



MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE AD HOC COMMITTEE

4:00 pm, Monday, February 10, 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. Present: Bill Kampe (Chair), Michael Meloy, James McCord, Mark Travaille,
 - b. Joined in progress: Jeanne Byrne (Alternate), Jean Anton
 - c. Absent: Robert Huitt
3. **Approval of January 27, 2014 minutes**
 - a. Approved (4-0)
4. **Public Comments**
 - a. With apologies, there were several inputs, but notes not taken.

(Jeanne Byrne, Jean Anton joined the meeting)
5. **Discuss Problem or Goal Statement – What are we trying to make better?**
 - a. We discussed the question of whether to create a problem statement or a goal statement for the ad hoc committee. The preference was for a goal statement. We considered 2 approaches – a brief 3 point statement of goals, or a longer problem statement that also suggested solutions. Goal statement adopted by consensus is:

Goal Statement Approach
 - We must reduce the time, cost, and complexity for historic determinations, both for additions and deletions
 - We must improve the clarity and of our processes for historic determinations and for project applications, especially the criteria used for decisions.
 - We must create equitable benefits and constraints from our historical review processes to maintain the intended character of our city while allowing reasonable enhancements to our built environment.
 - b. The longer problem statement is attachment 1.
 - c. The overall view was that the shorter Goal Statement above will simplify communication, while the longer statement provides a richer and more nuanced description of our situation.
6. **Discuss Historic Status Determination Process and Criteria; list possible areas of change**, e.g. HRC making more determinations without consultant reports; Modification

of Evaluation Criteria to align with State and National Register; multi-category historicity; linkage to Historical Context Statement; delisting procedure; other?

- a. We have public input and brief discussion by the committee. The primary exercise used post-its to collect specific suggestion of possible action. This approach integrates public input directly into the process with equal weight to the committee inputs. After posting all inputs on the wall, the committee sorted the inputs in groups of similar topics. The full listing of inputs is listed in Attachment 2.
- b. The committee noted that several recommendations emerged with a degree of strong conviction. Others clearly would need further examination.
- c. The action category headings are (the 3 in bold are the strong common themes):
 - i. Benefit/Constraints
 - ii. National Register Framework**
 - iii. Empower HRC and Staff**
 - iv. Expertise / Consistency / Documentation**
 - v. Review Resources Broadly, or as they arise?
 - vi. Other
- d. Note that at this point we are focused on the historic determination process. We could adjust our outlook as we move to the question of the project approval process.

7. Next Steps and Timetable for completion and schedule of meetings.

- a. We choose to suspend meetings until CDD staffing is adequate for meeting the workload of that department.

8. Adjournment.

- a. Adjourned at 5:30pm

Attachments

1. Long form problem statement that was distributed and discussed
2. Results of the Post-it exercise

<p><i>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.</i></p>

Attachment 1

Historic Preservation Ordinance Ad Hoc Committee

Problem Statement

Pacific Grove has adopted historic preservation policies that reflect the high value the community places on our unique architectural and cultural heritage, and has incorporated the policies into the General Plan and Municipal Code. Much of the responsibility for implementing the policies – determining which historic resources should be preserved, and how – is delegated to citizen commissions appointed by the City Council and authorized to make decisions. This community-based approach to historic preservation with active citizen participation is appropriate for Pacific Grove and should be continued.

The problems with the historic preservation ordinance are not with its goals or objectives, but with some aspects of how it functions.

1. Property owners' experience with historic preservation requirements is too often a negative one, sometimes costly, drawn-out and confusing. The City needs to do a better job of making clear the implications of having property listed on the Historic Resources Inventory, and to maximize the benefits of historic designation while minimizing the costs and eliminating unnecessary burdens.
2. Despite best intentions, mistakes are sometimes made, resulting in the loss of a significant resource or the designation of a property as historic that shouldn't be. The number of wrong historic preservation decisions needs to be reduced by adhering closely to adopted criteria and guidelines.
3. Responsibilities for making decisions are currently scattered and in some cases not understood by everyone in the same way. The City needs the HRC to be the primary decision-making body for all historic preservation issues, including additions to and deletions from the Historic Resources Inventory and approving permits for demolitions, alterations and additions.
4. There are deficiencies in the Historic Resources Inventory that need to be addressed, including limited documentation of some properties. Current efforts are underway to make the HRI a more reliable and useful database and they should continue.

Attachment 2

HPO Ad Hoc Committee, February 10, 2014

Results of Post-It Exercise for Historic Determination Improvement Opportunities

Benefit/Constraints

Clarify benefits versus constraints for historic properties

Add incentive thru "Mills Act" tax credits available to property owners

Consider mills act incentive for property owners

Flexibility – multi circumstances

Consider more than a single class of historical

Not too exact – need wiggle room

Factors

- Age of building
- Verified building permits, from original builds
- Community integrity

Go with intent of process – not the "letter of the law"

National Register Framework

Use significance/integrity for criteria

National Register criteria

Need criteria that establish that the resource has some significant historical importance

Substantial evidence of eligibility

Rely more on national and state criteria and less on local criteria

Use Historic Context Statement as reference in criteria

Empower HRC and Staff

[need] Inexpensive way to remove a property from the HRI

Architect statement of project meeting Sec. of Int Standards review by HRC

Empower HRC to make deletions to (from) list

Give HRC authority for all HRI decisions (add, delete, project approval, etc.)

Delegate more decisions to HRC re determinations

Initial staff review for ? or off consideration using DPR

Homeowner must be allowed to participate in the historic assessment process

Give the HRC more responsibilities

Concentrate Historic resource determinations & proposed changes thereto under the authority of one review board/committee

Make CEQA goes away except for major issues

Expertise / Consistency / Documentation

Need a process to ensure there is a consistency in application of the criteria

Whoever does historic assessments should have a certain level of expertise or experience whether paid or volunteer

Specify form to be used to document decisions

Develop a worksheet for staff to evaluate projects

Have 'dedicated' staff person interface with public & committee to assure consistency in process/communication

Good staff to talk to property owner

Delegate staff person to be the 'filter' for all historic resource related public questions to create continuity & clarity in the process

Review Resources Broadly, or as they arise?

Need to do a new review of all properties to review for inclusion/exclusion from the list

Other

Reduce application costs