



AGENDA HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

A Regular Meeting via Teleconference

Tuesday, February 2, 2021 at 5:00 PM

**City Manager's Conference Room
8130 Allison Avenue, La Mesa, California**

This meeting is being conducted utilizing teleconferencing and electronic means consistent with State of California Executive Order N-29-20 dated March 17, 2020, regarding the COVID-19 pandemic.

The public may view the meeting live using the following remote options:

Teleconference Meeting Webinar

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://zoom.us/j/98178342693>

Telephone (Audio only)

(669) 900-6833 or (346) 248-7799

Webinar ID: 981 7834 2693

Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

Members of the public who wish to make public comments may submit their comments by email to be read aloud at the Historic Preservation Commission meeting by staff. Email comments must be submitted to planning@cityoflamesa.us by 3:00 p.m. the day of the Commission meeting and be no more than 300 words. Any language beyond the 300 words shall not be read during the Commission meeting. The counting of words, for the purposes of public comment submissions, shall follow the same standards as set forth in Elections Code § 9 (see Attachment A). Please note in your email subject line that this is for "PUBLIC COMMENT". All email comments shall be subject to the same rules as would otherwise govern speaker comments at the Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Public Comments for items on the Agenda

Members of the public who wish to make public comments may submit their comments by email to be read aloud at the Historic Preservation Commission meeting by staff. Email comments will be accepted prior to the Commission meeting and up until the time that the Chair announces that public comment is closed for the agenda item being commented on. Email comments must

be submitted to planning@cityoflamesa.us. Please note in your email subject line the agenda item number related to the comment. All email comments shall be subject to the same rules as would otherwise govern speaker comments at the Historic Preservation Commission meeting. Applicants who wish to make an audio/visual presentation pertaining to an item on the agenda must contact and provide the electronic presentation materials to Cheryl Davis at cdavis@cityoflamesa.us or 619.667.1190, no later than 12:00 noon, one business day prior to the start of the meeting. Advance notification will ensure compatibility with City equipment and allow meeting presentations to progress smoothly and in a consistent and equitable manner. Presentations will not be accepted after the deadline. Please note that all presentations/digital materials are considered part of the maximum time limit provided to speakers.

1. Call meeting to order.
2. Roll Call:

	Don Cary			Crystal Arnote
	Carmen Pauli			Isaac Ullah
	Tyler Rogers			Jan Wilcox
	Curt Sherman			Jim Newland, Ex-Officio
3. Deletions from the Agenda/ Urgent additions to the Agenda
4. Communication
5. Public Discussion and Audience Participation
6. HEARINGS - None
7. BUSINESS
 - a. 2021 Work Plan Adoption
 - b. Historic Preservation Ordinance Update at the request of the Commission
 - c. Approval of the minutes from the January 5, 2021 meeting
8. INFORMATION ITEMS
9. Adjournment

Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection at <https://www.cityoflamesa.us/AgendaCenter>.

The City of La Mesa encourages the participation of disabled individuals in the services, activities and programs provided by the City. Individuals with disabilities, who require reasonable accommodation in order to participate in the Historic Preservation Commission meetings, should contact the City's Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Coordinator, Rida Freeman, Director of Administrative Services, 48 hours prior to the meeting at 619.667.1175, fax 619.667.1163, or rfreeman@ci.la-mesa.ca.us.

**NOTICE
OF APPEAL PROCEDURES**

Actions taken by the Historic Preservation Commission to approve or deny a Certificate of Appropriateness may be appealed to the City Council. If you disagree with an action of the Commission and wish to file an appeal, you must do so within ten working days of the date of the Commission's action. In order to file an appeal, you must submit an appeal letter stating why you disagree with the Commission's action to the Office of the City Clerk, City Hall, 8130 Allison Avenue along with a \$100.00 appeal fee. If no appeal is filed within this period, the action becomes final.

If an appeal is filed, a public hearing to consider the appeal will be scheduled for the next available City Council meeting. Public notice will be provided for any appeal hearing for an item that required public notice for the Historic Preservation Commission action being appealed. Any questions regarding the appeal process should be directed to the Office of the City Clerk at 619.667.1120 or cityclrk@cityoframesa.us, or the Community Development Department at 619.667.1196 or akinnard@cityoframesa.us.

E:\cp2021\Agendas\HPC\2021-02-02.docx



DATE: February 2, 2021
TO: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: Allyson Kinnard, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: Draft Work Plan Discussion

Work Plans for 2021 will be presented to the City Council at their regular meetings on February 9 and February 23, 2021. Work Plans represent preferred priority projects from the Commission's perspective and are intended to be guidance documents only. They provide staff with direction as workload and time permit.

A draft was provided for discussion at the January 5, 2021, Historic Preservation Commission meeting. From that discussion, it was agreed that ordinance and policy updates are the priority need at this time. It was suggested that elevating the policy goal to the first on the list would draw attention to its importance. Community support for an ordinance update is provided in correspondence received from Save Our Heritage Organisation (SOHO), provided as **Attachment B**. Commissioners also suggested adding a bullet point related to updating historic eligibility criteria to reflect an interest in revising the Mills Act program to allow participation by contributing resources in historic districts.

The remaining work plan goals reflect on-going activities that remain unchanged from the prior year.

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission discuss and take action to approve the draft Work Plan (**Attachment A**), which will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration.

Attachment: A – Draft 2021 Historic Preservation Commission Work Plan
B – Correspondence



**Work Plan
FY2021**

Goals should be consistent with the City’s goals:

- Safe Community
- Maintain a Financially Sound and Affordable City Government
- Continue to Improve High Quality Municipal Services
- Revitalize Neighborhoods and Corridors
- Enhanced Recreation and Quality of Life Opportunities
- Ensure Safe and Affordable Homes for All Current and Future Residents

Staffing Department: Community Development Department

GOALS	DUE DATE	TRACKING MILESTONES	STATUS
1. Update Historic Resources Inventory	On-going and as staffing support permits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue field survey and research with assistance from SDSU/LMHS • Develop a phased program to implement update procedures. • Develop assessment ranking criteria. • Bring the first completed submissions forward for consideration. 	On-going
2. Improve public understanding of historic preservation.	On-going and as staffing support permits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop outreach tools, such as a web page, story maps, and brochures to promote the City’s historic preservation program and the benefits of historic preservation. 	On-going
3. Regular Duties as identified in LMMC 25.01.060. G.	As-needed		On going
4. Consider Ordinance/Policy Updates	As-needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an ordinance amendment to require a review process for properties 50 years or older and assess community support for the ordinance. 	On-going

LMMC
25.01.060 - Historic preservation commission.

G. Powers and Duties. The Commission shall have the power and duty to:

1. Conduct a continuing survey of all cultural resources in the City which the Commission, on the basis of information available or presented to it, has reason to believe may be eligible for designation as a historic landmark or historic district or for recognition as a structure of merit.

2. Review the La Mesa Historic Resources Inventory according to the criteria set forth in the Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan.
3. Recommend to the City Council amendments to the La Mesa Historic Resources Inventory.
4. Recommend to the City Council that certain areas, places, buildings, structures, natural features, works of art or other improvements having significant historical, cultural, architectural, archaeological, community or aesthetic value as part of the heritage of the City be designated as a historic landmark or historic district.
5. Maintain a local register of designated landmarks and historic districts within the City.
6. Approve or disapprove, in whole or in part, applications for a Certificate of Appropriateness pertaining to alteration, modification, or removal of any exterior architecture feature of a designated landmark or improvement within a historic district.
7. Adopt guidelines to be used by the Commission in reviewing applications for Certificates of Appropriateness.
8. Review and comment upon applications for demolition permits pertaining to designated cultural resources and applications for demolition and alteration permits for cultural resources included in the La Mesa Historic Resources Inventory.
9. Explore means for protection, retention and use of any designated or potential landmark including, but not limited to, appropriate legislation and financing.
10. Recommend and encourage the protection, enhancement, appreciation and use of structures of historical, cultural, architectural, community or aesthetic value which have not been designated as landmarks but are deserving of recognition as structures of merit so as to emphasize their importance in the lifestyle of La Mesa.
11. Encourage public understanding of an involvement in the unique architectural and environmental heritage of the City through educational and interpretative programs. Such may include, but shall not be limited to, lectures, tours, walks, reports, publications, films, open houses, special events.
12. Encourage private efforts to acquire property and raise money on behalf of historic preservation; however, the Commission is specifically denied the power to acquire property or invest therein for or on behalf of itself or the City.
13. Render advice and guidance on any structure at the request of the property owner as time permits (i.e., painting, color, materials, landscaping, fencing, lighting). This advice shall not be construed to impose any controls, but shall be offered in a spirit of friendly help.
14. Investigate and report to the City Council on the use of various federal, state, local or private funding sources and mechanisms available to promote historic resource preservation in the City.
15. Cooperate with local, county, state and federal governments in the pursuit of the objectives of historic preservation.
16. Implement other historic preservation plans and programs including, but not limited to, those listed as Complementary Programs in the General Plan Element.
17. Prepare or cause to be prepared nominations to the National Register of Historic Places, as time permits.
18. Consult with professionals and experts in fields such as archaeology, paleontology, history, preservation, architecture, design and engineering whenever such consultation is desired or necessary.



Save Our Heritage Organisation
Protecting San Diego's architectural and cultural heritage since 1969

Tuesday, January 19, 2021

Mayor Arapostathis & La Mesa City Council
La Mesa City Hall
8130 Allison Avenue
La Mesa, CA 92101

Re: Historical Preservation 2021 Work Plan

Mayor Arapostathis and Councilmembers,

Save Our Heritage Organisation (SOHO) applauds your decision last January (2020,) directing staff to update the Historic Preservation Ordinance for the City of La Mesa. Now 2021, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) should begin reviewing this important planning component as soon as possible. This review process is especially important because La Mesa's historical survey is outdated. Additionally, SOHO recommends the City to support historical designation through Mills Act contracts to historical district contributing properties as well as individually significant resources.

SOHO previously expressed concern regarding La Mesa's review process for potentially historic resources, as it relates to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the existing historical inventory. The current review process did not properly evaluate the environmental impacts of the Drew Roundhouse located at Penske Ford Automotive, 8970 La Mesa Boulevard, nor the Lloyd Ruocco commercial façade remodel at 8371 La Mesa Boulevard. Updating this important planning component to follow best practices is in the interests of ALL stakeholders for a streamlined and transparent review as well as a fair process. Specifically, the HPC should review how the cities of San Diego and Coronado review potential and historical properties. Since decisions for potential historical properties is a discretionary and not a ministerial decision, La Mesa must comply with CEQA when making these decisions. For this reason, SOHO continues to suggest better utilizing the HPC, who should opine on potential historical resources prior to a project being approved.

Further, this ordinance update is an entirely separate need (though related) from updating the City's historical survey. SOHO understands the effort to update La Mesa's survey continues and we fully support this undertaking. However, updating the historical review process to be compliant with CEQA and making best use of the HPC should be the utmost priority as this will address any historical resources not listed on the City's outdated historical inventory.

Last, La Mesa should revise its Mills Act regulation to include historic district contributor resources. One of the benefits intended by this state statute is the ability for any qualified property to enter into a Mills Act contract. As the statute defines a qualified historical property as "listed on any federal, state, county, or city register," it was clearly intended to provide tax relief to all historical district contributing properties, not only those that are individually significant. SOHO recommends revising this element to reflect the intent of the regulation and best practice across the state.

Again, SOHO commends the Mayor and Council on moving forward to update the City's historical review process and become compliant with CEQA. Today, SOHO recommends the HPC begin to address these

ATTACHMENT B

deficiencies through an update to the ordinance. SOHO continues to offer our policy expertise and we look forward to participating in the public process around the historical review and Mills Act policy updates.

Thank you for taking our comments into consideration and we look forward to discussing this further,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bruce Coons", with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Bruce Coons
Executive Director
Save Our Heritage Organisation

Minutes of a Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission

January 5, 2021 5:00 p.m.
8130 Allison Avenue, La Mesa, CA

This meeting was conducted utilizing teleconferencing and electronic means consistent with State of California Executive Order N-29-20 dated March 17, 2020, regarding the COVID-19 pandemic.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wilcox called a regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL / ATTENDANCE

Members Attending: Chairman Wilcox, Vice Chair Pauli, Commissioners Arnote, Cary, Rogers, Sherman, Ullah and Ex-Officio Newland

Staff Attending: Senior Planner Kinnard

Absent: Commissioner Sherman

Visitors: 2020-48 Caitlin Murphy, Owner
Danilo Nesovic, Designer
2020-31 Brian and Jennifer Kick, Owners

3. DELETIONS FROM AGENDA /URGENT ADDITIONS None.

4. COMMUNICATIONS None.

5. PUBLIC DISCUSSION AND AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION None.

6. HEARINGS None.

Chairman Wilcox and Commissioner Rogers recused themselves from the first business item. Vice Chair Pauli stepped in to lead the meeting.

7. BUSINESS

7a. Project No. 2020-48 (Murphy) – Reconsideration of a proposed detached accessory dwelling unit at 4640 Date Avenue in the R1 (Urban Residential) zone. The Gertrude Park Updyke Home is a potential landmark in the Date Avenue Historic District.

Ms. Kinnard presented the staff report for this project and explained that, at the December 1, 2020 meeting, the HPC continued the item to a date certain of January 5, 2021, to allow the applicant time for a story pole to be erected to determine whether the overall height of the 7:12 roof pitch would be compatible and in scale with the front house. The Commissioners also requested that the story pole show the height of a 5:12 roof pitch. Ms. Kinnard added that the ADU structure complies with the zoning ordinance.

Staff went to the site and took photos, which were included in the staff report.

Mr. Nesovic felt strongly that the difference in the roof pitch from 5:12 to 7:12 was negligible.

The Commissioners discussed the project. Commissioner Cary said that the 7:12 pitch was out of character with the front house and the 5:12 pitch was more appropriate. He felt the scale was important.

Commissioner Arnote drove by the house and concluded the flag on the story pole showing the 5:12 pitch was much more appropriate in height as it would not dwarf the front house as well as other homes in the area. She said that the higher pitch would impact how the house looks from the front.

Commissioner Ullah walked around the house and agreed with Commissioners Arnote and Cary. He observed a noticeable difference between the steeper pitch and the lower pitch and concluded that the lower pitch is in keeping with the front house, especially when viewed from across the street. While conceding that neighboring houses have steeper pitches, the concern is not with whether the project is in keeping with the historic district, it is with the massing of the steeper pitched roof being extremely out of scale with the main house. He stated that the ADU cannot overwhelm or out-scale the front house.

Ex-Officio Newland was also in agreement and said that a mass and scale issue could affect potential landmark eligibility. He said the lower pitch was a better fit and less of a draw to the eye. He

pointed out that the Commission's responsibility is to determine how the standards are applied to a potential resource in order to protect the integrity of the home as a potential historic landmark. He discussed historic integrity, or authenticity, as an eligibility consideration, and said that a lower pitch roof was preferable because it would not affect integrity.

Vice Chair Pauli thanked the applicant for installing the story pole. She explained the role of the Commission when reviewing a project. In accordance with the La Mesa Municipal Code, it is the Commission's responsibility to ensure that there is no adverse impact to the historical resource. She stated that the purpose of the historic review is to guarantee that the project meets the requirements of the Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Secretary of the Interior's standards.

Vice Chair Pauli then stated that, because the ADU is detached and set behind the main house and does not alter or destroy any historic fabric, the project as proposed complies with the Secretary of the Interior's standards. She did, however, prefer the 5:12 pitch.

Vice Chair Pauli made a motion to approve the project. Commission Cary seconded the motion.

Aye: Pauli
Nay: Cary, Ullah and Arnote
Absent: Sherman
Recused: Wilcox, Rogers
Abstain: None

Motion failed.

Commissioner Ullah made a motion to approve the project with the added condition that the roof have a 5:12 pitch. Commissioner Cary seconded the motion. Motion carried with

Commissioners Cary, Arnote, Ullah, and Vice Chair Pauli in favor, none opposed, Commissioners Wilcox and Rogers were recused. Motion passed.

Aye: Pauli, Cary, Ullah and Arnote
Nay: None
Absent: Sherman
Recused: Wilcox, Rogers
Abstain: None

Ms. Kinnard read the appeal procedures and said that she would finalize and send out the Certificate of Appropriateness.

7b. Project No. 2020-51 (Kick) -- Consideration of a proposed detached accessory dwelling unit at 4538 Date Avenue in the R1 (Urban Residential) zone. The property is located in the Date Avenue Historic District

Ms. Kinnard presented the staff report. The two-story house on the lot is not listed on the Historic Resources Inventory and is not a contributing resource to the Date Avenue Historic District. The proposed project is a one-story ADU and will be located at the rear of the house facing Pasadena Avenue because the lot is a double-fronted site.

The ADU has a complex roof with gables and cross gables. It will sit upon a raised foundation. It has a low pitched roof, shingled siding, and colors to match the front house. It has architectural details such as bracing under the gables and decorative trim. The foundation will be RCP block.

Ms. Kinnard noted that, on the rear elevation showing the deck, shows supports with a thickening on the bottom, which doesn't match the front of the house. It is the only noted difference between the front and back of the ADU. Ms. Kinnard also mentioned that the retaining wall closest to the house should only have three feet of fill.

Staff determined that the project is compatible with the other house on the site as well as with the historic district. Staff recommended approval.

The representatives for the project explained that the posts weren't included on the front of the house because they would make the ADU too close to the main entrance. Chairman Wilcox said the design was great and he did not see a need to add posts to the front of the house. Vice Chair Pauli said the ADU would be a benefit to the street.

Chairman Wilcox made a motion to approve the project. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Pauli.

Aye: Pauli, Cary, Ullah and Arnote, Wilcox, and Rogers
Nay: None
Absent: Sherman
Recused: None
Abstain: None

7c. 2021 Work Plan Discussion

Regarding Item #4 (Consider Ordinance/Policy Updates), Vice Chair Pauli asked if it would be possible to have the HPC work on updating the Historic Preservation ordinance to present to the City Council. Ex-Officio Newland proposed the wording "Update Historic District eligibility criteria".

Commissioner Rogers felt that elevating City-wide historic buildings and parks should be included. This would fall under Item 2, "Improve public understanding of historic preservation". Ex-Officio Newland pointed out City-owned properties such as the Spring House and Nan Couts. Ms. Kinnard said that, through existing policies, powers, and duties, master plans for the parks would come before the HPC for discussion.

Commissioner Pauli and Ex-Officio Newland were in favor of moving Item 4 to the Item 1 position. The Commissioners would like to move forward with the ordinance update listed on the Plan. Ms. Kinnard explained that the current directive to staff is that no agenda item may be added that is not project related due to COVID. Chairman Wilcox, Vice Chair Pauli and Commissioner Rogers will hold an Ad Hoc meeting to work on the ordinance update.

Staff will bring the draft Work Plan back to HPC for further discussion and adoption at the February 2, 2021, meeting.

7d. Approval of the minutes from the January 5, 2021 meeting

Chairman Wilcox made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Vice Chair Paul seconded the motion.

Aye: Pauli, Cary, Ullah and Arnote, Wilcox, and Rogers
Nay: None
Absent: Sherman
Recused: None
Abstain: None

8. INFORMATION ITEMS

Ex-Officio Newland said that there is a need to get an estimate for a structural assessment in order to apply for a grant for the Spring House. He also mentioned that 8371 La Mesa Boulevard is back on the market. It is a 1926 building with a Lloyd Rocco front. There is also activity on the La Mesa Drug Store building. He told the Commission that the oldest house in La Mesa, the Grey House, just sold and the new owners have already contacted the Historical Society.

The Society received a plaster cast of some of the relief pattern from the First National Bank building, which was destroyed last May, from the owner of the property. The Society plans to include it in the Historic Landscape Interpretive Plan at the McKinney House.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl Davis
Administrative Coordinator