



City of Davis

**Historical Resources Management Commission Meeting Minutes  
Monday, July 15, 2019  
7:00 p.m.**

**Senior Center, 646 A Street, Activity Room, Davis, CA 95616**  
(Southeast Corner of A Street & 7<sup>th</sup> Street)

Commissioners Present: Mark S. Davis, David Hickman, Jordan Jacobs, Erin Autry  
Montgomery, William Allen Lowry (Vice-chairperson), Scott  
Miltenberger (Chairperson)

Staff Present: Ike Njoku, Planner & Historical Resources

---

**1. Call to Order & Roll Call.**

Chairperson Miltenberger called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. Approval of Agenda.**

Action: Lowry moved, seconded by Davis to approve the agenda. Motion passed unanimously.

**3. Public Comments**

None.

**4. Consent Calendar**

A. June 17, 2019, minutes approval. Hickman moved, and seconded by Jacobs to approve the minutes.  
Motion passed unanimously.

**5. Written Communications.**

Written communications folder was circulated.

**6. Museum Report.**

None. Mr. Dingemans was not present.

**7. Public Meeting.**

**A. 601 D Street -- PA #19-38 for Design Review #13-19, Minor Modification #4-19 Detached  
Accessory Dwelling Unit & Detached Garage Project.**

The Commission opened and continued the meeting on this project to August 19, 2019.

**B. 536 G Street: Proposed Addition to Existing Single-Family Dwelling and Conversion of the  
Structure to Commercial Restaurant Use: Planning Application #19-31, Design Review #10-19.**

Chairperson opened the meeting discussion on this item, and applicant Jonathan Hammond briefly introduced the project. The comments from Commissioners and two neighbors of the proposed project, Heather Mitchell owner 516 G Street and Gerrit Mulholland, owner 705 6<sup>th</sup> Street, can be summarized as follows:

- The overall building elevations and design is acceptable, and building architecture is a good transition.

- If approved as proposed, this will be the only property with a perimeter fence so it will stand out significantly. Therefore, it is important to try to blend the fencing if fencing is necessary into the landscaping discretely; the proposed fence looks very formal and "imperial." Specifically, the rounded posts for the arbor/trellis treatment does not match the architecture of the existing building or anything along the street/block.
- The existing home is traditional and craftsmen lines would be more in keeping with the design of the block relative to the posts of the trellis/arbor proposed -- the landscape treatment at Pizza and Pints, Village Pizza on G Street, and U and 3rd are more in keeping with the character of Old North Davis Neighborhood and should be considered. The proposed landscaping and fencing do not reflect the architecture of the building. The rounded columns proposed is an issue, and the curved feature of the fence is not consistent with the neighborhood.
- Landscaping treatment should be re-visited to better match the North Davis neighborhood.
- Are trees along the south side of the property are intended to be retained or removed? Specifically, the trees that are not in the way of the proposed addition should be carefully reviewed by the City before allowing their removal. At the minimum, efforts ought to be made to retain as many mature trees as feasible, especially for the shade and screening purposes.
- How is parking being handled? If this is not an HRMC item, can staff look into parking and address it?
- Is the zero setback proposed consistent with the zoning and acceptable given that the hardware store site could be redeveloped in the future?
- Will the surfacing be predominantly impervious surfaces?
- Revise the landscaping and fencing.
- Efforts to differentiate the addition from the existing building should be considered, perhaps through reversal of siding, windows treatment, or any other options.

The responses to the questions and comments from staff, the applicant and Commission can be summarized as follows:

- The property owner wanted a traditional frontage treatment, but the decision for the treatment is from the architecture with the intent to differentiate the proposed project.
- Parking and zoning relative comments and questions should be addressed to staff separately as those are not with the purview of the Commission.
- The next steps include staff review of the Commission's advisory input and public comments received to make a determination as to whether to send a letter of intent to approve, or to work with the applicant to address comments of concerns received prior to sending out a letter of intent to approve. Once a letter is sent out, there is a ten days comment period followed by another ten days appeal period. Comments received during the comment period is considered in making a final decision to approve, conditionally approve, or recommend a public hearing before the Planning Commission.
- Two Walnut trees are proposed to be removed based on the Arborist report and they will be replaced with another Walnut trees; the Ash tree will also be removed and replaced with a Walnut tree.
- The pavement will be mostly pervious surfacing, including gravel.

### **C. 420 I Street Historical Resources Analysis Report.**

The Historical Resources Management Commission (HRMC) by a majority vote, after deliberations, accepted the findings on the updated historical resources analysis for 420 I Street. Commissioner Hickman prepared the report, and concluded that the property is ineligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, or the City of Davis Register, and is not a historical resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

During deliberations, Commissioners had the following key comments:

- It is not hard to see what part of the existing house is original, thus replaced finishes should not be held against the property.
- Was the seven evaluation criteria were checked off?

- Had there not been a proposal associated with this HRA report, would Commissioner Hickman still recommended the same way?
- What changed since the 2015 evaluation?

Commissioner Hickman provided answers to the question.

The Commission provided an informal “consultation” comments on the proposed renovation and additions to 420 I Street. The property owner, Frank Nourot gave the Commission a packet of draft staff report that he and his wife had started. He introduced the intended project. The Commissioners asked Mr. Nourot some clarifying questions, and provided him some feedbacks. However, the Commission believes that a Subcommittee consisting of Commissioners Hickman, Lowry, and yet to be sworn in Commissioner Meter should work with Mr. Nourot to come up with an acceptable proposal that the full Commission will review and act upon on August 19, 2019.

**D. 335 Russell Boulevard Project.** The Commission was informed that cannot finding anything in the ordinance to support the request to present the 335 Russell Blvd. project to the Commission for advisory review and comments given its proximity to College Park historic district. The Commission, by consensus, believes that this request may create more issues than it would solve, hence it accepted the staff determination.

## 8. HRMC Work Plan.

**A. Historic District Designation Process. Historic District Designation Process.** Chairperson Miltenberger reminded Commissioners of the ongoing efforts, and the Commission’s resolve to continue to work on this project.

**B. College Park Historic District.** Chairperson Miltenberger updated the Commission on the fact that this is still something that the Subcommittee is still working on and will continue work on it. He indicated that he would be contacting Subcommittee members on the draft notice for refinement.

**C. Bike Lanes Nomination Form.** . Chairperson Miltenberger informed the Commission that he has contacted Assistant City Manager Ashley Feeney, and he indicated that he has not connected with City Manager Mike Webb. He added that he anticipates hearing back from him later this week.

## 9. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners and Liaisons.

Commissioner Hickman stated that he attended DPAC meeting and shared his impression of the process and DPAC. Staff Liaison explained that internal draft work from the current historical consultant is very encouraging, and the consultant is working currently to reconcile the plan recommendations with his recommendations.

## 10. Adjourn.

The next meeting will be August 19, 2019, at the Senior Center Activity Room, 646 A Street, Davis, CA 95616 (southeast corner of A Street and 7th Street) at 7:00 p.m.

Motion to adjourn by Hickman, seconded by Montgomery. Motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 9:02 p.m.