



**Historical Resources Management Commission
Hattie Weber Museum – 445 C Street, Davis, California
Corner of 5th and C Streets in Central Park
Monday, January 24, 2011**

Commissioners Present: Rand Herbert (Chair), Richard Rifkin, Mark Beason (Vice Chair),
Gale Sosnick, Jonathon Howard, Stacy Epstein, Amanda Maples

Commissioners Absent: Clifton McFarland (excused)

Council Liaison: Stephen Souza

Staff Present: Ike Njoku, Anne Brunette, and Catherine McCort

1. Call to Order. Chairperson Herbert called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. Approval of Agenda

Action: Commissioner Rifkin moved, seconded by Commissioner Sosnick, to approve the agenda. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Herbert, Beason, Rifkin, Sosnick, Howard, Epstein, Maples

NOES: None

ABSENT: McFarland

3. Induction of New Commissioners. No new commissioner to be inducted.

4. Approval of Minutes.

Action: Commissioner Howard moved, seconded by Commissioner Epstein, to approve the December 13, 2010 minutes. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Herbert, Beason, Rifkin, Howard, Epstein

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: Sosnick and Maples

ABSENT: McFarland

5. Public Communications. None.

6. Written Communications. Staff Liaison Njoku circulated written communications.

7. Museum Report. Hattie Weber Museum Director Jim Becket reported that the Davis Enterprise ran an article on the revitalization of the Hattie Weber Museum. He reported that

the museum had exhibited a re-created 1890s Christmas which included gifts for visiting children. The museum's other recent exhibits include a Martin Luther King Jr. and the Freedom Rides exhibit. Additionally the Yolo County Historical Society also gave a presentation about the Freedom Rides.

8. **Staff, Council Liaison, and Commissioner, Comments.** Commissioner Rifkin reminded the Commission about the upcoming Hillel House project; noting there was a newspaper advertisement offering the buildings for relocation. Commissioners discussed that it was brought to the Commission attention regarding the project application being processed and the Commission had no interest in re-visiting the project.

9. **Public Hearing.**

A. 602 D Street: Planning Application #27-10 for Certification of Appropriateness #04-10 and Design Review #11-10 for the Property Located at 602 D Street (Grady House)

Staff Liaison Njoku presented the City staff report recommending that the Commission determine that the project is categorically exempt from further environmental review and to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness #04-10. Project architect Mathew Piner presented the renovation plans to the Commission. Home owner Richard Robins emphasized the architect's specialization is basement renovations and their desire to maintain the integrity of the house. Community member Steve Tracy, the president of the Old North Davis Neighborhood Association, stated that the unofficial discussion among the neighbors was supportive of this project. Community member Dennis Dingemans, vice chair of the Old North Davis Neighborhood Association, agreed with Steve Tracy's assessment of the feelings of the neighborhood. The Commission discussed the proposed project and certificate of appropriateness, and asked questions of City staff and project proponents. The Commission recommended re-using materials and replacing damaged materials in-kind. City staff will continue to work with the property owners on the design of the fence. Commissioner Epstein left at 7:25 due to family reasons.

Action: Commissioner Rifkin moved, seconded by Vice-Chairperson Beason, to accept City staff's recommendation that the project is categorically exempt from further environmental review under Section 15301(a), which exempts minor alterations to existing structures and Section 15331 for the rehabilitation of a historical resource in a manner consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Herbert, Beason, Rifkin, Sosnick, Howard, Maples
NOES: None
ABSENT: McFarland, Epstein

Action: Commissioner Sosnick moved, seconded by Commissioner Howard, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness #04-10 based on the findings and

subject to the conditions of approval. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Herbert, Beason, Rifkin, Sosnick, Howard, Maples

NOES: None

ABSENT: McFarland and Epstein

B. Historical Significance Determination for the Central Park Master Plan Update

City staff person Anne Brunette presented the PAR Environmental Services Inc. report and City staff's recommendation to agree with the report finding that the Central Park WPA Bathroom does not constitute a significant historical resource subject to CEQA review pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21084.1. Community member and Hattie Weber Museum Director Jim Becket stated that the WPA was very important as a social mechanism. He added that the building is ugly but could be changed and repurposed without being destroyed. Community member Dennis Dingemans stated that he felt the important thing was whether the building stays, that it ought to be included in the Central Park redesign.

Action: Commissioner Howard moved, seconded by Commissioner Rifkin, to concur with the report that the restroom building does not constitute a significant historical resource subject to CEQA review pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21084.1. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Herbert, Beason, Rifkin, Sosnick, Howard, Maples

NOES: None

ABSENT: McFarland and Epstein

Community member and Hattie Weber Museum Director Jim Becket stated that the proposed plaque recognizing the WPA building should be located in Central Park, not in the Hattie Weber Museum. The Commission directed City staff to incorporate the plaque into the plan for the Historic Plaza and to provide that plan to the Commission for review. The Commission also directed that the original report should be donated to the Hattie Weber Museum.

10. **Adjournment.** The next meeting will be February 28, 2011 at the Hattie Weber Museum (445 C Street) at 7:00 PM. Chairperson Herbert announced he will be unable to attend the meeting of February 28, 2011. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Action: Commissioner Howard moved, seconded by Commissioner Maples, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed by the following vote.

AYES: Herbert, Beason, Rifkin, Sosnick, Howard, Maples,

NOES: None

ABSENT: McFarland and Epstein



Minutes
Historical Resources Management Commission
Hattie Weber Museum – 445 C Street, Davis, California
(Corner of 5th and C Streets in Central Park)
Monday, February 28, 2011

Commissioners Present: Richard Rifkin, Mark Beason (Vice Chair), Clifton McFarland, Gale Sosnick, Jonathon Howard, Stacy Epstein, Amanda Maples

Commissioners Absent: Rand Herbert (excused)

Council Liaison: Stephen Souza

Staff Present: Ike Njoku and Anne Brunette

1. **Call to Order.** Vice Chairperson Beason called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.
2. **Approval of Agenda.** Agenda was approved.
3. **Induction of New Commissioners.** This item was an oversight, and was removed from the Agenda.
4. **Approval of Minutes.** Copying error resulted in a missing page three of the minutes. No action was taken. This item will return to the Commission for action on March 21, 2011.
5. **Public Communications.** None.
6. **Written Communications.** Written communications was circulated.
7. **Museum Report.** Moved to the end of the agenda as Mr. Beckett was yet not present.
8. **Staff, Council Liaison, and Commissioner, Comments.** Council Liaison Souza explained that he would to leave to join the Natural Resources Commission (NRC) meeting that was going on at this same time. He explained that given the joint Council and NRC meeting tomorrow night and the water-rate issue that will be before the Council he had no choice. He noted that the meeting conflict occurs twice in a year; January and February due to holidays.

A copy of the booklet, E-500s People, was given to each Commissioner as requested by the Author John Lofland. The Commission asked staff to pass on its thanks to Author Lofland.

Project Management Coordinator Anne Brunette gave oral status update on the progress of the Tank house. She informed the Commission that the building has been relocated to the west side of the property, and that the next phase is the replacement in kind of the sidings as dry rot had rendered them useless. She concluded the presentation by reporting that there is lead paint

on the building, which will require special removal. Vice-chair Beason asked clarifying questions regarding when CEQA may be triggered if the city decided to demolish the building. Ms. Brunette answered that the Tank house demolition is an equal weight alternative. Commissioner Sosnick inquired of the status of the Mishka's Café new building. It was reported that the building is completed and opened for business last Sunday. Commission Rifkin mentioned that there is a sense at Council level that the building ought to be demolished given aesthetic concerns, and questioned if the Council could decide to demolish the building. Ms. Brunette explained the equal weight alternative process and indicated that the Council could decide to demolish it. Commissioners asked if the relocation was a mitigation measure, which staff did not know the answer. However, Ms. Brunette indicated that given the equal weight alternative analysis, the Council could decide to demolish. Rifkin commented on the financial aspect of the project. Ms. Brunette informed the Commission that if demolition is the Council decision, there still will be expenses associated with removal of the lead and re-conditioning of the site where the building is now relocated. There was further discussion of this item. Commissioner McFarland made a motion that the March 21, 2011 Agenda include an item to obtain a sense of the Commission on the status of the Tank house. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Maples. The Commission approved the motion unanimously.

9. Public Meeting. 337 D Street: Planning Application #8-09, Preapplication #1-09, to Provide Applicant Input and Direction on the Proposed Replacement Project for the Property Located at 337 D Street, Commonly Known as the Pena House.

Staff Liaison Njoku presented the city staff report and explained the purpose of the preapplication, which is to provide the proponents input on the intended replacement project. He explained that the input provided is not binding, but should be in good faith to give the applicant a sense of what the Commission thinks of the project concept.

Proponents Don Morrill, Richard and Carol Bourne introduced themselves for the benefit of new Commissioners, and explained their vision for the project. They restated the project's objectives, which are to build a senior project in the downtown; reduce their yard-care responsibilities and satisfy "gardening drive" by volunteering at Central Park and Arboretum; and construct a building that meets city goals by achieving zero-net energy and uses sustainable building materials. They explained the three story building design, and its design features, such as flat roof that is conducive for natural "NightSky" cooling without compressors, radiant heating and cooling delivery, etc.

Comment Item "A". The Commission deliberated on whether the property should be recommended to the City Council for designation as a Landmark consistent with ICF Jones and Stokes 2009 historical resources survey report. Commissioners' comments can be summarized as follows:

- Commissioner Sosnick – strongly stated her opposition to recommending designation of the property a Landmark because it is one block from the commercial center of the city, and the proposal "is much more elegant as compared to the existing building."
- Commissioner Howard – asked the proponents if the existing building will be relocated. There was detailed discussion of this question. He stated that because the building is the basis for the Landmark designation eligibility and the building's simple

architecture, he probably will not vote in support of recommending the property for designation as a Landmark at this time.

- Commissioner McFarland – pointed out the criteria for designation on page 9 of the ICF Jones & Stokes historical resources survey report that he agrees or disagrees with relative to the designation issue. There was detailed discussion of the survey report t. He suggested that the Commission act on the designation issue next month per Commissioner Sosnick comments. He concluded that at this time he would go along with the recommendation of the survey report and vote “Yes” to recommend to City Council designation of the property as a Landmark.
- Commissioner Epstein – stated that based on the historical resources survey report, she would vote “No” to recommending the property for designation as a Landmark given the condition of building. Vice-chairperson Beason reminded the Commission that physical condition of a building is not a factor when considering designation of a property.
- Commission Maples – stated that based on the discussions thus far she probably will vote “No” to designating the property a Landmark at this time.
- Commissioner Rifkin – explained his concern with the period of significance for the building as stated in the historical resources survey report. Vice-chairperson Beason interjected that the period of significance discussion has more to it, and pointed out that additions over 50 years could be considered to have gained significance on their own merits. Rifkin questioned some aspects of the report’s conclusion, but agreed with Commissioner McFarland that the conclusion of the report would be his vote; “Yes” to designation recommendation.
- Vice-chairperson Beason – stated he would vote “Yes” to recommend designation consistent with the historical resource report, while seconding Commissioner McFarland’s comments.

Staff Liaison Njoku summarized the comments. Commissioner Sosnick asked for the count. Commission Rifkin stated that it was four votes “No” and three votes “Yes” to the designation recommendation question.

Commissioner McFarland made a motion to place formal designation recommendation on the Commission’s March 21, 2011 meeting agenda. There was discussions. Commissioner Howard seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Comment Item “B”. Vice-chairperson Beason opened discussion on Staff Report Recommendation #B, which asked for advisory input on the concept replacement project’s compliance with the DDTRN Design Guidelines. Comments can be summarized as follows:

- Commissioner Rifkin – asked the proponents questions that include explanation for the proposed 4h Street treatment; particularly setback and the four-car garage appearance. The proponents responded. Based on the responses, Commissioner Rifkin stated that when a pedestrian is walking by this building along 4th Street, the 32 foot vertical wall just 6 feet away will appear very tall and will crowd the space in a negative way. The proponents stressed that their building would be no taller than the peaks of the church or the fraternity buildings. Commissioner Rifkin noted that the

problem with that comparison is that those peaks are setback much further from the sidewalks. He shared his opinion that if this project is built, its worst aspect, one he does not really see how they can change and keep the gist of their design, is this sheer wall rising up so close to the sidewalk on 4th Street. He added that the four garage doors appearance requires re-assessment; adding that when he was in San Francisco he lived in a 3-story house on Church Street in San Francisco (in Noe Valley) which had been converted into a 4-unit apartment building. He noted that the building had one garage door and residents parked front to back instead of having four garage doors and the proposed side to side parking. He asked the proponents if they thought it would be possible to have two garage units side by side, where each of the two units had cars parked front to back. The proponents said that this concept would not work. He wondered how this would not work on a 32 foot deep building as it would cut in half the problem they are creating on 4th Street by a very wide curb cut which ends up eliminating a number of possible parking places on the street. He asked if it is possible to redesign the project to include re-configured parking and storage facilities. The proponents responded that the suggested reconfiguration would not help achieve their goal. There was detailed discussion about options for parking and the 4th Street design treatment, including the driveways. Commissioner Rifkin added that a lot the design guidelines are not met by the proposal, including the roof form. He asked if the neighbor to the south had been contacted regarding the 10 feet setback proposed. Proponents answered questions regarding the setbacks and the proposed building design. He noted that the deviations of the proposal are reasonable, but wondered if the question should be whether design guidelines are appropriate for this property. He further stated that there are no improvements that could be derived with the DDTRN Design Guidelines in certain respect as was the situation in some past projects where the design guidelines were an improvement over what was proposed. He stated his belief that the proposal's benefits outweigh its costs. Despite this position he would vote that it does not meet the Design Guidelines and that it should be up to the City Council to decide if a project which violates the Guidelines they adopted should be approved. There was additional discussion.

- Commissioner Maples – expressed sharing similar concerns as Commissioner Rifkin, including the fact that no parking is being provided for visitors. However, she stated her belief that the project is “forward thinking” and that she would say “Yes” to the project despite that it does not comply with the DDTRN Design Guidelines. She explained that she like the sustainability aspect because it will be a benefit to the community. She wondered how big the project will be as it looked “larger than life.” The proponents responded to this comment, which resulted in additional detailed discussion. Commissioner Rifkin questioned the Staff Report discussion about two main entrances. The proponents responded that there are two primary entrances, but indicated that the entrances are designed differently. Vice-chair Beason clarified that the staff report only pointed out that this requirement is not met.
- Commissioner Epstein – stated her agreement with Commissioner Rifkin’s assessment of the proposal. She also stated that she likes the project as designed, but does not wish to make a decision at this time.
- Commissioner McFarland – stated his concerns by reading the DDTRN Design Guidelines Overview. He explained that the proposal is substantially inconsistent with

design guidelines; noting that he would like to see the project built as it is a good project concept. He noted that there are two visions; the proponents and the city visions. He listed all the design guidelines that were not met, and recalled the Commission's charges, which he said do not permit him to state that the proposed project complies with the DDTRN Design Guidelines. He noted that only the City Council can change the DDTRN Design Guidelines, or state that they should not apply to the project. He noted that this is a policy call for City Council. He further described the proposal relative to compliance with the DDTRN Design Guidelines as a "square peg in a round hole"; noting that while the proposal is laudable, it does not fit in with the city adopted DDTRN Design Guidelines. He explained that the clashes are too extreme that only the policy makers can override the DDTRN Design Guidelines as the vision of the proponents are not the same vision as the city. He concluded that he likes the proponents' vision, but cannot find that it complies with the vision of the City based on the DDTRN Design Guidelines. The proponents agreed with this assessment, and explained their rationale for the project design.

- Commissioner Howard – stated that proposed design is great, but does not comply with the DDTRN Design Guidelines. He also stated that he cannot vote to support that the project has complied with the DDTRN Design Guidelines. There were further discussions. The proponents acknowledged that their design is different from the DDTRN Design Guidelines, but encouraged the Commission to informally pass on their positive comments to the decision making body.
- Commissioner Sosnick – expressed concerns about the DDTRN Design Guidelines as she believes that the city's vision is inappropriate for the subject site; wondering if the site is covered by the DDTRN Design Guidelines. She stated that her vote would be in support of the proposed project. There were additional discussions on this issue.
- Vice-chairperson Beason – commented on the charges of the Commission, which include working with the DDTRN Design Guidelines while reviewing projects. He stated his agreement with Commissioner McFarland summation of the proposal. He further expressed areas of the DDTRN Design Guidelines he believes that there are substantial inconsistencies. He asked some clarifying questions of the proponents. He stated there are areas of substantial inconsistencies that would not allow him to state the proposal is consistent with the design guidelines. The Commission had additional discussion on the consistency and the proponents' vision for the property.

Staff liaison Njoku summarized the discussion as follows for the Commission confirmation:

- Commissioners McFarland, Howard, Maples, Epstein, Beason and Rifkin agreeing that the proposal has not complied with the DDTRN Design Guidelines.
- Commissioners Sosnick stating that it does not matter what the DDTRN Design Guidelines says, the proposal should be moved forward and approved as proposed.
- The general consensus of the Commission is that the proposed concept is appealing but does not comply with most applicable DDTRN Design Guidelines.

Comment Item "C". Vice-chair Beason opened the discussion on the Staff Report Recommendation #C, which asks the Commission to provide comments on whether the project as proposed could have adverse impact(s) on the adjacent Landmark, Davis

Community Church. He asked the Commissioners to respond with a “Yes” or “No” answer. The responses can be summarized as follows:

- Yes -- Beason and Rifkin
- No -- Sosnick, Howard, McFarland, Epstein, Maples, and Rifkin. Commissioner Rifkin noted that mostly there will be no adverse impacts.

Vice-chairperson Beason asked if there were additional comments to summarize the discussions on the proposal. Commissioner Sosnick suggested that the Commission should pass on to the City Council that there are concerns regarding the DDTRN Design Guidelines relative to the subject site. Specifically she wanted it made clear to the City Council that the DDTRN Design Guidelines do not apply to this specific site. She noted that the vision of the owners for the property is forward thinking and best serves the site and downtown Davis. Vice-chairperson Beason asked Commissioner Sosnick to make a motion regarding this position. There were discussions, including how the motion should be worded, questions about whether a motion is needed, and the proposal. Commissioner Sosnick made the following motion:

“On the next Agenda that the Commission discuss which of the Design Guidelines that are not appropriate to this project so that the Commission can present them to the City Council for their opinion.”

Commissioner Howard seconded the motion. The motion failed as follows:

- Ayes: Sosnick
- Noes: Beason, Epstein, Howard, Maples, McFarland and Rifkin

10. Adjournment. The next meeting will be March 21, 2011 at the Hattie Weber Museum (445 C Street) at 7:00 PM.

Action: Commissioner Howard moved, seconded by Commissioner Rifkin, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed by the following vote.

Ayes: McFarland, Epstein, Beason, Rifkin, Sosnick, Howard, Maples
Noes: None
Absent: Herbert

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 pm.