



## ***Minutes – Cultural Heritage Board***

July 20, 2011, 3:30 pm,  
MAYOR'S CEREMONIAL ROOM, CITY HALL  
3900 MAIN STREET

**APPROVED AS PRESENTED  
AT THE AUGUST 17, 2011  
MEETING**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Altamirano, Field, Garafalo, Gilleece, Leach, Megna,  
Murrieta, Preston-Chavez, Treen

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Erin Gettis, Historic Preservation Officer  
Smith, Supervising Deputy City Attorney  
Brenes, Senior Planner  
Lopez, Associate Planner  
Sennewald, Associate Planner  
Robinson, Stenographer

### **THE FOLLOWING BUSINESS WAS CONDUCTED:**

Chair Megna called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:.....	3
B.	CONSENT CALENDAR:.....	3
D.	PUBLIC HEARINGS: .....	4
4.	<b>PLANNING CASE P11-0149:</b> .....	4
C.	DISCUSSION CALENDAR:.....	5
1.	<b>PLANNING CASE P11-0384:</b> .....	5
2.	<b>PLANNING CASE P11-0142:</b> .....	8
D.	PUBLIC HEARINGS: .....	19
3.	<b>PLANNING CASE P11-0196:</b> .....	19
E.	MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:.....	22
5.	Brief report from the Historic Preservation Officer on recent City Council actions. ....	22
6.	Items for future agendas. ....	22
7.	Update on status of major development projects.....	22
F.	MINUTES: .....	22
8.	The minutes of July 20, 2011 were approved as presented.....	22
G.	ADJOURNMENT: .....	22

**A. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

Eileen Hewitt addressed the Board regarding an item on the agenda.

Chair Megna noted that the item was already on the agenda and could she wait until that item came up?

**B. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There were no Consent items scheduled.

**D. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

Chair Megna asked the Board if they could take an item 4 out of order. This item is being requested for continuance.

4. **PLANNING CASE P11-0149:** Proposal by the Housing Authority of the City of Riverside to consider repealing the Structure of Merit (SOM) designations for two structures located at 3344-3350 Fourth Street (SOM #585) and 3478 Lime Street (SOM #484). The properties are generally situated northerly of Fifth Street, easterly of Lime Street, southerly of Fourth Street, and westerly of Mulberry Street, in the DSP-RES-SP-CR – Downtown Specific Plan Heritage Square Residential District and Specific Plan (Downtown) and Cultural Resources Overlay Zones, in Ward 1.

Chair Megna announced that the applicant is requesting continuance to the meeting of October 19, 2011.

**MOTION MADE** by Board Member Field, **SECONDED** by Board Member Gilleece, **TO CONTINUE** Planning Case P11-0149 to the meeting of October 19, 2011 as requested by the applicant.

**MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

AYES: Altamirano, Field, Garafalo, Gilleece, Leach, Megna, Murrieta, Preston-Chavez, Treen  
NOES: None  
DISQUALIFIED: None  
ABSTAINED: None  
ABSENT: None

## C. DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

1. **PLANNING CASE P11-0384:** Proposal by Lisa Biddle to consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for the legalization of a satellite dish mounted on the street-facing second floor balcony of the residence at 3471 Redwood Drive, within the Mount Rubidoux Historic District, situated on the westerly side of Redwood Drive, between Mt. Rubidoux Drive and Beacon Way in the R-1-7000-CR – Single Family Residential and Cultural Resource Overlay Zones in Ward 1.

Kyle Smith, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Board Member Murrieta noted that the technician usually determined the best spot for reception.

Mr. Smith stated he would defer to the applicant. He understood that the dish had to be south facing.

Lisa Biddle addressed the Board. She stated that to begin, the picture on the screen is not from the street, it is from her neighbor's property. She stated that yes, the dish does have to be south facing. The reason it was placed here is because at the back of the house, it is not south facing and it is blocked by other houses and trees.

Chair Megna asked Ms. Biddle to come up to the podium.

Ms. Biddle came forward. She informed the Board that the dish couldn't go on the roof. The roof is tile roof and to be mounted there, it would crack the tiles. She asked to click through the pictures and noted which were taken from the front of the house and stated that the dish was not visible. Originally the satellite people wanted to put it dead center of the front door and she nearly had a heart attack. She has lived in a historical district house for a long time. Keeping with the historical guidelines is something very strong for her and very true to her heart, but you also have to live in the house. Also, those trees are growing up around it which will continue to cover it. Going back to the recommendations, as far as lowering, she didn't know if it was lowered on the tripod whether it would still be visible.

Board Member Murrieta asked if she knew whether it would affect the functionality of the dish if it were lowered?

Ms. Biddle replied that as long as it received a connection, it was fine, that is all it has to do. There are lots of homes in the historic district in a similar situation, she counted 5.

Board Member Treen asked if they were homes with satellite dishes that could be seen from the street. She noted that the satellite cannot be seen in some of the pictures and whether it was because the photo was taken straight on?

Ms. Biddle replied affirmatively.

Board Garafalo asked if the objection would be the same if it were a TV antenna or any type of equipment, after 1930?

Erin Gettis, Historic Preservation Officer, explained that the Guidelines specifically address satellite dishes.

Board Garafalo said he was wondering about the Guidelines and having to accommodate satellite dishes.

Ms. Gettis added that the Guidelines were written in 2001.

Board Member Leach asked if this was a neighbor complaint or someone driving down the street.

Mr. Smith stated that staff received a complaint.

Chair Megna asked the applicant if she was willing to try some of the suggestions made under the conditions of approval.

Ms. Biddle stated that she cannot go to the back of the house and it cannot be mounted on the roof. She felt she might be able to lower it. She stated that for their own personal satisfaction they were also trying to make it as least visible as possible.

Board Member Altamirano asked if the applicant has considered other vendors besides satellite?

Ms. Biddle explained that they have but satellite dish gets the best reception. She noted that because of the build of the house, this location is the best for reception.

Board Member Altamirano if the main view of the dish is from the side of the balcony, she asked if the applicant has considered using rectangular pots with ladder and vines growing on it so that it might cover the side of the house from the front.

Ms. Biddle replied that they have not gone through this. She noted again that from the street, it is not very visible.

Chair Megna said that the Board would very much want to approve something for the applicant. It sounds like the applicant is willing to work or experiment with staff with respect to the position of the dish and maybe the notion of a little balcony landscaping around it. He stated that he would like to propose that they move forward with the Certificate of Appropriateness with the applicant accepting the conditions as they are currently written which include the opportunity to explore other positions on the balcony.

Ms. Biddle added "and or camouflage".

Chair Megna agreed and potentially camouflaging the dish. If the Board approves this, staff would go out and check it and if they have an issue with it, would she mind coming back to the Board.

Ms. Biddle agreed.

Kristi Smith, Supervising Deputy City Attorney, said that what the Board would do is basically do what the conditions say or modify them. For example: approve the Certificate of

Appropriateness subject to staff and the applicant working out the best location, camouflaging, relocating whatever works best to still maintain the integrity of the historic structure. If they can't work that out then they should return the issue to the Board.

Chair Megna inquired whether the Board should then continue or proceed with approval?

Ms. Smith stated that her suggestion is that the Board approve the case and if applicant and staff are unable to work it out, that the item be returned to the Board. The applicant may say here is why she wants to do this. You could say ok that makes sense or no, too bad. But the goal is to try and work it out.

**MOTION MADE** by Board Member Leach, **SECONDED** by Board Member Garafalo, **TO APPROVE** Planning Case P11-0384 subject to staff's findings and with modification to the conditions to include #3. Explore other positions on and/or camouflaging the satellite as long as it maintains the historical integrity of the structure.

Chair Megna asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak to this issue. There was no one in the public requesting to speak.

Ms. Biddle stated she would like to know who made the complaint about this or why, if you look at the neighborhood there are multiple houses with the same issue.

Chair Megna commented that it is City policy that people can make complaints and that they don't have to disclose their identities and that they aren't disclosed to the public. The County also follows this same policy.

Ms. Smith noted that it is to protect whoever is making the complaint from possible retaliation.

Ms. Biddle said she understood but was wondering what other things she would be called out on. She stated that she has lived in this neighborhood for a long time.

**MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

AYES: Altamirano, Field, Garafalo, Gilleece, Leach, Megna, Murrieta, Preston-Chavez, Treen  
NOES: None  
DISQUALIFIED: None  
ABSTAINED: None  
ABSENT:

Chair Megna advised the applicant and members of the audience of the appeal process.

2. **PLANNING CASE P11-0142:** Proposal by Armando Dupont to consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of roofing materials on an existing single family residence at 4471 Fourth Street, within the Colony Heights Historic District, situated on the northeasterly side of Fourth Street, between Pine Street and Redwood Drive in the R-1-7000-CR – Single Family Residential and Cultural Resource Overlay Zones in Ward 1.

Kyle Smith, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. This case was considered by the Cultural Heritage Board in April of this year. The Board's direction was for the applicant to work with staff on an alternative material that is closer to the historical material which is a smoother metal roofing material. The Board also directed staff and the applicant that if they weren't able to come up with an agreement that the project would come back to the Board which is why it is before them today. He supplied the Board with the latest sample received by staff from the applicant. Staff would note that the proposed material does not provide the character defining style, size and scale of the original roof material. Therefore, pursuant to the City Historic District Guidelines which require the new roofing material be replaced in kind, staff is recommending denial at this time.

Board Member Leach asked staff's definition of smooth metal? She asked staff whether the sample provided was not smooth?

Ms. Gettis explained that staff is not recommending these conditions, they are being provided to the Board should the Board move approval. Staff is indicating that the sample does not match the existing roof, not that it is not smooth metal.

Board Member Leach stated that this sample was a closer match than the last time this case was heard.

Chair Megna asked staff to clarify what the current status of the project was? What is the condition of the house and roof at this moment?

Ms. Gettis stated that it was the same.

Board Member Field no one has done any roofing on the house since the last time it was before the Board.

Ms. Gettis responded she put in the status report that work had been done previously and no work has been done.

Board Member Altamirano asked if this material was originally made by hand or machine. Does staff know of the procedure when it was originally installed?

Ms. Gettis stated that it would have gone through some sort of manufacturing process. She doubted that it was made by hand. She stated that she did not know, there wasn't anything on file on the property.

Chair Megna stated that elsewhere in the country, this was a pressed metal product. It typically came in sheets of some kind and already had the barrel shape. The purpose it served was that it was less expensive and it was lighter than the tile it was meant to emulate so you did not



have to erect as much roof structure. Basically, this material was cheaper to put up. Now what has happened, historically, we are now 50-60 years later and now this material has acquired its own historic importance because there isn't that much of it out here any longer.

Board Member Gilleece asked what staff was looking for size-wise? What difference is this from what is on there because it is hard to tell from the picture. Is this the wrong scale? What is staff looking for in comparison to what has been presented today that would be acceptable.

Ms. Gettis stated that, first of all there are only three known examples in the City of this material. Staff's preference is as stated in the guidelines of the Secretary of Interior Standards which is to maintain the original fabric as much as possible. We agree, this picture is a good example that the metal has been damaged. The reason staff is bringing this back to you today is that neither of these examples for changing it out, at this point, is satisfactory. Our preference would be to determine whether the original material could be repaired or if there is in fact a manufacturer out there through research that makes this type of material. Maybe a historic architect needs to be contacted or somebody that has worked with this material before, beyond the research that has been done. Which wasn't exhausted, by the way, because we don't have limitless time.

Board Member Field noted that we still don't know if he can get replacement material anywhere at this point in time. We don't know if it exists?

Board Member Altamirano inquired if he is unable to find the replacement or a way to repair, wouldn't the next step be to do real tile instead or would that change?

Ms. Gettis stated that the clay tile that matched this profile would be better than these samples. She noted that there would be other challenges associated with this option such as structural issues.

Chair Megna opened the hearing to public comment.

Armando Dupont, applicant, addressed the Board. He stated that he was here April 20, 2011 and requested to repair his roof at that time. He stated that it was not a matter of repairing but a matter of replacing the roof. It has been three months already. He has been looking on his own and has been following up on the leads Planning staff has provided him with. He pointed to the tile sample in front of the Board and stated that this is all he could find. No one has anything close to the existing roof. He welcomes the idea that Board ask staff to assist him in finding it at the last hearing but this is the help he received. With staff's help and his additional efforts, he cannot locate any other material. He has completed the renovations inside the home and is ready to move on with the roof. He stated he would appreciate the Board's approval to reroof his home.

Board Member Altamirano asked if the ridge pieces could be rescued? What do the ridge pieces look like for this sample?

Mr. Dupont said the ridge pieces can be seen in the picture. The original ridge piece is a unique design. He was thinking that if he could use this sample material, he could try to restore the existing ridge but he is not sure that they would fit.

Board Member Altamirano asked if the existing ridges could be rescued?

Mr. Dupont replied that this is what he would like to try but they have to fit these different contours. He could try to place them on top of the other ridge to make them look that way and said that he would have to work with the roofer on this.

Board Member Altamirano asked if they were unable to move ahead with this material, would he be able to replace the roof with real tiles, would this be a burden?

Mr. Dupont explained that the home is adobe, he was not sure what kind of restructuring would need to be done to sustain the tile roof.

Sandy McNiel, 4478 Fourth Street, stated she did not think that it looked that bad. She believes wholeheartedly in historic preservation but we also live in a new age and new time and sometimes it is just not doable but to make it look as close as possible. This is at least 70 years old. She has seen the house from the upstairs room as you look out. The majority of it is dented in and bashed. She does not know that it can be repaired but her concern would be the ridgeline. If he has not talked to a roofer yet about this material and whether the ridgeline would work, This would be very important to see what that looks like to keep the structure and design of it. If the ridgeline fits well with this material, she would be in favor of that. It is better than the tarps and white stuff that has been on there for a year. The window screens were a concern but now that they have painted, they don't look so bad. She knows that he is making an effort. As a resident, she talked to some of the neighbors who couldn't make it here today. She didn't think that was bad, looking at these materials and cost. They would love to keep their homes historic but sometimes going back to the original material from 60-70 years ago is cost prohibitive. They couldn't afford to live in the homes if it was that way. He asked the Board to consider her comments.

Board Member Garafalo said he was trying to remember their conversation back in April when they decided to give the applicant this extra period of time. What prompted the Board was that there were any number of tiles that would have been more acceptable. Based on this the Board provided additional time, if this period of time has passed, three months, and nothing more appropriate than this is forthcoming, he did not know that they could burden the applicant further. Either show that material does exist that is not cost prohibitive which would be superior to this or approve the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Board Member Altamirano inquired if staff had any knowledge of tile-looking material that was lighter that would look like real tile? Or something that simulates clay tile?

Board Member Gettis there is lighter clay tile. The only thing that simulates clay tile is this plastic or concrete. The concrete is heavier than the clay tile. Both of those would be cheaper than clay tile.

Board Member Chavez-Preston would staff consider that it is easier to find the clay looking tile than the metal roofing material?

Ms. Gettis replied that the house is 98 years old and obviously has a really special roof on it and requires special research to locate matching material.

Board Member Field asked if staff has looked at fiber glass material.

Board Member Altamirano noted that it appears staff does not think the applicant has done enough research to rule out other options and that this sample isn't close enough to what is there to satisfy staff.

Ms. Gettis explained that staff put 12 hours into researching materials and provided the list to Mr. Dupont to talk to distributors and contractors. The goal was to give the applicant closure today rather than continue in this situation but she felt that there are people out there who do this for a living. There are architects, who work with historic buildings all the time that could provide better service than staff.

Chair Megna said he has experience with these type of roofs in two other venues, never actually in California but Florida and the mid-west. These kind of roofs, particularly on homes built in the '20s and up to the mid '30s were actually fairly popular. Again, it was a way to do a roof that looked like a tile roof but to save money both on the structure and material. The part he was a little perplexed by, but again he has invested no more than 15 minutes of his time in exploring this. Given the number of homes in other places in the country that have metallic roofs, formed metallic roofs, he is somewhat surprised that there isn't a replacement material for this. For what it is worth, by the way, in other parts of the country they not only come in clay red but they come in this wonderful green color. He shared staff's concern that this is a specialized activity and that not all the resources that can be potentially applied to this have been. One of the questions he raised even earlier today was whether anyone had done a professional catalog search through one of the major architectural catalogs like Sweets. It is one thing to search the internet but architects, particularly preservation architects, have access to catalog services that but you have to have subscriptions to them. I can't help but wonder if there was a professional engaged in this that might not have a greater chance of finding a replacement material rather than a generalized search on the internet. His position today would be that he has not seen a material yet which he thinks does a good job of replicating the original roof.

Board Member Field pointed out that the hip line is going to be a real challenge.

Chair Megna stated he had great sympathy and sensitivity to the applicant. The Board would like to see him proceed but the home poses a bit of a problem and he did not think the potential research resources available have been exhausted to determine whether or not there is someone that makes this material. He is having a hard time believing, given what he knows about the number of homes elsewhere in the country, that nobody makes this material.

Board Member Leach commented that the issue she has is that the Board needs to make a decision, they can't just keep saying do more research.

Chair Megna stated that it would depend on the kind of research. There is a difference between the kind of research a professional architect would do, the resources that person would have at their disposal, than just simply googling it on the internet.

Board Member Gilleece indicated that this was her comment before, it seems that there are two angles to this. One, is this good enough and two, has he really done all the research. Is it the Board's position to require him to hire a professional to do this research? Who is the Board putting the burden on, the applicant or staff? If it is on the applicant, is the Board asking him to provide them with the professional opinion as to whether this material exists? He is not a roofing expert either. The Board should either request that an expert determine

whether this exists or not or the Board should approve it because the applicant has given them what he can find. This is where she felt the Board was at.

Chair Megna agreed that was a basis for discussion, where is the Board at? The position he would take is that, knowing what he knows, he does not think all the resources have been exhausted here to determine whether there is a replacement material. He appreciates the fact that they are putting burden on the property owner but isn't that inherit in the historic property to begin with? There are going to be expenses associated with the maintenance of a historic property. Again, he stated he was open to the pleasure of the Board on this but if they are just going to approve something, he is unlikely to vote in favor of it.

Board Member Gilleece clarified that she was not suggesting the Board approve it, just trying to clarify the issues. Her thoughts are that they should either require him to bring something back from a professional historic preservation architect, that is specifically where the information can come from, or vote on the approval or denial. They cannot just keep recommending that more research be done. The Board should specifically state what would satisfy the staff and Board.

Board Member Murrieta asked if this wasn't the suggestion made to the applicant previously, to seek out the advice of a professional. Wasn't he already told this?

Ms. Gettis explained that this is something that has come up in the last few days.

Chair Megna asked the applicant for his comments.

Mr. Dupont stated that the Board has mentioned whether or not he has done enough research. The internet is one of the main avenues to do that research and of course, after that to call those numbers and obtain estimates. He is a land surveyor by profession and has architects that he has asked to see if they can find a replacement material. The architect also obtained the same information he has. He stated he has done quite a bit of research. Again, as in April, he welcomes that staff was to help him find it but that was as far as they got.

**MOTION MADE** by Board Member Garafalo, **SECONDED** by Board Member Leach, **TO APPROVE** Planning Case P11-0142 subject to staff's alternate findings and recommended conditions on page 4 of the staff report.

Board Member Leach stated she wasn't sure this was going forward.

Chair Megna agreed, the Board will approve something that will go back to square one.

Board Member Leach stated that in her mind, this is formed smooth metal roofing material and is good but staff is saying it is not.

Chair Megna stated that it didn't have the same shape.

Board Member Leach disagreed, in her mind, it does.

Chair Megna stated that this brings up the other issue that Board Member Leach did raise, we don't know whether there is ridge line material for it.

Board Member Leach agreed, that would be the only question as far as the sample material is concerned. As the Chair said, those came in very similar pieces to that. To her the samples are very similar, as you look across the street at it but the ridge line would be the question.

Board Member Murrieta asked if the applicant could provide a ridgeline sample to the Board.

Mr. Dupont stated he did but did not have a sample of it.

Chair Megna asked if the sample was a metal material or composite?

It was confirmed that the material was metal.

Board Member Leach stated it was much smoother than the first sample.

Board Member Garafalo asked if the Board were to move staff's recommendation with the statement that the Board finds this material to be acceptable subject to ridgeline samples. He offered to change his motion to reflect this.

Chair Megna agreed but staff will still need to see a ridgeline sample.

Board Member Leach agreed and seconded the motion.

Chair Megna pointed that Board Member Garafalo's modification was already included under specific condition of approval 5.

Ms. Smith clarified that Board Member Garafalo's motion is that this material sample is ok. The Board needs to specify that the material sample is acceptable subject to the ridgeline sample being brought in for staff's approval. Otherwise, it's still the issue of where the Board is right now. If the Board's intention is that this material is acceptable, it must be stated.

Chair Megna restated then that, the motion before the Board is to approve the project subject to staff's alternate recommended conditions of approval. The sample presented to the Board today is satisfactory pending the resolution of condition 5, to provide a ridgeline sample that is satisfactory to the Cultural Heritage Board staff.

Board Members Garafalo and Leach agreed.

Board Member Altamirano asked if the Board can add another condition that the applicant consult a preservation architect before making a final decision to ensure there is a professional opinion.

Ms. Smith stated that the Board should do this separately because it conflicts with the current motion unless the current motion says this material is acceptable pending the review of a professional historical architect who says, yes, this material is like enough with what is out there now. The motion can be amended if the maker and second of the motion agree to this or someone must propose a substitute motion.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION MADE** by Board Member Altamirano, **TO APPROVE** Planning Case P11-0142 subject to staff's alternate findings and recommended conditions on page 4. With

the modification to condition 5 that the applicant consult with a preservation architect to determine whether there is a satisfactory replacement available.

Board Member Murrieta asked if this motion will require something in writing from that professional architect. According to the applicant, he has consulted an architect.

Board Member Megna agreed that the expectation needs to be articulated that the Board/staff will receive something from a preservation architect one way or another in writing.

**MOTION FAILED** due to lack of second.

Chair Megna announced that substitute motion failed, therefore the Board will return to the original motion.

Ms. Smith explained to the Board that they also need to make findings that support approval of the provided sample. The findings in the staff report is that the sample material does not comply with Title 20. The Board needs to make a finding that the sample material is consistent.

Chair Megna asked the Board for the necessary findings to approve the proposal. He stated that the Board would also need to make the finding that the contemporary machine formed roofing material would be in keeping with the historic smooth metal roofing of the residence; and that the applicant's proposed roofing material is appropriate.

Ms. Smith added that the Board will also need to make the finding that the material is consistent.

Chair Megna summarized findings starting with facts for finding 2: the Board has to find that it is consistent with the historic integrity; in finding 3: the Board has to find that it would resemble the roofing material of the appropriate period, and; finding 4: the Board has to find that the contemporary machine form roofing material would be in keeping with the historic smooth metal roofing of the residence.

The Motion is to approve the recommended conditions of approval on page 4 with the modification to specific condition 5; that the material shown to the Board today is satisfactory to the CHB and that in order to do this the changes to facts for findings 1, 2, 3, and 4 are consistent with this position.

**MOTION FAILED** by a vote of 4 ayes to 5 noes and 0 disqualified and 0 abstentions.

AYES: Garafalo, Leach, Murrieta, Treen  
NOES: Altamirano, Field, Gilleece, Megna, Preston-Chavez,  
DISQUALIFIED: None  
ABSTAINED: None  
ABSENT: None

Board Member Field commented that the sample material looks like a modern concrete tract house roof to him. This looks like a metal version of that. Without seeing what the ridgeline looks like, he would prefer the previous sample provided at the last meeting. This is not a good replacement roof. He stated he would really have trouble with this without seeing the

ridgeline. This is really the key element to this home. He stated that he hated to hold up the applicant for this because this is a beautiful home. He knows this home very well but without seeing what the ridgeline will look like, it is really hard for him and felt this would destroy the character of the house. He stated he could not support it.

Mr. Dupont commented that as he mentioned before, the only thing he can do is put the proper ridgeline that goes with this roofing material or this, as far as he is concerned, this will work. He could at least save the roofline and put that roofline in front of the house on top of this new material.

Board Member Field stated that the original ridgeline material will not fit on either of the samples provided.

Mr. Dupont stated that once it is protected with the roofline material that goes with this material, the original material can be glued on with an epoxy.

Board Member Field again, noted that it would not match up. It is a different material.

Ms. Gettis noted that there is a property at CBU that uses this material. Staff does have pictures of the ridgeline for that material. Should the Board wish to add the condition for the preservation architect. She has written a condition of approval that encapsulates some of the things that were mentioned including Board Member Murrieta's comment that the applicant hire a preservation architect to review the home's roofing material and make their recommendation in the form of a report for the Cultural Heritage Board staff or to return to the Board.

Chair Megna asked Ms. Gettis for her impression of this material as she has visited CBU's facility. He asked for her real live impression as opposed to photographs and catalog pictures.

Ms. Gettis stated that the texture bothered her less than the shape. When you see it there you can see the thickness of it, it doesn't have the same dimension to it that the existing material has. Based on seeing this yesterday, she began considering the need for someone who specializes in this to review and provide their recommendations. Which is why it wasn't included in the report before the Board.

Chair Megna said we made an effort earlier to try the preservation architect approach. He inquired if the Board wanted to try that motion again.

Ms. Gettis suggested the deletion of condition 4 and 5, with the addition of a condition: That the applicant hire a preservation architect to review the house and roofing material and make their recommendation in the form of a report to the Cultural Heritage Board or staff.

Ms. Smith clarified that if the condition reads, "report to the Board", the motion should be a continuance. If the report is for staff review, the motion would stand.

Chair Megna noted that if the Board refers this to staff, although staff can respond much more quickly, should the architect indicate alternatives are available, does the Board need to approve the alternate?

Ms. Smith replied that this would be up to the Board. The Board is requesting that he hire a preservation architect and if the Board is satisfied with staff making the decision on any alternate material that may be suggested by the architect, the motion would stand. If not, then the Board needs to recommend a continuance with the direction that the applicant do this and comes back with the material the architect recommends.

Chair Megna emphasized to Mr. Dupont that they do not want to hold him up. The Board appreciates his efforts. He wanted to give him the opportunity and decide how he would like to proceed. He explained that the Board's motion basically denied his Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant may appeal this decision within 10 days. The appeal will be heard by the City Council's Land Use Committee. The Land Use Committee will forward their decision full City Council for final approval.

Ken Gutierrez, Planning Director, stated he was verifying the meeting date in August. He noted that there may not be much time saving with this process as it could take about 2 months.

Chair Megna agreed and noted that the Board was trying to be sensitive to the applicant's time issue. He suggested the possibility of the appeal process to the Land Use Committee and City Council, although they do not always agree with the Cultural Heritage Board. The alternative is that the Board ask the applicant to hire a professional architect and provide them with the architect's findings. If the applicant agrees with this alternative, the Board will continue this item. He added that this would probably be the quickest way to get this resolved.

Mr. Gutierrez announced that there will be a Land Use Committee meeting on August 11. This item can be heard if it is appealed immediately.

Chair Megna stated that this was the applicant's choice, to appeal and go to Land Use Committee on August 11 but understand that whatever they do, it still has to go to City Council for final approval. Or, he can engage a preservation architect to see whether there is an alternate material and return to the August 17 meeting. He stated it was the applicant's choice.

Mr. Dupont stated that there was no guarantee that the architect would find any other material.

Chair Megna agreed in which case the applicant would bring a letter from the architect that said it has been researched and the material is no longer available. At that point, it would greatly change the view of multiple Board Members here with respect to what the alternatives would be.

Board Member Gilleece requested that he also bring a ridgeline material sample.

Mr. Dupont asked for continuance. Once the Board receives a letter from the professional or whatever, and it says we have it or we don't?

Chair Megna pointed out that the problem is that the material he presented the Board failed to get approval. The motion failed by a 4- 5 vote. What would change the view of the board is if they were able to see the ridgeline material. He felt the applicant's quickest route here is the continuance and that the applicant inform staff by a date certain of the results of the research



by a preservation architect one way or another and finding the ridgeline material sample for this roofing solution.

Mr. Dupont replied that he can obtain the ridgeline material right away. The point is that he's going to get an architect, ask him to do a letter and provide staff with his findings, but he would like to get approval so he can proceed with his roof.

Board Member Garafalo said he was agreement with this as long as the applicant is aware that staff has been behind a more literal interpretation. If you are aware that it goes back to staff instead of the Board, you're taking your chances that staff will think better of it the next time.

Chair Megna agreed and noted that the applicant may find the Board more accommodating.

Mr. Dupont said he would bring the choices available to the Board.

Board Member Field added that he thought it was important to point out the fact that the Board is referring to a historic preservation architect, not your friend, the architect. It needs to be someone that specializes in this field in order for the Board to be convinced that this material is no longer available.

Ms. Smith wanted to make sure it comes back to the Board next time so that they can vote one way or another. She asked if the Board just wants a letter that the material is not available or a letter that also includes suggested alternate materials that maintain the historic integrity of the house.

Chair Megna agreed and stated that in any case, it's going to be new material if the exact roofing material is clearly unavailable. The manufacturer of this probably went out of business decades ago but is there replicant material close to it, that's what we are looking for here.

Mr. Dupont stated that there wasn't, he has been looking all over the place.

Board Member Treen noted that the historic architect can look other places.

Chair Megna reiterated that they are trying to be accommodating to him, he can appeal the Board's denial or request a continuance for one month.

Mr. Dupont said he had mentioned continuance.

**MOTION BY** Board Member Gilleece, **SECONDED BY** Board Member Field, **TO CONTINUE** Planning Case P11-0142 to the meeting of August 17, 2011.

Chair Megna stated that the purpose of the continuance is to continue the research.

**MOTION CARRIED:** by a vote of 8 ayes to 1 noes and 0 disqualified and 0 abstentions.

AYES: Altamirano, Field Garafalo, Gilleece, Megna, Murrieta, Preston-Chavez,  
Treen

NOES: Leach

DISQUALIFIED: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT:           None

#### **D. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

3. **PLANNING CASE P11-0196:** Proposal by California Baptist University (CBU) to consider a Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation of the A.C.E Hawthorne House, which is eligible for designation as a City Landmark, and establishment of a 317 space parking lot to serve the CBU campus, located at 3747 Monroe Street, situated on the southeasterly corner of Magnolia Avenue and Monroe Street, in the R-1-7000-SP -Single-Family Residential and Specific Plan (Magnolia Avenue) Overlay Zones, in Ward 5.

Patricia Brenes, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. She stated, for the record, since the writing of the staff report, a written comment in support of the proposal has been received from Laura Klure and a copy has been distributed for the Board's consideration. Staff also received a phone call from the previous owner of the home, Eileen Hewitt who kindly offered to share stories and photographs of the home.

Board Member Altamirano stated that the e-mail received from Ms. Klure says that she is worried about the signing of the house. Not to demolish? She didn't know if they are involved with that. The numbering of the house is wrong that clearly puts the home under danger of demolishing by mistake. Is staff aware of this?

Ms. Brenes explained that she had a phone conversation with Ms. Klure and clarified that the Hawthorne house is not intended to be demolished. Building permits were issued for the demolition of two other houses and for the demolition of the ancillary structures at 3747. There is no intent to demolish the Hawthorne house.

Chair Megna opened the public hearing. He invited the applicant to address the Board.

Steve Smith, Director of Facilities and Planning, stated that this project has been a great example of the collaboration with Planning staff. The demolition has happened and the site has been cleaned up. The site lines right now are amazing. He assured the Board that the home is staying. This will be his office, he will not let anything happen to that house. The site line by the way right now, Chair Megna had e-mailed him asking a question about the site line. If you were riding on Monroe looking at the alley between the palm and trees, you are going to have a clean site line to the front of the house. The other thing, there will be a visual of the second story of the house over the citrus.

Chair Megna said he would take this opportunity to press the issue of visibility just a bit further. He wanted to use this opportunity to comment that CBU has done a wonderful job here with an unenviable task, preserving a historic building in the middle of a 317 parking lot. He wanted some assurance that whatever is doing in the foreground, fence or landscaping, will allow somebody to stand there and appreciate the house in an historic way.

Mr. Smith agreed, they have worked with Ms. Gettis and Ms. Brenes to ensure that the site line was plain from the sidewalk and very open. They tried to detail the site to make it more Riverside appropriate. Originally they had the pathway, more formal with concrete and changed the pathway to make it look more like the original.

Chair Megna inquired if there were any pilasters in the space in front or just open fence work?

Mr. Smith replied that there are pilasters.

Board Member Altamirano noted that since this a historical house kind of setback, were they planning on any kind of plaque, that goes to the sidewalk to kind of tell this home's story?

Mr. Smith explained that they have agreed to do this.

Ms. Gettis added that it is a condition of approval.

Chair Megna asked the applicant if he had read the conditions of approval and if they were in agreement?

Mr. Smith replied yes.

Chair Megna asked if there was anyone else present that would like to comment on this item.

Eileen Hewitt addressed the Board. She and her husband were the previous owners and sold the home to the University several years ago. She stated that naming the home a City Landmark was a marvelous idea and she definitely supported this. The Hewitt family is thrilled to hear that the public can actually see the home. When they signed contracts with the University, they asked that a plaque be placed with the Hewitt family name. She has pictures and history of the home that she would be happy to supply to staff or the applicant. She reiterated that she would like to see the plaque put up because the home was owned by the Hewitt family for 43 years. They have lovingly preserved it as best they could during those years. She hoped that the proposed "renovation" did not mean a drastic change to the interior of the home. There is wood paneling on the ceiling, wood floors, the original 1800 glass windows and frames, all of which make this home unique. She stated she was happy with what is going on and thanked the Board for listening.

Chair Megna thanked Mrs. Hewitt for taking the time to come down here today. He added that under Title 20, this Board does not have any capacity to govern any interior changes to the building but of the items you mentioned, windows are within their purview.

Ted Hewitt addressed the Board. He was brought to this home when he was born and when his son was born, he was brought him to this house as well. This house means something to him. He appreciates the care that CBU is taking to do what it can to help this house. He also knows enough about the house that he does not envy them the job. This is an old lady and has a lot of problems, not least of which are the sagging floors that had to be boosted up. The people that did it just chopped off the pillars and stuck in shivs, so it was not done well. There were issues with the foundation, it is an old foundation, a lot of sand in the concrete. It has two integral chimneys inside, one is an extremely unique chimney in the main area of the house going in to three different rooms all tiled. He believed the tile to be from the Ramona Tile Company in the 1800s that produced them in a very European way. Gorgeous, but that chimney, one good shake and not sure what damage it would do. There are a lot of problems with the house that need to be addressed that need to be done to make it safe for offices. He offered his assistance in anyway. He stated he had a great love for the old lady and hope she will be well taken care of.

Chair Megna asked if there was anyone else in the audience, seeing none, the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION MADE** by Board Member Field, **SECONDED** by Board Member Murrieta, **TO APPROVE** Planning Case P11-0196 subject to staff's findings and recommended conditions.

**MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

AYES: Altamirano, Field, Garafalo, Gilleece, Leach, Megna, Murrieta, Preston-Chavez, Treen  
NOES: None  
DISQUALIFIED: None  
ABSTAINED: None  
ABSENT: None

Chair Megna thanked CBU for still another project everyone will be proud of. He advised the applicant of the appeal procedure.

**E. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:**

5. Brief report from the Historic Preservation Officer on recent City Council actions.
6. Items for future agendas.
7. Update on status of major development projects.

Ms. Gettis stated that the Board may have noticed the status report's added items. She added the status update on the grants staff is working on, as well as announced that staff received another grant for \$22,500 from the State Office of Historic Preservation for the Cliffside Historic District survey. Also new to the status report are community projects, in particular the EIR moving forward for the Imperial Hardware building.

She stated that the appeal of the Main Street facades did go to the City Council and that they upheld the decision of the Board and Land Use Committee's recommendations.

Chair Megna stated that they received an e-mail from OHP this afternoon.

Ms. Gettis explained that the State Historic Preservation Office was going through the City's annual report and notified her after the fact, that the Board Members were be adding to their list serve. Only those Board Members listed on the last annual report were added to the list serve, there are new members that would not have been added. The members can opt out of this, there are instructions at the bottom of the e-mail. She indicated that she and Ken are both on the list serve as well.

**F. MINUTES:**

8. The minutes of July 20, 2011 were approved as corrected.

Ms. Gettis noted that Ms. Gonzales was not included as being present at the last meeting.

**G. ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 pm to Wednesday, August 17, 2011 at 3:30 p.m. in the Mayor's Ceremonial Room.