringing the local criteria in line with the National Register criteria.

6. A Model for our Historic Preservation Processes (Robert Huitt)

Member Huitt discussed his suggested Framework including key issues for discussion (attached). He recommended the following:

- i. using the Context Statement to evaluate properties and to aid in determining any impacts of potential changes;
- ii. allow the HRC to remove properties from the HRI that don't meet the criteria;
- iii. modify the evaluation criteria in S. 23.76.025 to align with the National Register standards.

Member Meloy stated that the proposed recommendations are very similar to the Certified Local Government streamlining process. He also stated that a property being on the list is a benefit to the community, but queried whether it was a benefit to the property owner. He also stated that the City's current criteria are overly broad and suggested the Committee explore applying differing levels of evaluation criteria depending on the resource and its level of historical significance.

Member Travaille stated that a property's owner experience is not always negative and that historic preservation is good for the City and the Committee should find a way to make it a better experience. It should be a fair, yet uncomplicated and unburden some process.

Member McCord also stated that the Building Official also plays a role and should also be considered, particularly when potentially eligible or historic properties are demolished due to neglect.

Recommendation Summary

1. *Train staff to conduct initial screening and Phase 2 reports to streamline the process;*
2. *Consider requiring notification of property addition/deletions as a courtesy;*
3. *Conduct a full discussion about bringing the local criteria in line with the National Register criteria;*
4. *Use the Context Statement to evaluate properties and to aid in determining any impacts of potential changes;*
5. *Allow the HRC to remove properties from the HRI that don't meet the existing criteria;*

6. *Modify the evaluation criteria in S. 23.76.025 to align with the National Register standards;*
 7. *Explore applying differing levels of evaluation criteria depending on the resource and it's level of historical significance*
7. **Next Steps**
Next meeting on Monday, February 10, 2014 at the Kuwatani Room, Community Center.
8. **Adjournment at 5:40pm.**

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.