



City of Davis

**Historical Resources Management Commission Meeting Minutes**  
**Monday, November 18, 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, William Allen Lowry (Vice-chairperson), Michelle Van Meter, Scott Miltenberger (Chairperson), Ning Wan

Council Liaison: Mayor Pro Tempore Gloria Partida

Excused Absence: Erin Autry Montgomery

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: Commission Davis moved, seconded by Vice-chairperson Lowry to approve the agenda. Commissioner Hickman pointed out that the next meeting on the agenda should be January 27, 2020, instead of 2019. Motion passed unanimously with the understanding that the next regular meeting will be in the year, 2020.

**3. Public Comments**

None.

**4. Consent Calendar**

A. August 19, 2019, minutes approval. Davis moved, and seconded by Van Meter to approve the minutes. Commissioner Hickman pointed out that he was not present at meeting, therefore, did not move the motion to adjourn. Motion passed unanimously subject to the correction of the motion adjourn.

**5. Written Communications.**

Written communications folder was circulated.

**6. Museum Report.**

None. Mr. Dingemans was not present.

**7. Public Meeting.**

**A. 47 College Park -- Planning Application #19-62 for Design Review #20-19 and Demolition #6-19, for Demolition of an Existing One-car Garage and a Portion of the Easterly Wall of the Existing Single-family Building to Allow Remodeling and Additions.**

Chairperson Miltenberger opened the public meeting discussion. Staff Liaison Njoku introduced the project. Project applicant and designer Jeff Roy introduced himself and the property owners. He explained that the project is simply an expansion of the four-bedroom house by demolishing the

detached garage and attached sun porch to construct a two-car attached garage and a two-story addition that will allow for interior expansion of spaces that include kitchen and bathroom. He added that the house remains a four-bedroom home at the end, and that the house was significantly altered in 1978. Chairperson Miltenberger disclosed that the HRMC development Subcommittee, including the former HRMC Chairperson Herbert, met with the applicant and the property owners on site to offer some suggested changes. He added that his concerns still are about the height, mass and scale of the addition. Vice-chairperson Lowry expressed appreciation for the efforts that went into project site plan and elevations, and suggested addition materials and features treatment that could be considered to better the project. The following neighbors in attendance made comments summarized below:

- Jim and Ginia Willette (25 College Park Drive)
- Jeanie Decker (34 College Park Drive)
- Pat Thompson (44 College Park)
- Mr. Huston (20 College Park Drive)
- Robert & Kathryn Crow (24 College Park Drive)

The comments can be summarized to include:

- Supports current proposal at 47 College Park, but wonders how 33 College Park Drive got approved
- Can property owners meet with neighbors to discuss elevation options
- Height of proposed addition is not in proportion with the rest of the house
- Support the proposed project idea, but would have liked to discuss design options
- The City process is flawed as there should be a way to allow neighbors to make comments clandestinely so as to not create conflict between neighbors

Chairperson Miltenberger closed the public comments. The Commission comments can be summarized as follows:

- The height, mass and scale of the proposed second story addition should be re-visited
- Treatment of the stucco, overhang, trellis, and other features should be considered to provide interest to the proposed addition
- Windows to be replaced are not clearly delineated, and should be called out
- Proposed addition looks plane and has no character, so other things could be done to give it “personality”
- Colors, different materials or something should be considered for improvement of the addition
- Height of the addition appears to be out of scale with the existing house
- Property owners are encouraged to conduct an outreach with their neighbors
- The Commission has embarked on establishing historic district management plan for College Park, which will include design guidelines that could assist residents, property owners, and Commission in reviewing proposals. Current review process is not acceptable as there are no guidelines for the applicant and homeowners to use in preparing plans; none to guide the Commission in providing advisory input pursuant to the Municipal Code.

Mayor Pro Tempore Partida asked if the project will be subject to the recently adopted “Large House” ordinance relative to the two-story addition. Staff Liaison Njoku responded that the process involves site plan and architectural review, which is the requirement for large house addition. He further explained for the benefits of the neighbors in attendance that staff notice that the notice for the meeting had error, as a number of College Park neighborhood residents did not get notice. He added that this error was made in the notice sent out for College Park Neighborhood Historic District meeting held by the Commission as well. He informed them every effort would be made to include everyone in College Park historic district in the future mail out notices, including when a letter of intent to approve the project.

There were questions and answers session involving Commission, the applicant, property owners and staff on issues not related to the project, namely the College Park historic district management plan and past approval for 33 College Park Drive demolition and addition.

The Commission by a voice consensus determined that the 1978 additions, specifically the addition of dormers, significantly altered the building for it to qualify as a Contributor to College Park. In addition, by consensus that Commission advised the applicant and property owner to take into consideration the comments from neighbors and the advisory comments by the Commission when revising the project plans and elevations, which will be reviewed by HRMC Subcommittee and staff prior to a determination of whether staff should proceed with issuance of intent to approve letter.

## **B. Historic City Hall Goals and Policies for Rehabilitation.**

Chairperson Miltenberger opened the public meeting. Staff Liaison Njoku introduced the project and answered questions from the Commission and City Council Liaison Partida.

There were no comments from the public. Commissioner Hickman observed that the photos in the document were not updated alongside the written words to reflect current conditions, specifically the northerly side that now has patio improvements.

Commissioner Hickman moved for approval as shown below. Vice-chairperson Lowry seconded the motion. Chairperson Miltenberger asked for volunteers to work with staff to update the photos. Commissioner Hickman volunteered as a Subcommittee of one. The motion passed unanimously.

- 1. Approved the Goals and Policies for Rehabilitation of the historic city hall located at 227 F Street, subject to Commissioner Hickman and staff updating the photos; and**
- 2. Recommended that the City Council adopt a Resolution in support of the Goals and Policies for the Rehabilitation of the property.**

## **8. HRMC Work Plan.**

- **Davis Centennial Seal.** The Commission received the informational staff report on the Davis Centennial Seal to be located on the front area of Dresbach-Hunt Boyer Mansion. Chairperson Miltenberger expressed concern at the level of involvement by the Commission and questioned if the location is the most appropriate for the Davis Seal given that the location of Centennial Plaza at the southeast corner of Second and G Streets. Vice-chairperson Lowry explained that the Commission's prior involvement was adequate, and the proposal would have no adverse impact on the Landmark mansion, but could activate it as well as support economic development in the downtown.
- **Bike Lane Nomination versus Downtown Plan Update.** Chairperson Miltenberger provided a brief update on efforts to get the SHPO to provide the City with technical assistance. He indicated that the efforts are ongoing, and that given his involvement in many subcommittees there is a slight delay due to time constraint. He encouraged Commissioners to volunteer more on these efforts.
- **College Park Historic District.** Chairperson Miltenberger, Vice-chairperson Lowry and Staff Liaison Njoku provided a brief update on the College Park Neighborhood Meeting on the historic district management plan efforts that took on October 23, 2019. Some property owners and residents of College Park in the audience asked questions and provided varying comments and opinions on the process. The predominant comments are in support of the historic district management plan effort.

- **College Park Historic District Signage.** Staff Liaison Njoku updated the Commission on the progress made thus far toward installation of a historic monument sign in College Park that will identify it as a Historic District. The consensus of the Commission is to table this effort until such a time the neighborhood fully appreciates and understands what a historic district means and a majority is on-board for the district management plan. City Council Liaison Mayor Tempore Partida expressed support to the idea of waiting as well.
- **Downtown Plan Update DPRs.** A Subcommittee consisting of Chairperson Miltenberger, and Commissioners Hickman and Van Meter presented their initial findings, expressing that the DPRs contents are acceptable. Commissioners Hickman and Van Meter explained that there are some technical edits to be made and provided examples of the needed technical edits. In addition, the subcommittee pointed out the proposed eight properties to be designated as historical resources, Merit, may not be consistent with City’s past practices and standards for designation, and would need to be considered more carefully by the Commission when brought forth later for recommendation to City Council for adoption.
- **Update on Draft Downtown Davis Specific Plan.** Staff Liaison Njoku reminded the Commission that the draft downtown plan was released as of November 14, 2019, and that the end of comment period will be January 14, 2020. He reminded Commissioners to attend the various presentations, including one tentatively scheduled for December 4, 2019.

Commissioners Hickman and Vice-chairperson Lowry indicated that they had attended two previous presentations and spoke to Opticos representatives after the presentations. They expressed concerns about “setback” only treatment envisioned by Opticos for treatment of redevelopments adjacent and near designated resources, especially the one-size fits all approach and the fact that the concept is not consistent with treatment of historical resource and the fact that this concept has no precedent elsewhere.

Citing the holidays and other responsibilities, Commissioners agree that a special meeting is needed in the first week of January 2020 in order for the Commission to formulate its comments on the draft plan.

**9. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners and Liaisons.**  
None.

**10. Adjourn.**

The next meeting will be a Special Meeting to be determined. The location will be 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 Lowry, seconded by Hickman. Motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.