



Minutes – Cultural Heritage Board

September 21 2011, 3:30 pm,
MAYOR'S CEREMONIAL ROOM, CITY HALL
3900 MAIN STREET

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Altamirano, Field, Gilleece, Megna, Preston-Chavez,

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Garafalo, Leach, Murrieta, Treen

STAFF PRESENT: Erin Gettis, Historic Preservation Officer
Smith, Supervising Deputy City Attorney
Brenes, Senior Planner
Smith, Associate Planner
Andrade, 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
C.	DISCUSSION CALENDAR:.....	4
1.	PLANNING CASE P11-0138: Proposal by Craig Johnson for a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior modifications including new storefronts to replace existing roll-up loading doors, wainscot tiling, storefront modifications and paint at Mission Galleria, formerly known as the Sears-Roebuck Building, designated City Structure of Merit 291 and contributor to the Mission Inn and Seventh Street Historic Districts located at 3700 Main Street, situated on the south corner of Mission Inn Avenue and Main Street in the Downtown Specific Plan – Raincross District in Ward 1.....	4
2.	PLANNING CASE P11-0142 (Continued from August 17, 2011): 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.....	5
D.	PUBLIC HEARINGS:	9
E.	MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:.....	9
3.	Workshop/Rules for the Transaction of Business – Presentation – Erin Gettis, City Historic Preservation Officer and Kristi Smith, Supervising Deputy City Attorney.....	9
4.	Workshop/Conduct of Hearings – Presentation – Kristi Smith, Supervising Deputy City Attorney	9
5.	Brief report from the Historic Preservation Officer on recent City Council actions.....	9
6.	Items for future agendas.....	9
7.	Update on status of major development projects.....	9
F.	MINUTES:	9
8.	The minutes of September 21, 2011 were approved as presented.....	9
G.	ADJOURNMENT:	10

A. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

There were no comments from the audience.

B. CONSENT CALENDAR:

There were no consent items scheduled.

C. DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

1. **PLANNING CASE P11-0138:** Proposal by Craig Johnson for a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior modifications including new storefronts to replace existing roll-up loading doors, wainscot tiling, storefront modifications and paint at Mission Galleria, formerly known as the Sears-Roebuck Building, designated City Structure of Merit 291 and contributor to the Mission Inn and Seventh Street Historic Districts located at 3700 Main Street, situated on the south corner of Mission Inn Avenue and Main Street in the Downtown Specific Plan – Raincross District in Ward 1.

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

MOTION MADE by Board Member Field, **SECONDED** by Board Member Gilleece, **TO CONTINUE** Planning Case P11-0138 to the meeting of October 19, 2011 as requested by the applicant.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

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

2. **PLANNING CASE P11-0142 (Continued from August 17, 2011)**: 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. He stated that at the July Cultural Heritage Board meeting, the Board directed the applicant to consult with a local historic preservation architect on the appropriate roofing material. The Board also directed the applicant to provide either a material sample or a description of the ridgeline. Staff presented the various samples provided to the Board to date. He indicated that subsequent to the July meeting, the applicant provided a new machine form smooth roofing panel. The applicant also commissioned TR Design Group to prepare a report and research the availability of an alternative material that would be appropriate for the home. This report concluded that the best available material is a product manufactured by Rare Manufacturing. Staff can support this material as it provides the appropriate smooth metal texture and character defining style historically found on the residence. As recommended by the architect, staff recommends that the applicant investigate the feasibility of refurbishing and reinstalling the historic ridgelines on the house to the satisfaction of staff. Also, staff is recommending a condition that a custom manufactured end cap be painted and installed to match the existing roof line to the satisfaction of staff. Staff would ask that the applicant call staff to the site to investigate the ridgeline and end cap. If conditions are not satisfactory to staff, staff may condition the matter back to the Cultural Heritage Board. He also indicated that a supplemental letter from the applicant was received by staff this morning and distributed to the Board. The report includes a description of an alternative material which is also before the Board. This textured material is terra cotta in color and is the applicant's current proposal, as of this morning. He deferred to the applicant for additional product description.

Chair Megna asked for the applicant to come forward.

Armando Dupont, applicant, stated that they have tried to find something similar to what is existing but it is not available. Apparently, staff is suggesting that the Board accept the Rare Manufacturing roof sample which is something he found in Canada. The manufacturer claims 20-25 year life for the product but after doing additional research, you would most likely get 5 years out of it. He introduced a new material by Steel Rock Products which was presented for the Board's review. It is granule which was not accepted previously, however, it is an item that is available locally. He has the local expertise to have it installed. He thought that as far as form, it was appropriate to the house.

Board Member Field asked for a sample of the ridgeline for the Steel Rock Products material.

Mr. Dupont stated he did not have a sample but provided the brochure photos.

Thomas Riggle, TR Design, addressed the Board. He stated that as indicated in his first letter, the product from Rare Manufacturing matches the style, shape, curvature and length. It is probably the closest approximation to that original roof. Since then, Mr. Dupont had a general contractor with 30 years roofing experience look at the sample product and existing ridgeline. The contractor evaluated whether the ridgeline and endcaps could be removed, cut, painted and reinstalled to match the new roof. The contractor felt that the condition of the existing

endcaps and ridgeline, as seen in the pictures, could not be reused. There is 40 years of rust on the steel roof and it would fall apart. It appears that the home has been tented a couple of times and walked over. He had hoped there would be some salvageable material but the roof has been wrecked. The applicant has concerns from water penetration issues, warranty issues with the new roof and the look that the Board is trying to achieve with reusing the material. He understood the Rare Manufacturing sample was a good solution but it does not provide an endcap and ridgeline solution. He felt the Steel Rock product looked very similar from a distance. The size looks a little tighter but the product does provide a better ridgeline and endcap solution that would be more in character with the house. He stated that he did not believe a solution existed that would look exactly as the home does today. He asked that the Board approve the latest product provided from Steel Rock Products over the previous selection, Rare Manufacturing.

Chair Megna asked if there was anyone in the audience who would like to speak to this issue.

Sandy McNeil stated that she lived across the street from this home. She has been there for 30 years. She stated that the home has been tented at least two times that she is aware of. The second sample from the end (Rare Manufacturing) does look very nice but the end one (Steel Rock Products) looks very well too. If the Steel Rock product looks better as a finished product with the ridgelines, it will look better than how it has been for several years now. There have been many people looking at the house, it is up for sale. It would be an asset to the neighborhood to have it finished correctly and get some good homeowners in there.

Board Member Preston-Chavez asked staff for their opinion of the last material sample.

Mr. Smith noted that the shape and scale of it may be appropriate but that it is a textured material. He recalled the Board wanted to replace the roof like for like which would be a smooth metal material.

Board Member Gilleece asked staff to clarify their recommendation as far as the ridgeline and endcaps were concerned with regard to the smooth material.

Erin Gettis, Historic Preservation Officer, explained that the staff report was based upon the previous recommendation of the architect. She stated that part of staff's responsibility is to recommend what they believe to be the most like for like materials. She agreed that the most recent solution presented by Mr. Dupont is actually good but when you see them compared to each other, spacing and everything it is the better match. After staff met with the applicant this morning and received the new sample, staff's recommendation stands as indicated in the staff report.

Board Member Field stated that there was no endcap for this "Rare Manufacturing" material. It appeared that the original roof has some sort of concave stamped into it? The existing roof also appears to have been sealed with something.

Mr. Riggle explained that this is a unique shape but it wasn't this shape originally, it has been walked on so that now it has a little dimple to it. He added that it also has years of patching with putty, concrete, etc. Throughout the roof, you can see everywhere the roof has been walked on at some point. His concern is that this is not a fair assessment of what probably was original to the home.

Chair Megna pointed out that there was an installation of this granularly treated material at California Baptist University,

Mr. Riggle spoke to the material at California Baptist University as he was the architect for the project. He noted that it's the same product but it's a different shape.

Chair Megna commented that his reason for raising this issue, referring to the slide of Cal Baptist's building is that there is a different geometry to the original roof in this case. From a distance both from a horizontal and vertical, this roof has a sort of level reflectivity which at least, to his eye, isn't considerably different than what the Rare Manufacturing product would be if it had a matte finish. There may have been a moment when the original roof had a shininess to it that probably didn't survive for long in the California sun. Anyone who has seen the roof in the last 10-15 years has seen a roof that is pretty weather worn. He stated he was prepared to make a motion. He felt that the owner has shown a considerable good faith effort in retaining an architect and engaging in extensive research to find a reasonable solution. He said that the Steel Rock Product ends with something that is semi closed whereas the Rare Manufacturing piece ends completely open. He said he was prepared to move staff's recommendation with the modification to accept the late entry material, Steel Rock Products, with staff's recommendation that the installation will be subject to staff review. The goal here is to ensure the greatest possible consistency with the overall look of the roof that exists today. It is a minor issue and certainly not something of the Board's purview that this material is manufactured locally but it shouldn't go unnoticed. Given our current economic conditions, giving business to a local manufacturer is probably preferable to buying something from Canada. He asked Ms. Smith, if he needed to make any other modifications to the motion as he was moving staff's recommendation with the change in material with additional emphasis that staff's condition that this be subject to staff review of its installation, not only stays in place, but the Board is emphasizing that requirement.

MOTION MADE by Board Member Megna, **SECONDED** by Board Member Gilleece, **TO APPROVE** Planning Case P11-0142 subject to staff's findings and conditions with modifications to conditions to reflect the use of the Steel Rock Product and emphasizing staff's review of the installation.

Board Member Gilleece asked to see the materials again. She stated it would help her because you will see this from the ground, you won't be looking down from above at the roof. She stated she would second Chair Megna's motion.

Ms. Gettis pointed out that the Board will also need to modify specific condition #5 and reference the second report from Mr. Riggle as the justification of the feasibility for not reinstalling the ridgeline. The condition should probably be modified to say that "The applicant shall install new ridgelines as seen in picture according to the satisfaction of staff".

Chair Megna noted that specific condition #6 may be unnecessary because this particular material appears to provide a semi closed end, whereas the other one was completely open.

He clarified that the condition was modifying condition 5 and effectively dropping condition 6.

Board Member Gilleece, the second of the motion, was in agreement. She also suggested modifying condition 4 to state the correct manufacturer "Steel Rock Products".

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

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

Chair Megna advised the applicant of the appeal procedure.

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

There were no public hearings scheduled.

E. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:

3. Workshop/Rules for the Transaction of Business – Presentation – Erin Gettis, City Historic Preservation Officer and Kristi Smith, Supervising Deputy City Attorney
4. Workshop/Conduct of Hearings – Presentation – Kristi Smith, Supervising Deputy City Attorney

Kristi Smith, Supervising Deputy City Attorney, gave a brief presentation regarding the Rules for the Transaction of Business and Conduct of Hearings. She was glad to see that the three new members were present today. She did not know if they were able to attend the City Attorney's, Greg Priamos', presentation on this subject. She stated that this would be a condensed version and will be hitting on the high points that are really applicable to the Board. She stated she would give an overview of the Brown Act, Conflict of Interest and just the overall meeting rules.

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 Status Report was passed out to the Board this afternoon. In the spirit of the many projects on hold pending staff workload, she informed the Board that next Monday and Tuesday she will be interviewing for a Senior Planner position one of which will have a historic preservation purpose. There will be a new historic preservation staff member here at the City, hopefully before too long and the Board will see some of those pending items move forward. This person will also attend these regularly scheduled meetings.

Also, as it happens sometimes in the past the December meeting is really close to the Christmas holiday. The meeting in December is on the 21st. She asked if the Board would consider adjourning the November meeting to December 14th, the Wednesday before in order to avoid the Christmas week. There may be a couple of projects that may come forward during this time. If there are no items, the December meeting can be cancelled.

It was the Board's consensus to adjourn the meeting in November to a date specific as needed.

F. MINUTES:

8. The minutes of September 21, 2011 were approved as presented.

G. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm p.m. to the Wednesday, October 19, 2011 meeting at 3:30 p.m. in the Mayor's Ceremonial Room.