



**Historical Resources Management Commission
Hattie Weber Museum – 445 C Street, Davis, California
Corner of 5th and C Streets in Central Park
Monday, March 16, 2015**

Commissioners Present: Rand Herbert (Chair), Gale Sosnick, Scott Miltenberger, Richard Rifkin, William Allen Lowry, Karen Clementi

Commissioners Absent: Mark Beason (Vice Chair)

Council Liaisons Present: None

Staff Present: Ike Njoku, Robert Cain, Catherine McCort

1. Call to Order. Chairperson Herbert called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. Approval of Agenda.

Action: Commissioner Miltenberger moved, seconded by Commissioner Lowry, to approve the agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes.

The Commission corrected some typographical errors in the minutes of February 23, 2015.

Action: Commissioner Clementi moved, seconded by Commissioner Miltenberger, to approve the minutes of February 23, 2015 as edited. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Communications.

Community member Steve Penniman asked the Commission how they rate the reliability of the Sanborn maps. The Commission responded that the maps are quite reliable, but that the Sanborn Company often went many years between updates.

5. Written Communications

Staff Liaison Njoku circulated the written communications.

6. Museum Report

Dennis Dingemans and Mary Lee Thompson presented the museum report. Ms. Thompson circulated the architect's plans and cost estimate for the re-purposing of the WPA bathroom building. The estimate is higher than they anticipated and Mr. Dingemans described their plans for fund raising and possible cost reductions.

7. Staff, Council Liaison, and Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Rifkin asked Rob Cain, the Urban Forest Manager, to talk about the work done on the trees along Russell Blvd (i.e, Avenue of Trees). Mr. Cain reported that PG&E and West Coast Arborist donated crew time to remove mistletoe from the landmark trees on Russell Blvd.

8. Public Meeting.

A) Landmark Tree Designation for Nine *Pinus canariensis*, Canary Island Pine Trees, located at 2627 E. Covell Blvd.

Urban Forrest Manager Rob Cain presented the staff report. He described the location and the history of the Canary Island Pines, and asked the Commission to provide comments for the Tree Commission. In response to Commissioner questions, Mr. Cain reported that the trees were planned in the early 1960s, that the house located at 2627 E. Covell Blvd. is not the original Haussler house, and that there are other plantings of Canary Island Pines trees of this age in Davis.

Property owner Jason Taormino told the Commission that the trees were planted in the early 1960s, and that they came from the forestry department's giveaway program, like many other Canary Island Pine Trees in Davis. He stated that this potential designation is a political move, that landmark designated trees require a permit to remove or modify, and warned that the designation of trees against the property owner's wishes creates a precedent in which the government controls privately owned trees and thereby significantly alter the value of a property. Mr. Taormino requested that the Commission to list the criteria that defines a Landmark tree to include age, significance, and any other criteria used.

In response to Commissioner questions, Mr. Cain reported that no tree has been given Landmark Status against the will of the property owner in the history of Davis.

Chairperson Herbert commented that if the trees were a contributing feature of a historic resource, the HRMC could identify them as significant, but that the HRMC really does not have the jurisdiction to identify trees as landmark trees in and of themselves.

Community member Eileen Samitz stated that the trees do have an association with the Haussler family, in that the Haussler family built the home and planted the trees. She also reported that there are very few groves of that age in the Wildhorse area, and that the trees are significant to the area. She added that no one can know for certainty that that the trees actually came from the forestry department.

Chairperson Herbert reiterated that they are fine trees, but that this is a question of jurisdiction. Speculation cannot be used in determining significance, and the trees are not associated with a historic resource.

Commission Miltenberger agreed that there is not enough documentary evidence provided to the Commission to determine whether the trees have historical values for designation. He added that it is beyond the Commission's purview to make statements about the criteria that ought to be used to designate landmark trees, and that it is not appropriate for the Commission to make a statement about the existing ordinance or the political process.

In response to Commissioner questions, Mr. Taormino explained that the trees are currently on private property, but that the owners have put in a proposal to put the trees on public property. Mr. Taormino states that this is one of the reasons he finds this a little “farcical”, and would rather wait until City Council weighs in on that proposal to settle this question.

In response to Commissioner questions, Mr. Cain reported that any trees in an urban setting can be problematic, but that this species is generally less so than many others, and that there is no preference for native trees when designating landmarks.

The HRMC comments were summed up by Chairperson Herbert, which was that the grove of trees has no historic interest to warrant input from the HRMC as there is no evidence provided to the Commission that it is significantly associated with historical resources within the City; therefore, the Commission has no comments on the designation of the trees. He added historic resources might include landscaping that is associated with the historical resource, and that the HRMC's purview always comes back to the historical resource. He stated that the Commission cannot judge a tree a landmark tree with historical value simply based on age. Thus, he concludes for the Commission that HRMC does not have a role to play in this question as it is a Tree Commission issue.

Commissioners Miltenberger, Sosnick, Rifkin, and Lowry agreed that Chairperson Herbert accurately summed up the Commission’s position.

Mr. Cain thanked the Commission.

B) Historical Resources Analysis (HRA) Report Determination for 115 Hickory Lane and 1233 Olive Drive (Calori Properties)

Staff Liaison Njoku presented the staff report, which states that the buildings are not historically significant; the demolition of the buildings would not have a significant adverse effect on any surrounding resources or districts.

Consultant Dennis Dahlin described his report and discussed the history of the property

The Commission discussed the report and asked questions of City staff and of the consultant. The Commission generally agreed that the property has an interesting history, but that the property has lost its integrity and is not historically significant.

Action: Commissioner Lowry moved, seconded by Commissioner Miltenberger, to accept the staff report, including its conclusion that:

- A. The buildings are not historically significant in terms of the designer, architectural style, character defining features, or cultural meaning, therefore, are not eligible for designation as national, state, or local historical resources, and are not subject to CEQA review;**
- B. The demolition of the buildings would not have a significant adverse effect on any resources listed on the Davis Register of Historical Resources, the adjacent Slatter's Court that is identified as a potentially significant historical resource, and the Landmark designated cork oak tree at 1233 Olive Drive and;**

C. The demolition of the buildings would not have a negative effect on the qualities of Slatter's Court (a previously identified potential Historic District). The buildings do not have a history of highway orientation or highway-related use, which would be a primary focus of the district.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Herbert commended Mr. Dahlin on his research, and asked that he include all his finding in the report as it will be a valuable record after the demolition.

9. Business Items

A. Subcommittee's Update Report on Conservation Overlay District Relative to the Citywide Historical Resources Survey Project

Commissioner Rifkin reported that only the Old East neighborhood remained to be photographed.

B. Commissioner Clementi Update on the Designation Status Document of the Conservation Overlay District Relative to the Citywide Historical Resources Survey Project

Commissioner Clementi reported her progress on the designation status document to the Commission. She reported that there are approximately 402 buildings in all three surveys, and that most of those have status codes. She is going over the overlay district now, and there are about 60 buildings that need to be looked at again. She reported that she should be done with that within the week.

Chairperson Herbert explained that when he wrote the grant proposal he believed that all the buildings in the conservation district had been surveyed, and that the Commission would be doing updates on the buildings in the conservation district. As it turns out, about 50% of the buildings in the conservation district have not been surveyed. The grant says the Commission will do updated on the buildings that had been surveyed, so the minimum the Commission must do to fulfill the terms of the grant is to update the forms of the surveyed buildings. The best that the Commission could do is to evaluate all the buildings that haven't been treated. He suggested that under Item D the Commission add a goal of filling in those evaluations. This would eliminate the uncertainty faced by property owners and developers who currently have to deal with "potential" resources.

C. Time Line for Commission Survey of the Conservation Overlay District and Appointment of Commission Subcommittee for the Survey Effort

The Commission, rather than the consultant, is responsible for updating the buildings in conservation district have been surveyed, but not the buildings that have been surveyed and found not to be contributors. The Commission must complete this assignment by the time the consultant submits the draft report in mid-May, 2015.

D. 2015-2017 HRMC Goals.

Chairperson Herbert suggested adding the goal of getting all the survey holes filled, which would be a two year process

Chairperson Herbert suggested removing the goals the Commission has completed

Commissioner Rifkin commented that the Commission has not completed the landmark signs, so that goal should remain.

E. Appointment of a minor Project Review Subcommittee that Determines if Staff should review and approve projects pursuant to Davis Municipal Code Section 40.23.050

The Commission appointed a Minor Project Review Subcommittee consisting of Chairperson Herbert and Commissioner Lowry.

The Commission appointed a Signage Subcommittee consisting of Commissioner Rifkin, who will work on the Landmark signage project and will approach the Tree Commission about collaborating on signs for Landmark Trees.

The subcommittees will report to the Commission during Staff and Commissioner Comments.

10. **Adjournment.** The next meeting will be **Monday, April 20, 2015** at the Hattie Weber Museum (445 C Street) at 7:00 pm.

Action: Commissioner Miltenberger moved, seconded by Commissioner Clementi, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.