



**BENICIA HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

**City Hall Commission Room
Thursday, September 22, 2011
6:30 P.M.**

I. OPENING OF MEETING:

- A. Pledge of Allegiance**
- B. Roll Call of Commissioners**

Present: Commissioners Haughey, Mang, McKee, Taagepera, Van Landschoot,
White and Chair Crompton

Absent: None

Staff Present:

Mark Rhoades, Interim Land Use Manager

Lisa Porras, Senior Planner

Stacy Hatfield, Sr. Admin. Clerk, Recording Secretary

- C. Reference to Fundamental Rights of Public**

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA:

On motion of Commissioner Taagepera, seconded by Commissioner White, the Agenda was approved by a majority vote.

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. WRITTEN COMMENT**
None.
- B. PUBLIC COMMENT**
None.

IV. PRESENTATIONS

None.

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approval of Minutes of August 25, 2011

On motion of Commissioner Haughey, seconded by Commissioner Taagepera, the Consent Calendar was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Haughey, Mang, McKee, Taagepera, Van Landschoot, White and Chair Crompton

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

VI. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

A. 963 JEFFERSON STREET – DESIGN REVIEW (CONTINUED FROM JULY 28, 2011)

08PLN-00028 – Design Review

963 Jefferson Street, APNs: 0080-150-020 and 0080-150-030

PROPOSAL:

At the HPRC hearing of July 28, 2011, the Commissioners requested more information on the following: (1) design of bathrooms, (2) details of lattice wall, dimensions, materials; (3) railings to be constructed per the Historical Building Code; (4) reconstruct front porch at original size; (5) information on columns, cost analysis, precedent on National Register properties; (6) Wrought iron rail details, and to revise plans showing abovementioned changes. These items have been addressed by the applicant and are now ready for consideration by the HPRC.

Recommendation: Approve design review request based on additional items addressed and changes presented.

Staff gave a presentation to the Commissioners regarding the design review items that were continued from the July 28, 2011 HPRC meeting for 963 Jefferson Street. Staff highlighted the notable changes the applicant has made to the plans since that meeting, including further details on the column supports, the lattice wall, the railings, and the size of the south porch.

Due to potential liability and safety concerns, the Applicant is proposing a railing height of 42" instead of the original 32" height. The increase in railing height will be accomplished by raising the existing railing and adding a new section to the bottom of it. This new section will match the original railing.

Applicant originally proposed to expand the south porch of the property and to widen the existing moats. Applicant has withdrawn his request to widen the moats and clarified his intention to increase the porch size to 8'6."

Discussion of this item was opened to the public for comment:

Dana Dean, on behalf of Amports, thanked the applicant and staff for taking their concerns expressed at the previous meeting seriously. Based on the current information regarding this project, all of their concerns have been addressed.

Jim Conlow complimented staff on their presentation and indicated that all of his concerns regarding the project have been addressed.

Manuel Lopes thanked everyone involved for their hard work and believes the applicant should be able to move forward with his project.

Richard Bortolazzo expressed the same sentiment as those above and believes the applicant should be allowed to continue the project.

Once public comment was concluded, Commissioner White declared for the record that he has had several ex parte discussions with the applicant about his efforts and goals for the project. This communication occurred after Commissioner White believed his term had expired and he was no longer going to be serving on the Commission.

Staff presented a letter from the J. Reed Robbins Trust requesting three items be included into the Conditions of Approval for this project. Specifically, that no loud construction noise will be allowed on weekends, that the east side of the property be kept clean of construction equipment, debris, and materials, and that a Declaration of Restriction be recorded with the County of Solano.

Commissioner McKee liked the concept of lifting the railing to achieve the height increase.

Commissioner Taagepera stressed that, where possible, all decorative architectural features of the building should be rehabilitated and reused instead of being replaced. The applicant agreed to amend his project description to include this. Commissioner Taagepera also stated that the expanded south porch is not inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Commissioner Haughey stated she was fine with the project changes, including the south porch expansion because it would not be wider than the side verandas.

Commissioner Mang requested the following clarifications be included in the resolution:

Item 1: Eliminate as duplicate of Condition 2.

Item 5: The sandstone should stand-out on the lattice.

Item 8: The extension of the south entry porch shall be a maximum of 8'6" instead of 8'.

Item 10: Add to the language that a cover, as is existing, in lieu of a railing, will be on the moat on the south side of the building.

RESOLUTION NO. 11-X (HPRC)

A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BENICIA APPROVING DESIGN REVIEW FOR 963 JEFFERSON STREET (08PLN-00028)

On motion of Commissioner Mang, seconded by Commissioner White, the resolution was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Haughey, Mang, McKee, Taagepera, Van Landschoot, White and Chair Crompton

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

B. 235 East L Street

11PLN-47 – Design Review

235 East L Street, APN: 089-243-140

PROPOSAL:

The applicant requests design review approval to make exterior modifications to the west facing façade by adding a dormer to the 2nd story, and to install four new gates in the yard area: one at the driveway, one at the main entrance path, one in the rear yard, and one in the east side yard. In addition, the applicant requests to install a vegetable garden

in the rear yard and two new shade trees in the front yard. Last, the applicant is proposing to change the mechanization of the garage door by converting it into a sliding door.

Recommendation: Approve the design review request to alter the mechanization of a garage door, install a dormer on the second story of the main building, and perform site work consisting of installation of four new gates, a vegetable garden, and two new shade trees located at 235 East L Street, based on the findings and conditions of approval set forth in the proposed resolution.

Staff gave a presentation to the Commission detailing proposed exterior modifications to the property at 235 East L Street. Staff also provided an overview of modifications that were approved to the house last year, including changes to some windows, the restoration of two porches, other site work and the addition of a pergola. Currently, the pergola is a matter of code enforcement since the plan called for it to be detached from the dwelling, and instead, the pergola is attached to the house. There is also another code enforcement matter regarding the primary bay window on the façade of the house. The glass in that window was replaced with wavy glass instead of the same type of glass that was in the original window. A Stop Work Order has been placed on all glasswork.

Discussion regarding the request for the new dormer took place among the Commissioners. It became apparent that the new dormer had already been constructed and the applicant wanted to be able to keep the dormer in order to accommodate a new door and provide adequate egress onto a deck. Originally, there were only windows on that part of the house, but the previous owner replaced one of the windows with a 5'6" door. In order to use that door; however, you had to duck so that you wouldn't bump your head. The applicant is requesting that the dormer be approved so they can keep the 6'8" door that had already been installed.

The meeting was opened for public discussion.

Karen Burns recounted her first-hand experience with the house dating back to the 1940s. Ms. Burns believes that the alterations that have been made to the house, and the new ones proposed, are not compatible with the original house and that the building has been totally altered.

Dana Dean requested that the public be given the opportunity to look at new picture evidence concerning this matter before a final decision is made.

Public discussion of this item was closed.

The Commissioners continued to discuss many related issues including whether the portion of the building in question was an addition made to the original house, or whether it was actually part of the original house, as is believed to be shown in the new pictures (provided by Commissioner Haughey) circulated at the meeting. The Commissioners discussed the importance of this historic house and the consequences of allowing additional alterations to occur. It was also pointed out that not only did the applicant fail to get prior approval to alter the exterior of the house with a dormer, they also failed to have the style of the 6'8" door approved. With the installation of the dormer, the roofline of the house was modified as well, and the Commissioners discussed those effects to the integrity of the house.

The Commissioners reviewed the four gates the applicant proposed. There were no objections to the gates except that they would like Gate B to be less ornate and more consistent with Gate A.

The proposed vegetable garden and shade trees were discussed. The Commissioners had no problem with the vegetable garden and had some concern over the eventual height of the trees.

Also discussed was the mechanization of the garage door by installing a rolling rack. There was no objection to the rolling rack.

Commissioner Haughey requested the following conditions be included in the resolution:

- The dormer is to be removed, the existing roofline is to be restored to the original roofline, and the existing 6'8" door is to be replaced with an appropriate door or window to match the adjacent windows with standard glass.
- The gates were approved as requested except that Gate B is to be less ornate than proposed and is to be consistent with Gate A.
- The trees proposed are not approved due to their eventual expected height of 20'. The Commission would like the applicant to propose trees that will reach approximately 15' at maturity, subject to staff approval.
- The garage door is to be consistent with the approval received in 2010. There was no objection to the rolling rack.

RESOLUTION NO. 11- (HPRC)

A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BENICIA APPROVING DESIGN REVIEW OF 235 EAST L STREET (PLN-00047)

On motion of Commissioner Haughey, seconded by Commissioner White, the resolution with the above conditions was not approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Haughey, and Chair Crompton

Noes: Commissioners Mang, McKee, Taagepera, Van Landschoot and White

Absent: None

Abstain: None

After revision of the above conditions, accepting Applicant's original proposed shade trees that reach 20' at maturity, on motion of Commissioner Haughey, seconded by Commissioner McKee, the resolution was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Haughey, Mang, McKee, Taagepera, Van Landschoot, White and Chair Crompton

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

VII. COMMUNICATIONS FROM STAFF

None

VIII. COMMUNICATIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Gina Eleccion, Management Analyst for the City of Benicia, and Commissioner Haughey will be accepting the Preservation Design Award for the Historic Context Statement on October 1, 2011.

It was noted that Liberty High School, located in the Historic District, is in the process of installing new windows and they have not come to HPRC for approval. Staff explained that the City has no jurisdiction over the Benicia School District, but will contact them for advisement purposes.

Commissioner White clarified that technically his term on the Commission has expired; however, he is willing serve until a replacement commissioner is found.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Crompton adjourned the meeting at 9:06 pm.