Historical Resources Management Commission Meeting Minutes  
Monday, January 23, 2017  
7:00 p.m.  
Hattie Weber Museum – 445 C Street (Corner 5th & C Streets in Central Park) Davis, CA

Commissioners Present: Rand Herbert (Chair), David Hickman, Jonathon Howard (Alternate), Scott Miltenberger, Richard Rifkin

Commissioners Absent: Excused Absents -- Karen Clementi, William Allen Lowry

Staff Present: Staff Liaison Ike Njoku, HRMC Secretary Nancy Stephenson

1. Call to Order & Roll Call.
   Chairperson Herbert called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda.

   Action: Commissioner Miltenberger moved, seconded by Commissioner Howard to approve the agenda. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons.
   Chair Herbert announced that Commissioner Beason has resigned from the Commission due to teaching commitments.

   Commissioner Howard: As the alternate, do I move into a regular position?

   Staff Liaison Ike Njoku: That is the usual procedure, but we will clarify with City Clerk.

   A. Appointment of Vice-chairperson.
      Commissioner Miltenberger volunteered to serve as Vice-chairperson.

      Action: Commissioner Rifkin moved, seconded by Commissioner Howard to appoint Commissioner Miltenberger as the Vice-chairperson. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Comment.
   None.

5. Consent Calendar.
   A. HRMC Minutes: December 12, 2016
B. Informational Items – administrative approvals and the HRMC Subcommittee work report.

Action: Commissioner Howard moved, seconded by Commissioner Miltenberger to approve the Consent Calendar with Item 5B moved to the next meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

6. Written Communications.
Written communications were circulated to Commissioners.

Hattie Weber Museum Director Dennis Dingemans: The renovation of the WPA-funded restroom is moving along; the City Council is expected to approve the new outline for the renovation at their next meeting. Architect Maria Ogrydziak’s plan provides a cost savings by including less demolition and more retention of original and added-on features, allowing the building to “tell its own story.” Dingemans noted also that the plans allow for a tile roof, which would be more historically accurate, if funds are available.

8. Regular Items.
A. 201, 205, 209 and 213 2nd Street: Preliminary Comments on Proposed Boutique Extended Stay Hotel Project.

Staff liaison Ike Njoku presented the project to the Commission, explaining the pre-application for an extended stay hotel that would be located at the northeast corner of 2nd and A Streets. He noted that the tank house and the Barovetto house are designated Merit Resources, and that the previous plans for the site intended to demolish all the buildings on the site to build a new structure, while the current plan concept retains the Barovetto house. Njoku stated that applicant will seek changes to Core Area Specific Plan (CASP), the existing design guidelines and the current PD development standards for the new redevelopment concept, should it move forward; and that the applicant would like any HRMC input on the redevelopment project concept from historical resources perspective, including neighborhood and community members feedback as well.

Project Architect Robert Lindley representing the owners gave an overview of the project: The structure would be an L-shaped, predominantly 3-story building with a minor 4-story element and basement parking (one-half level down). The existing Barovetto House at 209 2nd Street would be retained and repurposed to provide facilities for guests with dining, meeting rooms, and administrative offices, while the existing Tank House at 213 2nd Street as well as the duplex at 201 and 205 2nd Street would be removed and replaced with the hotel building. The Commission is being asked to provide preliminary comments to guide applicant and staff; this is not the final design proposal and no formal decisions on the project are being made at this time.

Chair Herbert opened the Public comments.
Community members and property owners present and who spoke included Cyrette Beauchemin-Smith, Karen Moore and Adam Abildgaard. Their comments can be summarized to include the following:

- Own property in the neighborhood because of the historic nature of the neighborhood (between A and B Streets and 1st and 5th Streets). Concerned with historic value of the neighborhood as a whole; this project divides the neighborhood in half. The project’s location is not appropriate: is the neighborhood a historic residential neighborhood in central Davis or an arm of downtown Davis? Project could be tipping point for neighborhood; a cumulative effect is developing. Project would wall off Rice Land and adjoining houses from the rest of neighborhood.
- Demolishing tank house (Merit Resource) would have a significant negative impact; should trigger environmental review under CEQA. Concerned about mass and scale of project in relation to Barovetto house; 36-foot wall right up against this historic resource.
- Project not consistent with CASP, zoning or DDTRN Design Guidelines; approach of reacting project-by-project erodes integrity and value of CASP, zoning and DDTRN Design Guidelines. City should take more comprehensive and holistic approach to infill redevelopment projects to assure full sensitivity to existing neighborhood characteristics.
- Regarding proposed use: applicant alluded to conversion from extended-stay hotel to ownership units -- are standards the same for a condo project as for a hotel? Is café use for Barovetto house an issue that needs to be considered?
- There is a need for extended-stay options for professors. Perfect location for the project concept because of proximity to campus, however, the concerns of neighbors need to be addressed.

Public comments closed.

Commission questions/comments for architect and staff can be summarized to include the following:

- What is projected time table?
- How many parking spaces? Employee parking?
- Need to differentiate between new structure and Barovetto house, a Merit Resource.
- Staff should outline process(es) involved when an applicant is seeking exceptions/deviations from design guidelines. How transparent / open is the process? Will HRMC be asked to participate when “real” project comes forward?
- What is HRMC being asked to do? This is not the usual process to have applicants come in and say they are not going to follow the design guidelines or most applicable policies, codes and guidelines, but they want HRMC opinion.
- An appealing redevelopment concept, but the City is nibbling at the edges of the design guidelines. Concerned about mass and scale. Concerned about the DDTRN Design Guidelines becoming meaningless. To adapt to changing economic
circumstances, adopt new guidelines, if necessary, rather than undermining the existing DDTRN Design Guidelines.

- Would like to see this done in an area zoned commercial, fitting surrounding structures.
- Viewed from the university, the building looks like a wall. Height of building is actually four-and-a-half to five stories (with elevation of underground parking); this changes the character of the neighborhood from residential to commercial.
- Demolishing a merit resource raises concerns. There is no mitigation for that.
- Connecting new structure to Barovetto house, building too close would produce unmitigable change to setting of the resource.
- This is another case of a very large building very close to a Merit Resource. If we were to vote on this, we would say that it damages the setting of the resource. Setting of Barovetto house will be radically changed. Difficult for us to argue that there is not an unmitigable impact in terms of CEQA; a focused EIR is needed from a CEQA point of view to address the impact.
- Tank house is an interesting building, second-to-last tank house left in city limits. Can tank house be moved?
- Tank house is associated with the Barovetto house, its setting is important.
- Mitigation measures will be proposed in the course of preparing the focused EIR.
- Issue of cumulative impacts is important. Conservation district is now in the crosshairs for densification due to voter rejection of Nishi and other peripheral projects. HRMC charged with applying the DDTRN Design Guidelines. Property owners in conservation district are required to conform to DDTRN Design Guidelines for additions and alterations, which they do. Infill proposals should adhere to the same DDTRN Design Guidelines as do existing residents proposing additions and alteration/remodeling projects.
- Numerous densification projects in Old East Davis neighborhood have followed the DDTRN Design Guidelines, and have provided several accessory units.

Architect/staff responses summarized below:

- Timetable hinges on public process. CEQA analysis takes time. Owner motivated to move quickly.
- 24 parking spaces for 22 units. Minimal spaces needed for employees. Housekeeping will be run off-site.
- When formal application is made, the project will come before HRMC, Planning Commission, possible neighborhood meeting, City Council.
- Owners would like to determine if there is support from the City for the concept.
- Development occurs when opportunity is there. City has to make decision.
- Architect believes in historical preservation, but also densification (as opposed to sprawl into agricultural land), sustainable development. Competing goals. Would like to intensify sensitively. The development team wants to get the agreement of the neighbors and build a good project.
- Project is on the edge of a district and has relationship to the university.

Discussion ended at 8:20 p.m.

   The Commission decided by consensus to continue Item 9A to the March 20, 2017 Meeting.

10. Commission and Staff Communications.
    Nothing to report.

11. Adjournment.

    Action: Commissioner Hickman moved, seconded by Commissioner Howard to adjourn the meeting to February 27, 2017. Motion passed unanimously.

    The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.