



City of Davis

**Historical Resources Management Commission Meeting Minutes  
Monday, February 24, 2020**

**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: Jordan Jacobs, William Allen Lowry (Vice-chairperson), Erin Autry  
Montgomery, Ning Wan

Commissioner(s) Absent: Mark S. Davis, David Hickman, Scott Miltenberger (Chairperson),  
Michelle Van Meter

Council Liaison(s) Present: Mayor Pro Tempore Gloria Partida

Other Officers Present:

Also in Attendance:

Staff Present: Ike Njoku, Planner & Historical Resources, Elise Carroll, Senior  
Planner De Novo Planning Group

---

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

Chairperson Miltenberger called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

**2. Approval of Agenda.**

Action: Commission Jacobs moved, seconded by Commissioner Wan to approve the agenda with a note that Item 7A recommendation 3 is missing the “Boy Scott Cabin at 616 1<sup>st</sup> Street”. Motion passed unanimously.

**3. Public Comments**

None.

**4. Consent Calendar**

A. January 13, 2020, special meeting minutes approval. Commissioner Montgomery moved and seconded by Commissioner Jacobs. The Commission approved the minutes unanimously through oral consensus.

**5. Written Communications.**

Written communications folder was circulated.

**6. Museum Report.**

None. Hattie Weber Museum Director Mr. Dingemans was not present.

**7. Public Meeting.**

A. **503, 509 & 515 1St Street** -- Planning Application (PA) #18-14 for Demolition #3-18, Lot Merger & Lot Line Adjustment #1-18, Conditional Use Permit (CUP) #5-18, Design Review (DR) #5-18, and Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) #3-18 -- Theta Xi Fraternity Redevelopment Project.

Vice-Chairperson Lowry opened the public meeting discussion. Staff Liaison Njoku introduced the project. Elise Carroll of De Novo Planning Group gave a brief presentation on the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). Project Architect Robert Lindley made a presentation as to the project site layout and building architectural design. Mr. Bob Testa, one of the project applicants, provided background on the 70 years of Theta Xi existence on the properties and the basis for the proposal instead of preservation of the buildings and renovations.

The Commission deliberated first on the FEIR, and asked the following questions:

- Explain the status code comments relative to the EIR and the CEQA Guidelines
- What is the Commission being asked to do in the light of the CEQA presentation and the staff report recommended action
- Responses to the comments are very detailed
- The mitigation measure for the historic resources impact (i.e., the report and public plaque/display) is agreeable to the Commission

Staff Liaison Njoku and EIR Consultant Elise Carroll explained that the status code is one of the many considerations a local government may use when determining if a structure is historically significant, and the fact remains that the status code question does not nullify the findings and conclusions of the HRAs.

Commissioner Montgomery moved staff recommendation below, seconded by Commissioner Wan. The motion was approved unanimously.

- 1. Recommend that the Planning Commission adopt the Resolution certifying Theta Xi Fraternity Redevelopment Project FEIR, subject to the Findings of Facts and Statement of Overriding Consideration and the understanding that certification of the EIR does not mean a support for the proposed project;**

Ayes: Jacobs, Allen Lowry (Vice-chairperson), Montgomery, Wan

Absent: Davis, Hickman, Miltenberger (Chairperson), Van Meter

The Commission deliberated and decided that advisory input should be provided prior to voting on recommendation number 2. The Commission provided the following advisory input on the proposed replacement project:

- The building design is missing something, such as details and features that make the building resemble a residential facility
- The building elevations does not make it to tell the building's use, which is residential – it needs to be more residential in appearance and layout
- The entrance needs more work, such as defined entrance with articulations
- Proposed patio is a good feature
- Location of the storage and laundry structure is a good thing as the small building provides for the historic setting and characteristics of the area
- Provide memorial for the fraternity and the original owners of the building along the wall of the storage and laundry building

- The building appears to look like a commercial or apartment building rather than a residential building, needs to be addressed
- Efforts should be made to allow people to see into the patio area from the street
- In concurrence with Commission Van Meter written comment #2, the Commission entered into the record Commissioner Hickman and Van Meter comments, which are as follows:

Commissioner Hickman:

I don't want to make any extensive comments as I won't be there and won't be able to participate in the conversation. In general, I am supportive of the proposed mitigation measures and hope that they will be accepted so that the project can move forward.

I still have some issues with the way the property's historic status is being described. On page 27 of the packet it says that the Jackson House and Bryson House have been found eligible for listing in the CRHR. None of the prior surveys ever found them eligible for listing in the California Register. Based upon the 5D2 status code that they were given beginning with the 2003 survey, the most that could be said is that they are potential contributors to potential historic districts. They've never been proposed for listing as a city Merit Resource, much less for inclusion as a state-designated resource.

That being said, I know the project proponents don't want to fight over this issue and just want to move forward with the mitigation measures. I'm supportive of that decision.

Commissioner Van Meter:

Below are my comments as they relate to the agenda items for the meeting tomorrow. I apologize if any of this input has already been put forth by other members of the commission - I realize that this is not the first meeting in which the Theta Xi fraternity project has been discussed. To clarify, are we to agree with the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Consideration, or are we to provide comments on those conclusions? If it is latter, I don't agree with the rejection of the third project alternative: "Preservation, Renovation, and New Build Alternative." The rejection explanation suggests that demolishing one historical resource would have as substantial an impact as demolishing two historical resources. However, this alternative would maintain more of the traditional streetscape and diversity of architectural style while meeting the approximate capacity goals of the proposed project.

- The proposed project suggests that "the architectural theme recalls the Craftsman Bungalow style of the houses being replaced." While the proposed replacement project should not seek to mimic the bungalows, it should incorporate additional Craftsman-style elements for compatibility with its surroundings. Based on the information provided in Attachment #4 "Downtown Core Commercial Design Guidelines Consistency Review," the proposed project appears to simply follow the recommendations that new buildings should adhere to "simple rectangular forms" and be "divided into modules." The proposed replacement project should take into consideration the traditional scale and massing of Craftsman-style residential architecture, which includes low-slung building forms with projecting porches and/or dormers. Use of Craftsman-derived features such

as overhanging eaves with exposed rafters, ornamental knee-brace brackets, and gable vents would benefit the exterior appearance of the proposed replacement project.

- I disagree that the "simplicity of material finishes and building colors stir a sense of richness," as described in Attached #4 under "Building Materials and Color." The proposed replacement project would benefit from combining multiple material finishes, perhaps using wood shingles, clapboard, or brick (all of which are commonly found in Craftsman-style residences) in concentrated locations on the exterior.

Commissioner Jordan moved staff recommendation #2 below, and Commissioner Wan seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

**2. Recommend approval of the demolition of the two buildings at 503 and 509 First Street, plus the detached garage based on the EIR Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Consideration and subject to support of approval of the replacement project;**

Ayes: Jacobs, Allen Lowry (Vice-chairperson), Montgomery, Wan

Absent: Davis, Hickman, Miltenberger (Chairperson), Van Meter

Vice-chairperson Lowry stated that the above comments serve as the advisory input from the Commission and encouraged the applicants and design to include the Commission's suggestions in the final plans and elevations' design. Commissioner Montgomery reminded staff that the recommendation #3 as provided by the Commission includes the "Boy Scout Cabin." She added that she believes that spoke for the Commission when she stated that these two historical resources would not be adversely affected by the proposed replacement project. The recommendation was modified as accordingly and as follows:

**3. Provide advisory input on the proposed replacement project given that the project site is within 300-feet of a designated historical resources, Dresbach-Hunt-Boyer Mansion and Boy Scout Cabin, and the site is within the Conservation Overlay District, subject to the findings and conditions of approval.**

**8. Business Items -- HRMC Work Plan.**

- A. **Update on Draft Downtown Davis Specific Plan.** The 90-day public comment period on the Draft Downtown Davis Specific Plan concluded on January 14, 2020. DPAC held its final meeting on January 23, 2020, and made a number of recommendations related to the Downtown Plan. DPAC's general recommendation was to move the Draft Downtown Plan forward along with the public comments received to the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the next steps. DPAC further recommended that any amendments made to the plan include communication with the public. Staff is currently evaluating the public comments and will be scheduling Planning Commission and City Council meetings to present the comments and to discuss a number of issues and next steps.

Commissioner Montgomery asked whether the Commission would be provided updates on the Downtown Plan, including responses to the HRMC comments. She requested and supported by other Commissioners present (Commission consensus) that the historical resources sections of the plan relative to the comments by the HRMC be provided at some

point in the future, to the Commission. She also inquired if the comments including those of DPAC can be seen online.

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

Vice-chairperson Lowry inquired if Hattie Weber Museum Director Dennis Dingemans have advertised for an assistant director position that could seat in for him. He requested that updates from Hattie Weber Museum show be looked into in the future given that Mr. Dingemans had been unable to attend meetings. He further reported on the Amtrak Studies, and further indicated the potential for Parking structure and Hotel being built nearby and encouraged fellow Commissioners to pay attention to the process.

Staff Liaison Njoku reported on the status of the four potential projects at the locations in the table below and answered questions of the Commission.

47 College Park Drive -- remodeling	24 College Park Drive – windows replacement
410 K Street – HRA & remodeling	420 I Street -- remodeling

**10. Adjourn.**

The next meeting will be on March 16, 2020. 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 Montgomery, seconded by Hickman. Motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.