



MINUTES - DRAFT

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE AD HOC COMMITTEE

4:00 pm, Monday, December 14, 2015

Council Chambers, City Hall, 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

2. Roll Call

- a. Present: Bill Kampe, Robert Huitt, Don Murphy, Mike Gunby, Maureen Mason, Rudy Munoz
- b. Absent: Jean Anton

3. Approval of Minutes

- a. Meeting of 11/30/2015 – Approved, 6-0-1 (Anton absent)

4. General Public Comment

- a. Comment by Mr. Tony Ciani showing example of a survey done in San Diego.

5. Review Proposed Wording Change on the Integrity Criterion (Mason/Anton)

- a. Maureen Mason present the results of the work by Mason/Anton. The recommendation was to include wording from and reference to the description of Integrity from the City's Historic Context statement. After discussion, the committee concluded that the seven key aspects of integrity should be itemized by attribute name in the definition of integrity in the PG HPO, with reference to the full discussion of integrity found in the Historic Context Statement.
- b. Based on the discussion, there are implications for how we interpret Integrity, both for historic interpretations and for project reviews. Integrity means much more than "not changed". Especially with respect to character defining features, the context statement links integrity of a single resource to the character defining features of similar resources of a neighborhood or the city. It also implies that integrity can be maintained even if a particular feature, e.g. a window, is moved or altered yet still is consistent with the character-defining aspects of the resource/building.

6. HPO Topics for Discussion

- Multi-tier historicity; What distinguishes tiers? Benefits / constraints / documentation
 - Tony Ciani commented with an analogy to a sieve that separates the most important resources from other resources.
 - We discussed the question of whether some properties are more important than others in representing the history and heritage of the city. The working conclusion was "yes".

- In terms of a top tier of historicity, we looked at the current resources on the National Register. Resources on the National Register are classified as significant at the local, state, or national level. The consensus of the committee was that the National or State Register process would be suitable for selecting top tier resources. We noted that the National Register process uses specific criteria for Significance and for Integrity consistent with the period of significance. A consultant may be helpful for identifying the top tier resources, in addition to our current National register resources.
- An additional suggestion was that we be clear about what we are trying to accomplish with any differential distinctions in level of historicity. For the top level, the suggestion was that our goal is to “Ensure the Preservation of our most important properties (or resources)”
- The committee looked at the implication for remaining resources. The working conclusion is that the local HRI has the goal to “Preserve the character of our city in the character of these locally significant resources.”
- We considered any incentives that might be useful to help insure that property owners actually preserve their historic properties. We do not have a specific menu of incentives to recommend at this point, but are aware that other cities have been able to specify particular advantages.
- Protecting “the collection” – districts, overlays, companion structures, etc.
 - We had a brief discussion on the idea of preservation districts and overlays.
 - Intent is sustainability (needs definition) while allowing renewal and modernization.
 - Mr. Rick Steres, public, described some of his experience in the historic determination and project review process.
- At this point we continued the remaining topics:
- Deletions – Comprehensive survey? Case by case? Who may initiate?

7. Comments on Benchmark Cities

- a. Anastazia has provided a comparison matrix from prior work.
- b. Each share highlights from another city’s approach to Historic Preservation

8. Schedule of meetings; Next Steps

- a. We set January 4 as the date for the next meeting.

9. Adjournment.

- a. We adjourned at 5:30 pm. Happy Holidays!

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.