

HISTORICAL PRESERVATION COMMISSION

APPROVED ACTION MINUTES

FEBRUARY 13, 2008

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vicars; Brookshear; Orlins
MEMBERS ABSENT: Butler; Bunse
STAFF PRESENT: Norris; Stillman; Echols

Roll Call:

- Meeting called to order at 6:00 PM.

Approval/Revision of Agenda:

- It was decided to move items #12 and #13 ahead of item #8 due to the fact that the applicants were in the audience to discuss their projects.

Approval of Minutes:

- Commissioner Brookshear noted that some of the wording was missing from the first line, but other than that the minutes were very thorough. Commissioner Brookshear made a motion to approve the minutes. It was seconded by Commissioner Orlins and unanimously carried.

Secretary's Report:

- Cindy Norris introduced Associate Planner Jimmy Stillman, and Planning Intern Marshall Echols.
- Staff has an update on the house at 210 Lincoln Avenue. The project has site plan approval for a small office and a building permit was issued in November 2007. The applicant has 180 days in which to start the project and call for an inspection before the permit lapses. It is the staffs' understanding that the applicant did not want to start construction in winter. Should the applicant not commence with construction after 180 days, the City could begin nuisance abatement proceedings at that time.
- Commissioner Vicars asked if as part of the project the house would be moved or taken down.
- Jimmy Stillman, Associate Planner stated that the house would be moved slightly forward to Lincoln Avenue to accommodate the approved site plan. The approved site plan for a small office is allowed by right under the Downtown Specific Plan.
- Commissioner Vicars wanted clarification; the house remains but is converted to a small office.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that was correct; also indicating there would be a change of use and quite a bit of improvement.
- Cindy Norris stated that there is a second house on blocks located on Court Street that is part of a larger project. The applicant has started grading work for the larger project. This project is affiliated with a large developer and she believes the house should come off the blocks soon.
- Cindy Norris gave an update on the Opera House expansion plan. Staff met with SHPO and discussed the CEQA implications. It was a very positive meeting. Jimmy Stillman is the project manager on the Opera House and he will speak more to it.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that the Opera House currently has an application in process for site plan and design review for the expansion to the existing facility. The plans call for filling in the existing rotary square next to the plaza. The intent of the addition is to house a black box theater for children to further enhance current operations. The Opera House is a State facility and a State run park. The original Opera House is a national historic registered landmark. The small annex

addition that is currently exposed to Main Street was added in the mid-1980s. This project should come before the Historic Planning Commission hopefully by March 2008, followed up by approval by the Planning Commission and final approval by the City Council. The Opera House expansion does involve taxpayer money, approximately \$3 million have been allotted, part of Measure E. Because of this staff is looking for the optimum in public input on this project.

- Commissioner Vicars questioned if the expansion proposed will take up the lawn area on Main Street.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that yes; the proposed expansion would fill in the entire footprint.
- Commissioner Robert Orlins explained that the room upstairs in the Opera House that is currently used for refreshments was originally intended to be used as a museum room for artifacts found in the basement of the Opera House during the original renovation. Commissioner Orlins asked if it would be possible to change the room back to its intended usage with the proposed expansion.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that with the interior improvement of the building that it is planned to have an area to display the artifacts of the Opera House, but the exact location would have to be decided by the Opera Board and the architects involved with the expansion project.
- Cindy Norris reported that the Beamer/Motroni Report is on the March 4, 2008 City Council agenda and that a public notice will go out to the neighbors to let them know the boundaries that the Historic Commission has recommended for the Honorary District.
- Cindy Norris stated that also on the March 4, 2008 City Council agenda is the Work Program and in essence the “infomercial” regarding historic preservation and what is going on with it.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned whether the Beamer/Motroni Report will be consent or an action item.
- Cindy Norris stated that at this time it is slated to be a director’s report.
- Cindy Norris reported that at the March 12, 2008 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting there will be a plaque proposal. David Wilkinson and Ron Pinegar are proposing to sponsor two signs for the City of Woodland as historic markers for the two Freeman homes to honor the City’s founder.
- Cindy Norris reported that the California Preservation Foundation sponsored two workshops this week regarding historic preservation, one on site inventory and the other on CEQA. Both were well attended and very informative.

Subcommittee Reports:

- None Reported

Public Comment:

- No public comment.

Commission and Staff Comments:

- Commissioner Vicars asked about the status on the Ice House project. She wanted to know if it was coming back before the Commission again.
- Cindy Norris stated that the initial survey was to look into the possibilities for the location. Staff forwarded the comments received from the Historic Commission to the applicant. Should they choose to come back before the Commission with the project staff would ask them to comply with comments presented to the applicant. As of this time, however, it is not scheduled to come before the Commission again.

416-418 First Street Façade Remodel:

- Jimmy Stillman reported that this project has gone through design review. Staff has come up with a couple areas of concern to discuss with the Commission. Staff has discussed these issues with the applicant. Primarily the issues have to do with painting the columns, which staff supports. Staff feels that it will trigger interest from other building owners on this block. When the other owners do come forward to do their facades staff will encourage them to follow this similar paint scheme at the pedestrian level. In working with the applicant it is understood that the adjacent owners are in support of this proposal and in the future continuing this pattern of work on their storefronts as well. Due to the narrow façade of this building the applicant is proposing to use two separate awnings to identify the two separate entrances. Staff initially had concerns about breaking up the awning but recognized the need to have two separate awnings to define each entrance to this building. Finally, the original proposal included a copper cap to cover the decorative brick wedge at the top. Staff has worked with the applicant to remove the copper cap and restore and repaint the brick in keeping with the historic preservation of the building.
- Commissioner Vicars asked whether the color or the design scheme is intended to continue down the street.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that the floral design on the columns is already there and the pattern is consistent down the face of all five shops. The staff's concern is keeping the paint scheme consistent throughout the block and limiting the colors.
- Sean Denny, owner of 416-418 First Street stated that has agreed with the staff's comments, although there may be some slight details to be decided upon.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that another one of staff's concern was the detail work above the awning. Some of the work seemed to be ornate and tended to take away from the features of the building. Some of those designs are in the signage and staff has discussed with the applicant the possibility of reducing some of the colors. There will be no structure changes, just painting, and that staff will work with the applicant to reduce some of the imagery on the signage that could possibly trump the original façade of the building.
- Commissioner Brookshear questioned the thought behind adding the redwood siding above the awnings.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that the redwood-beveled blocks will help frame in each unit. It would also help provide a clear definition between each address.
- Commissioner Brookshear reiterated that the large rectangle above the awning is painted onto the building as part of the proposed signage.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned whether staff would want to continue the redwood treatment on other portions of the building.
- Jimmy Stillman reported that it is staff's desire at a pedestrian level for the paint scheme to remain the same. The addition of the redwood-beveled blocks would help delineate the storefronts. Staff would have the paint schemes for the actual facades to be more liberal, but keep it consistent.
- Commissioner Orlins stated that he agreed with staff in regards to the note in the memorandum; that the first rendering was overpowering; the subsequent rendering are headed in the right direction with regard to architectural style.
- Jimmy Stillman reported that this building does not have any particular architectural design, it is a simple design. Staff had concerns that some details made it appear as something it is not. Those issues have been addressed in the signage for the building.
- Commissioner Orlins stated that he wanted to commend the applicant for his enthusiasm and vision on this project.

- Commissioner Orlins motioned to approve the proposed façade changes with staff recommendations for alterations to the drawings as submitted to the Historic Preservation Commission. It was seconded by Commissioner Vicars and unanimously approved.

509 North Street Residential Remodel:

- Cindy Norris reported that this house has the potential for national register status. Staff had concerns with the exterior renovations proposed, but the applicant has been very willing to work with staff. The window that has been proposed has been modified significantly in size. She also reported that because this item is a designated resource that it is subject to the Historic Building Code and there are quite a number of exceptions that are possible and may give more flexibility under that code. In particular, the required egress window size, 3.3 square feet as opposed to the 5.7 square feet under the standard code. There are also exceptions to the sill height and other areas, so it does appear that the applicant will be able to achieve their objective of having a window and a master bedroom and the light that they would like while keeping the character of the house intact. The applicant is intending to install the window above the shed roof into the gable. This item is in the Downtown Specific Plan, so there are specific regulations. The ordinance, however, does not speak very directly to residential remodels. Staff continues to have issues with the ordinance, since Woodland has an incredible resource of historic residential structures and if significant character defining features are lost through remodels over time the overall stock of the City's residential resources will be lost. Staff and the applicant have come to a resolution. The applicant would like to have windows in the east and west gables. Staff will work to insure that the windows fit into the space without cutting into the cornice detailing or the shed roof detailing.
- Pippin Mader, owner and applicant stated that ideally he and his wife wanted the upper windows to match the lower windows, keeping the same dental and cornice detailing.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned whether the smaller size window was more of a concern with staff as opposed to matching other windows on the house.
- Cindy Norris stated that the more significant concern was fitting the window into the gable so as to not cut into the shed roof or the cornice. The secondary concern then became the actual shape of the window. The applicant will have to evaluate given the minimum requirements so it may not be of the same proportion as the lower window. The other issue is that staff feels that the lower windows are more recent, they have been enlarged and are not historic in character.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned whether or not the roofline is changing.
- Cindy Norris stated that it was not changing.
- Pippin Mader asked for the Commission's input on historic significance of the shed roof above the line of dental. He feels the bigger the window the better as far as light is concerned.
- Commissioner Brookshear stated that there is a vast improvement on the revisions brought before the Commission tonight. She thanked the applicant for revising his plans so as to not cut into the cornices. She feels the cornice is more of a character defining feature for the house than the shed roof.
- Cindy Norris stated that the applicant is proposing to install the window above the shed roof.
- Laura Mader, owner and applicant stated that since that is the only window in the room they would like to get as much light out of it as possible while keeping the historic look.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned the staff's suggestion of skylights.
- Laura Mader stated that they preferred not to use skylights, especially if it shows from the front of the house. She feels that it would be historically inaccurate to use skylights.

- Cindy Norris stated that staff wanted to emphasize that because of the allowance for flexibility with utilizing the Historic Building Code the smaller window is allowed, and staff is recommending the smaller window.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned if the window would be of the same style as current.
- Pippin Mader stated that the hope was to have a single-hung, paned window. He also wanted to point out that the front of the house does not have the scallops that are on the side, where the proposed window would go.
- Cindy Norris stated that judging by the photos from the 1980s some of the original work seems to have been modified.
- Commissioner Brookshear stated that she thought shrinking the width of the window improves the design because it lends a little more verticality, which she believes is what happening in the front of the house.
- Commissioner Vicars clarified that when talking about the window being an egress that is just another fire exit from the house, not necessarily a stairwell. She questioned if there is already a stairwell to the attic.
- Pippin Mader stated that there is no stairwell to the attic. The stairwell is in the structural part of the plan. It starts roughly in the center of the upstairs and comes down next to the front door.
- Commissioner Vicars stated she liked the smallest window the best.
- Commissioner Orlins stated he thought it was a satisfactory resolution.
- Cindy Norris wanted again to thank the applicants for working with staff and being so patient.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned if staff was looking for a motion or consensus or if staff just wanted comments.
- Cindy Norris stated that staff was looking for comments. This project is in the Downtown Specific Plan and is subject to review. Staff wanted the Commission to give advice and assistance on this project. Staff will continue to work with the applicant regarding the smallest window size, and with the intent of not cutting into the shed roof.
- Commissioner Vicars reiterated the Commission's comments as 1) using the small window, and 2) do not cut into the shed roof.
- Pippin Mader stated that they were putting a bathroom upstairs.

Work Program Review:

- Commissioner Vicars stated that she appreciated the staff taking the time to retype and reformat the work program. However, there are still a few formatting issues. She feels that you should not start a new subject with only one line of text on the bottom of the page before continuing to the next page. You should put a page break in so that all subject information is listed together. It appears that most of the suggestions that were made at the previous meeting have been entered into the program. Commissioner Vicars questioned if anyone had any comments or concerns. There were none. She also stated that if the Work Program is approved by the Commission this evening, then it will be taken before the City Council on March 4, 2008 as part of the Work Program for the year. She had a concern with the date, it being listed as 2007-08 year. Should it be 2008-09 year?
- Cindy Norris confirmed that it should read 2008-09.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that it was understood that work is still being done on some of the projects, but it is 2008-09 and needs to get into the budget correctly.
- Commissioner Brookshear feels that it has incorporated everything that the Commission discussed at the previous meeting.

- Commissioner Brookshear made a motion to accept the Work Program as presented and prepare it for City Council on March 4, 2008. Commissioner Orlins seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

CLG Information Update:

- Commissioner Vicars expressed her appreciation of the information on the update of the CLG, but feels there is still much work to do.
- Cindy Norris reported that the Commission has been provided with a copy of the application that was sent to SHPO as a draft and with that applicant is a response from Lucinda Woodward with her suggestions to changes in our ordinance. Cindy Norris feels this is something that reflected in the Work Program and should be addressed and moved forward on as soon as possible. Staff and the Commission need to discuss what direction the ordinance should move in and that is what should be brought before Council, so as to get authorization to continue to move forward.
- Commissioner Vicars would like to see this CLG information update be a main topic on an agenda, with the ordinance in hand, so the Commission can devote an appropriate amount of time comparing the suggestions to the changes in the ordinance and the current ordinance. She concurs that some direction is needed in what changes Commission feels are needed versus what is being requested.
- Commissioner Brookshear felt that a meeting spent solely on discussing the CLG issue would be most beneficial. She also stated she could forward ordinances from other cities that she had dealt with. She also believes that OHP has sample ordinances that are available.
- Commissioner Vicars felt that the CLG issue would come back before the Commission during the April 2008 meeting. However, another item on the April 2008 agenda would be the selection of the Preservation Awards applicants for June 2008.
- Cindy Norris stated that the nominations for the Preservation Awards should be at the April 2008 meeting.
- Commissioner Brookshear questioned whether the CLG was an item that needed a subcommittee.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that was understandable and should be discussed at the future meeting regarding CLG.

Heritage Home Awards:

- Commissioner Vicars reported that the Heritage Home Awards will be presented at the May 2008 meeting and that there are six homes suggested.
- Cindy Norris introduced Marshall Echols, planning intern, who provided the presentation on the six homes that were suggested.
- Commissioner Vicars commented that there was a very good cross-section of homes, displaying quite a bit of the different architectural types within the City.
- Jimmy Stillman reported that typically in the past the Heritage Home Awards were based on the recommendation of five homes; staff would like the Commission to discuss the nomination of all six homes or to stay within the five home nominations.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that she had no problem with six, but felt more comfortable with five; and perhaps doing more research on one or two of these homes to bring them back next year.
- Cindy Norris stated that staff needs to investigate whether the home at 555 College Street is actually a single family dwelling or used as commercial/office.
- Jimmy Stillman also stated that staff will also try to provide enhanced maps of the nominated homes in relation to past Heritage Home Award winners.

- Cindy Norris stated that staff needed time to research the homes and to order the plaques. Once nominated staff sends letters to homeowners asking if they want to be one of the designated homes.
- Commissioner Orlins stated that he felt that if had been five homes for the past years, then it should continue to do so.
- Commissioner Vicars reported the reason that five homes were chosen originally was so that each Commission member could make a presentation.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that for the purpose of nominating staff should go forth with the research on all six homes. If the home in question on College is in fact commercial staff can bring it back before the Commission to decide.
- Commissioner Orlins stated that David Wilkinson wrote extensively regarding the house at 555 College Street in *The Valley Jewel Book*.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned that if this item was brought back before the Commission next month would there be enough time to order the plaques.
- The key to the timeline is the letters that are sent to the nominations.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that the Commissioner would like to the letters to the nominations to be sent out and return by next the next meeting to make check if the Commission had to eliminate anyone. She wants to make sure there is enough time to order the plaques.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned if that suggestion was agreeable with the other Commission members.
- Commissioner Brookshear stated she hesitated in narrowing the vote to five until she was positive that the home is question (555 College Street) was eligible or not.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned whether the Commission was suggesting that letters be sent to all six applicants with modified language.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that staff will conduct research and based on findings will send either five or six letters.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that Commissioner Orlins wished to discuss an issue regarding bulk.
- Commissioner Orlins reported that there is a residence at 166 Third Street that stand out on the block of primarily historic homes, bungalow and cottages because of the mass, volume and scale of the building is overwhelming the lot size. It towers above the lot and ruins the ambience of the neighborhood. Other communities have guidelines/ordinances that address mass of volume of structure with regard to size of lot. Is it possible for staff to look into guidelines that would prohibit that kind of structure in historic neighborhoods?
- Jimmy Stillman reported that staff has taken note of the address at 166 Third Street and is researching what is being done to the property. It is possible that it is a fairly new construction or reconstruction, which would require a building permit, site plan review and there are regulations are far as lot size and lot coverage that should be taken into consideration. If it is in the Downtown Specific Plan that does address building massing, specifically for commercial property. Quite a bit of this area is a transition zone, particularly around North Street and Court Street so there are several properties that have been converted to office and commercial. These tend to bleed into the historic residential neighborhoods.
- Cindy Norris commented that at one time residential design guidelines for historic neighborhoods were discussed and she believes that they are in the General Plan as a policy item. Staff has a difficult time dealing with design guidelines with no cross reference in the ordinance on how to evaluate, to have design guidelines consistent with character defining features such as mass scale setbacks; potentially getting into details such as windows, compatibility, etc. That is a fine line politically.

- Commissioner Vicars commented that with the cost of land and building presently this has become more of an issue. With nothing further Commissioner Vicars asked for a motion to adjourn.
- Commissioner Brookshear made a motion to adjourn the meeting. It was seconded by Commissioner Orlins and unanimously carried.

The being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:32 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Munowitch, AICP
Assistant City Manager