HISTORICAL PRESERVATION COMMISSION

APPROVED ACTION MINUTES APRIL 16, 2008

MEMBERS PRESENT: Butler; Bunse; Vicars; Brookshear; Orlins

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Norris; Stillman; Echols; Gnos (Contract Planner)

Roll Call:

• Meeting called to order at 6:00 PM.

Approval/Revision of Agenda:

• It was motioned by Commissioner Brookshear, seconded by Commissioner Bunse, and unanimously carried to approve the Agenda as submitted.

Approval of Minutes:

• It was motioned by Commissioner Bunse, seconded by Commissioner Orlins, and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the February 12, 2008 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting as submitted.

Secretary's Report:

- Cindy Norris, Principal Planner, stated that the house located on the proposed Rite Aid site on Sixth Street and Main Street is in progress.
- Jimmy Stillman, Associate Planner stated that the foundation was started but that it was a few feet off towards the railroad tracks. The contractor is working with the Building Division to correct the problem so that it conforms to the approved site plan. Jimmy Stillman stated there was an update on the house located at 210 Lincoln Avenue also. There has been activity on the sight such as weed abatement. The Building Division has also been in contact with the applicant and owner of the property. There has been a building permit issued, which will expire in the coming months.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that she witnessed someone working in the back of that property, cleaning it up.

Subcommittee Reports:

• None Reported

Public Comment:

• No public comment.

Commission and Staff Comments:

• Commissioner Orlins asked whether the City would consider transferring the indexing and tax rolls to the County Archives. People who research historic properties would find it very convenient to have all the records at a single location. The current storage in the basement at the City Hall Annex is not an ideal place for historic records that are over one hundred years old. Their curation at the Yolo County Archives would ensure that they are maintained according to the standards appropriate to the specific documents.

HPC MINUTES 1 4/16/08

- Cindy Norris stated that Staff has had some contact with Mel Russell concerning this. One of the issues is that the records belong to multiple departments. Ron Pinegar collected them together while researching for the new Walking Tour Book, but they are normally stored in a vault. She stated that Staff will have to discuss with the other departments to make sure all are in agreement, especially given the limited hours of the Yolo County Archives.
- Commissioner Vicars clarified that Staff will research this and bring back to the Commission at a later date.
- Cindy Norris stated that is correct.
- Commissioner Butler stated that not only is the issue of multiple departments being involved, but that the library information must be accurate. The Historic Preservation Commission Ordinance states that the Commission sees to it that the library has the books, but on the other hand we have no authority over them.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that the historic records are used for reference, so when Staff needs them they would have to make an appointment with the Archives to use them, which may be a time management issue. But we will try again to work things out.
- Commissioner Butler reiterated that the Commission has no authority over the Archives.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that the proposal could still be made and perhaps the Commission will have to take steps to retain the authority.
- Commissioner Bunse feels that the documents belong with the local history collection at the Library. It would be more accessible there. The goal is long term preservation of the documents.
- Commissioner Butler stated that the Library has some of the information on discs, and when asked for the information, the librarian seems to run around to find the information.
- Cindy Norris stated she thought that perhaps it would be best to retain an archivist to determine the best place to store the documents.
- Commissioner Butler questioned how the process coordinated.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that is what Staff will be working on.
- Commissioner Butler questioned if there was any known index that can be used.
- Commissioner Bunse stated that there was not. She suggested that Staff review the policies for records management and what the retention schedules are.
- Commissioner Vicars stated she thinks that some of the tax rolls were previously from the County and that the City took possession of them.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that Staff will set up a meeting with Mel Russell and the Library to formulate a plan on the storage of the documents. He also agreed with Commissioner Orlins in that the basement in the City Hall Annex was not the appropriate place to store the documents. Jimmy Stillman stated that he will get it on the next Historic Preservation Agenda.
- Commissioner Butler questioned whether Mel Russell's listing or indexing will be useful to us.
- Commissioner Bunse stated that she felt that Mel Russell would follow standardized procedures for preparing itemized lists, which are accessible when she is open for research. At this point there is not a great deal of online information.
- Commissioner Butler questioned what would the budget be to index the records.
- Commissioner Brookshear stated she felt it would depend on the organization that would do the work, and whether they had professional employees or volunteers doing the work. It is something that is going to be variable.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned when Mel Russell would be willing to take on this project.

HPC MINUTES 2 4/16/08

- Commissioner Bunse stated that she felt the tact to take was to explore the records management situation that the City has. Whatever the City's polices are, perhaps they can be refined to help develop some kind of storage system that is adequate and accessible.
- Commissioner Butler suggested asking the Yolo County Historical Society if they had anyone with knowledge on the subject.
- Commissioner Orlins stated that all of the holdings of the archives are accessioned according to current and professional standards. He also stated that he has discussed this project with Mel Russell and she has expressed an interest in meeting with City Staff to come to an agreement regarding this.

<u>City Center Lofts Project Design, Information/Discussion:</u>

- Cindy Gnos, Contract Planner, reported that she was presenting the design, comments on the
 design and the consistency of the design with the Downtown Specific Plan. The applicant has
 made some minor modifications, but before they have a final design they wanted to get feedback
 from the Historical Preservation Commission as to how it meets your criteria as it relates to the
 historical context.
- Commissioner Vicars asked what type of use is in the various sections of the proposed buildings.
- Cindy Gnos stated she did not know the individual break down of the buildings themselves but that the totals had not changed; there are still 170 residential units, 32,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor and 307 parking stalls underneath. The exterior of the building has just been refined.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that it was unclear from the report that the entire commercial was still on the main floor.
- Cindy Gnos stated that the use mix has not changed; all that has changed is the exterior elevation.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned whether all of the buildings were four-story.
- Larry Andrews, City Center Lofts, stated that the project has four levels of residential over a ground floor retail and live/work space.
- Commissioner Vicars reiterated that the buildings were five-story. She also questioned whether the building at the back has commercial on the bottom with the four levels of residential above that.
- Larry Andrews stated that was correct.
- Commissioner Orlins questioned whether all of the parking was underground.
- Larry Andrews stated that was correct.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned where the entrance to the parking was.
- Larry Andrews stated that there were two entrances, one on Court Street and one on Walnut Street.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned where the entrance to the parking was located on Walnut Street.
- Larry Andrews stated that the entrance was south of Dead Cat Alley.
- Commissioner Orlins questioned where the entrance to the parking was located on Court Street.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that the entrance was east of the Catholic Church.
- Commissioner Butler asked for an expanded drawing to show how this proposed project blends into the historic area. He feels the elevation shown tonight is not historic, but it must fit into or abut the historic area. He also would like to see multiple elevations on this project.
- Cindy Gnos stated that the packet from the RRM Design Group will walk the Commissioners through the historic context as it relates to other structures in the Downtown Area.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that the print was too small in the RRM Design Group packet. She could not read most of it.

HPC MINUTES 3 4/16/08

- Cindy Gnos stated that she was unsure how to address that and wanted to be clear that the packet came in the 11x17 size that she had.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that all Commission packets were 8 ½x11 not 11x17.
- Cindy Gnos stated that she would summarize RRM's comments and the different components of the building that they thought needed to be better enhanced to meet the Downtown Specific Plan. On page 2 of the report RRM highlighted the corner of the building, and noted that the Downtown Specific Plan wants to emphasize the street and announce the arrival to the building. Corners have a prominent feature that they not only have a pedestrian-level feature but also an upper-story level feature. Commercial storefronts are recessed. On the elevation drawing they have highlighted the center area and stated that this is an opportunity for a corner element, and they have highlighted the street façade along Walnut and stated that pedestrian and storefront entrances need enhancements.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned how much are the building setback from the existing sidewalk.
- Larry Andrews stated that they are still working on it. RRM's suggestion is that we set it further back than what the City requires.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned whether it would then be probably 10 12 feet.
- Larry Andrews stated he thought that it would be approximately 10 feet.
- Cindy Gnos stated that the setbacks would probably be varied in spaces.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that she appreciated the broken facades.
- Cindy Gnos stated that RRM recommended the break up of the facades to create smaller pedestrian-scale elements with open space on the buildings. Staff is still working with RRM to refine this design but we would like the Commission's comments to include in the report to the Planning Commission.
- Cindy Norris commented that this was a very conceptual vision; the next step will be to complete the design with comments from the Historical Preservation Commission and take it before the Planning Commission.
- Commissioner Butler questioned if there were any artist's renderings or drawings that depicts how this project fits into the area.
- Cindy Gnos stated she was unsure what Commissioner Butler was asking for. This project does take up a whole block, so is he asking to see it in context of several blocks?
- Commissioner Bunse stated that the Commission's purview was the Historical District. This project removes two buildings from the Historical District. The information before the Commission tonight does not show what the project looks like in relation to any of the remaining buildings of the Historical District on the west side of town.
- Commissioner Brookshear stated that it appeared that all of the comments were based on the City's Planning Design criteria and questioned if anyone has contacted the Secretary of the Interior for the treatment of historical property and how this project would fit with their criteria. She would like to she how this project adjoins with other blocks historically speaking.
- Commissioner Bunse stated that she realized this project was located on the west side of the Downtown Historical District so our opinion of how it fits with buildings west of the project is not relevant but our opinion of how it fits with the Historical District east of the project is relevant. She questioned what the status of the environmental process is. Commissioner Bunse stated that the Draft EIR did not include mitigation for removal of buildings, which is not adequate to her. This does need some mitigation because of the fact that the project proposes to demolish two historic buildings.

HPC MINUTES 4 4/16/08

- Cindy Gnos stated that the mitigation has been added to the Final EIR. The Final EIR has not been published and released for public review as yet. She was waiting on completing the EIR until the Downtown Parking Ordinance had been adopted. Cindy Gnos stated that she planned to gather the Historical Preservation Commission's design comments, attend a workshop at one of the Planning Commission meetings in May to further discuss the design review, and then at the beginning of June bringing the EIR and the project before the Planning Commission.
- Commissioner Butler questioned if the buildings that are scheduled to be demolished are on the Historic Register, or if other buildings in the area will be demolished.
- Cindy Gnos stated that the buildings on the proposed site will be demolished, and the Final EIR will address that.
- Commissioner Bunse stated that the proposed buildings for demolition were on the Historic Register.
- Commissioner Butler suggested that the applicant consider the fact that the project could be stopped if the Historical Preservation Commission is not apprised of the mitigation changes. The Historical Preservation Commission has to consider the destruction of registered buildings without mitigation.
- Cindy Norris questioned when Cindy Gnos thought the Final EIR would be ready for release and could be forwarded to the Historical Preservation Commission.
- Cindy Gnos stated that it would probably be available in mid-May.
- Commissioner Bunse stated she had a question regarding the process. Does Staff want comments from the Historical Preservation Commission on how this project relates to the Historic District and historic resources in general in Woodland? As Commissioners will we be asked to give our opinion regarding the Final EIR to the Planning Commission, or is it only in relation to the actual application to demolish the building?
- Cindy Norris stated it is in relation to the demolition. It is in the National Register District and alterations are subject to review and recommendations by the Historical Preservation Commission. This project is somewhat different since it came to the Commission through Ordinance 12-A as a demolition review. The intent at this time is to bring before the Historical Preservation Commission as an informational then to receive the recommendations on the design aspect.
- Commissioner Bunse questioned whether this project would come before this Commission again or not
- Cindy Norris stated that it is not intended to come before the Historical Preservation Commission, but rather move forward to the Planning Commission.
- Commissioner Bunse wanted it clarified whether Staff wanted a recommendation. She thought that no action was being sought by Staff tonight.
- Cindy Gnos stated that the Commission should provide recommendations on design so that Staff may incorporate them into the Planning Commission staff report. The Historical Preservation Commissions comments on the demolition were given several months previous at a hearing.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that it did not make sense to take this project to the Planning Commission before the Historical Preservation Commission has had an opportunity to review the demolition with the mitigation, since mitigation was not in place several months ago.

HPC MINUTES 5 4/16/08

- Commissioner Orlins stated that he agreed with the comments from the other Commissioners. He felt the project could not go forward without the demolition of two structures that have been determined to be significant and the impact is unavoidable. There are contributing elements to the Downtown Historic District and the Downtown Specific Plan and he feels very strongly that the mitigation for the destruction of those structures be focused entirely in some way on furthering the City's Historic Preservation efforts.
- Cindy Gnos stated that it would be possible for the Historical Preservation Commission to receive the mitigation in draft form.
- Commissioner Orlins questioned when the Commission would see the mitigation proposal.
- Cindy Gnos stated she will work with Staff to attempt to bring the draft mitigation to the next meeting. However, the final EIR and response to comments will not be available until approximately mid-May.
- Commissioner Butler questioned when the applicant intended to apply for a demolition permit.
- Cindy Gnos stated that she needed to review with Staff regarding the last hearings and the outcome of those hearings.
- Commissioner Bunse stated that she did not have a problem with the project overall as a resident of Woodland. However, as a Historic Preservation Commissioner she is unclear of what is expected of her. The staff report states this project is consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan because it meets the goal to revitalize the heart of the City through preservation of historic structures within the Historic District. She states that she disagrees with the staff report. Commissioner Bunse also stated that this project could be successful with adequate mitigation, but at this point she feels there is not enough information to make recommendations to the Planning Commission or City Council.
- Cindy Gnos asked what additional information does the Historic Preservation Commission require other than the mitigation.
- Commissioner Bunse stated that the Commission would like staff to present design review depicting how the proposed project design relates to the remaining historic structures, not the structures which are intended for demolition. She also felt that the staff report was inaccurate in that it stated the project was preserving historic structures. The proposed project actually is demolishing historic structures. Commissioner Bunse stated that the design review should inject references as to how the proposed project does or does not meet the Secretary of the Interior standards for treatment of historic property. This would not be necessary to the demolition of the two historic buildings but to the district, since the district as a whole will be affected.
- Commissioner Brookshear stated that she felt that it was not possible for the Historical Preservation Commission to comment on a demolition at draft form with key information, such as mitigation missing. She is unsure of the current ordinance and procedure, and also questioned whether any of the mitigation measures relate to the building design.
- Cindy Gnos stated that she could not recall any mitigation measures related to the building designs. She stated that there were photo documentation treatments in the lobby to show the history of the site, but not necessarily any mitigation measures for the exterior.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned if Staff has done any research to retrieve the old neon sign that was on that site.
- Cindy Gnos stated that she believed there has been some research but that the sign was not available.
- Larry Andrews stated that the previous owner was in possession of the sign.

HPC MINUTES 6 4/16/08

- Commissioner Vicars stated that she understood that but still questioned if Staff had corresponded with the previous owner in an attempt to retrieve the sign for historical purposes.
- Larry Andrews stated that he was not aware of any such correspondence.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned whether the Commissioners wanted to continue with the review
 that was presented tonight or send back for Staff to resubmit with additional information at a later
 date.
- Commissioner Butler stated he felt it very important to have all information possible available prior to review. He also stated he felt that the City Attorney should be in attendance so all procedures are followed as required.
- Cindy Norris stated that Staff will have to review the City Attorney schedule and the budget to decide if it is feasible.
- Commissioner Butler reiterated that it is very important all steps are done correctly with a project this complex.
- Commissioner Vicars clarified tonight that Staff wanted only design review comments; that no decisions was to be made. She questioned whether Commissioner Butler's concern was regarding when the demolition permit comes before the Commission.
- Commissioner Butler reiterated he felt that when and if something for this project was presented to the Commission or if the Commission was asked to vote on anything regarding this project then they need to seek the advice of the City Attorney.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that she agreed with Commissioner Butler, but she still wanted to clarify how the Commission would like to proceed on this project tonight.
- Commissioner Bunse questioned where the comments from tonight's meeting would go.
- Cindy Gnos stated that they would end in one of two places, or perhaps both. After the comments have been discussed by the applicant and Staff they would be incorporated in the finalizing design. The comments would also be added to the staff report presented to the Planning Commission as concerns of the Historical Preservation Commission. Cindy Gnos stated that she understood the need for historic context. The Planning Commission suggested stronger entry features and break up the massing. Staff does want as much input from the Historical Preservation Commission as possible on the individual components of the design.
- Commissioner Bunse agreed with the Planning Commission regarding the corner treatment on the building. It is a feature that is on other historic buildings in the downtown area. She appreciates that the design is not attempting to fully mimic a historic look or aesthetic. It is new construction and there is nothing wrong with good, new design.
- Commissioner Brookshear stated that a couple of the key elements were the comments on standardizing the window pattern and varying the surface textures. She feels in keeping the rthymn found in the downtown area Staff will be meeting some of the Secretary of the Interior standards.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned whether the drawing depicted solar panels on the rooftops.
- Cindy Gnos stated that was not the intention.
- Larry Andrews stated that the applicant would like solar, but not at this time.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned then if the sloping of the roof panels were for shading purposes or design purposes.
- Cindy Gnos stated that it was for design purposes.

HPC MINUTES 7 4/16/08

- Commissioner Bunse stated that there was a comment made regarding the use of balconies. She stated that there was a precedent in Woodland for a small use of that. But the buildings that are scheduled to be demolished have window patterns similar to the elevation on Page 4. The commercial store fronts have large panels of glass with a transom row above of small panes. Commissioner Bunse stated she felt that there needs to be pedestrian interaction.
- Commissioner Brookshear questioned if there were to be any awnings.
- Cindy Gnos stated that RRM and the Planning Commission have both recommended awnings on the building.
- Commissioner Orlins questioned whether the facades will have different textures or the same texture in varying colors. He feels it would be best to have a variety of textures and colors for the facades.
- Larry Andrews stated that was a suggestion by RRM Design Group and the applicant concurred. The applicant is moving forward with those revisions to give greater variety.
- Commissioner Orlins asked if there was a plan to create a scale model of the project.
- Cindy Gnos stated she did not believe so, since a computer-generated version of the model could be attained.
- Commissioner Brookshear commented that the proposed building for Court Street, on page 7, was a very modernistic, contemporary building; the only comments listed thus far have been in regards to the number of windows. This proposed building probably does not have as big an effect on the Historic District as those proposed for Main Street, but should this building be more residential in nature in keeping with the neighborhood on Court Street.
- Commissioner Bunse stated that if there are historic resources on the north side of Court Street facing the proposed building then the Commission will need to discuss any relationship issues between the buildings. She also stated that she is not opposed to new buildings looking new, provided that it does not adversely impact the district. Commissioner Bunse stated that her concern for this proposed building would be the south side mid-block since that is the area where it would face the one remaining contributor to the district.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that the north side of Court Street was a mixture of cottages and houses, most of which have been turned into commercial property.
- Jimmy Stillman reiterated that most of the various homes on Court Street in the proposed area have been converted to businesses.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that the buildings are modest Craftsman and Bungalow types.
- Commissioner Bunse commented that the south elevation and the southeast corner of the building marked #10 on the large model be more in keeping with the district than the north and western part of the project.
- Commissioner Vicars noted that whoever lives in this building will have an abundance of sunlight.
- Cindy Gnos stated that this is a main concern and that Staff is working on rectifying this issue.
- Commissioner Orlins questioned if the Holy Rosary Catholic Church was going to be moving to Cross Street, and if so did the City have any designs for that property.
- Cindy Norris stated she was unsure when the church was moving, but that it was still planning on relocating.
- Cindy Gnos stated that conversations have been ongoing. However the church has not submitted any applications or timelines.

HPC MINUTES 8 4/16/08

- Commissioner Vicars noted that there is a sign posted on Cross Street that states it is the future home of Holy Rosary Church, but that it has been there for awhile.
- Commissioner Bunse felt that the architecture on the buildings at 325 and 333 Main Street are one part commercial block building as opposed to moderne as stated in the staff report on page 2. This commercial block building is standard fair for historical commercial buildings in the 1920s. She believes the statement regarding moderne stems from the previous Safeway building on Elm Street, which was moderne-like.
- Jimmy Stillman stated the Commission has provided some very good recommendations. He stated that Staff will work with the consultant and the architect to incorporate some of the Commission's suggestions for Phase I. The comments will be included in future staff reports as recommendations to the Planning Commission to consider. If the elevations change prior to the Planning Commission Staff will acknowledge the Historical Preservation Commission suggestions, and if not then the comments will be included with the staff report. At this point staff would like the Commission to move forward with the recommendation, unless there are further recommendations to architectural changes. Staff would also like to reiterate that the draft mitigation measure for the removal of the two historic buildings will come before the Commission at the next meeting, which is May 14th.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that as part of the draft mitigation measure to come before them on May 14th she would also like to get some perspective with the historical neighborhood to the east of the proposed project.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that Staff could include not just the east, but the rest of the downtown structures as well. He also stated the need for a discussion to legitimize how elements from existing structures are being incorporated into this project.
- Commissioner Bunse wanted to clarify that Staff requested from the Historical Preservation Commission recommendations that would then be forwarded to the Planning Commission.
- Jimmy Stillman stated Staff was seeking a recommendation that supported the ideas depicted in the drawings submitted tonight; things like massing roof lines, recessed entry ways. In addition, Staff will include the Commission's comments and recommended changes, such as texturing, patterning, and use of various materials.
- Cindy Gnos stated Staff would also include the request for additional information.
- Commissioner Butler questioned the effect on the Downtown City Plan. Will it have to be amended?
- Jimmy Stillman stated that the City is currently reviewing the possibility of updated the Downtown Specific Plan. At this point the discussion is not leading to a complete update, but to enhance the existing plan. This particular project does not require any special amendment to the Downtown Specific Plan.
- Commissioner Bunse asked for assurances that the comments from the Historical Preservation Commission be forwarded to the Staff and Planning Commission.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that a transcribe copy of the minutes from this meeting would be included with the staff report to the Planning Commission.
- Commissioner Vicars asked for clarification on two items: 1) when is the workshop with the Planning Commission scheduled? and 2) Will Dead Cat Alley be open to vehicles and pedestrians or just pedestrians?

HPC MINUTES 9 4/16/08

- Cindy Gnos stated that she and Robert MacNicholl have decided on May 15th for the workshop with the Planning Commission and that Dead Cat Alley will be opened to vehicles, it will not be abandoned.
- Commissioner Bunse and Commissioner Vicars both asked that the Historical Preservation Commission be kept apprised of the date of the Planning Commission Workshop.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that Staff will bring the draft mitigation measure forward to the next Historical Preservation Commission meeting for review.

Heritage Home Awards:

- Commissioner Vicars stated that the Commission had decided on four homes. She also stated that
 the write-up for the homes will be forwarded to Staff by the end of this week, or the beginning of
 next week at the latest.
- Jimmy Stillman that Staff had received one write-up so far and was hoping to receive the rest in draft form by the next Wednesday, April 23rd. Staff will then edit the writings and confer with the Commissioners for any changes that are necessary to obtain approval. All four homeowners have been contacted. He also stated that there will be a homeowner from last year who will receive a plaque with the correct date of construction on it. The presentation is scheduled for the May 14th meeting. Marshall Echols will give an update on the mailings and invitations.
- Commissioner Butler stated that he was not in a position to give a recommendation on the home located at 33 Third Street since he nominated the home years ago and it was denied by the Commission. He feels the building is deserving of historical recommendation. Commissioner Butler stated the problem was with the Fire Commissioner, the look of the house in the back half, and how it is situated on the lot. He stated that the other Commission members should see the house for themselves and decide whether it is aesthetically appropriate for the Commission. The house has been denied by the Commission twice in the past.
- Commissioner Bunse stated that this is a different Commission that those that denied the house in the past.
- Commissioner Butler stated he understood that but wanted the Commission to know the history and that the problem was not visible from the front.
- Commissioner Bunse commented that she personally would give an award to a home with a substantial addition if the original portion of the home was still intact. She believes the Commission could address Commissioner Butler's concerns by viewing the house for themselves.
- Commissioner Vicars questioned who is doing the write-up and presentation for the home at 33 Third Street.
- Commissioner Butler stated that he will do them.
- Jimmy Stillman wanted to clarify that the reason the home was previously denied was because of the rear and side marking.
- Commissioner Butler stated that there were two homes built on the lot with one driveway. One home kept the driveway.
- Jimmy Stillman questioned whether the home at 33 Third Street has had any improvements made since the last time it was before the Commission.
- Commissioner Butler stated he did not believe so.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that if Staff could get a consensus from the Commission to view the home at 33 Third Street, they can send their comments directly to Jimmy. He also stated that the façade of the home had been well maintained.

- Commissioner Butler stated that he could not remember why the home was denied a second time.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that Staff would research the past minutes of the Historical Commission for the answer as to why it was denied a second time. Staff was unable to locate the minutes regarding the denial at this time. Jimmy also stated that he would like Commissioner Butler to continue with the write-up for 33 Third Street and receive comments from the rest of the Commissioners by Wednesday, April 23rd regarding whether Staff should move forward with this recommendation.
- Marshall Echols gave an update regarding the proceedings for the Historic Home Awards Presentation. He stated that all four acceptance letters have been mailed, including 33 Third Street. Staff and three of the homeowners have agreed upon a date. Three of the homes are in the Walking Tour Book. Marshall also stated that in researching with Mel from the Yolo County Archives he found that one home located at 241 Cross Street was actually constructed four years earlier than previous thought. The actual construction date was 1914. He also stated that he has sent out invitations to the Daily Democrat and the Davis Enterprise for the May 14th Historical Preservation Commission and Heritage Home Awards. Invitations have also been sent to various people and agencies on the City's Historic Preservation mailing list. The plaques have been ordered and should arrive approximately one week prior to the meeting. There will be six plaques in all, four for this year and two from last year with corrected dates on them.

Ordinance Amendment Discussion:

- Commissioner Vicars stated that Staff sent two ordinances from other cities to review. She has not had time to compare them to the City's ordinance but this was not what she was looking for in the discussion. Commissioner Vicars stated she had hoped Staff would start with the basics of why this is necessary and then what steps Staff would take to achieve their goal.
- Cindy Norris stated that Staff has not had the opportunity to evaluate the differences. She felt that Staff could discuss the structure of what the Commission would like to see when Staff brings it back before the Commission, as well as some flow of discussion in terms of what key elements the Commission feels is necessary in our ordinance as Staff and Commission analyze the ordinance along with the technical bulletins for use as comparison. These bulletins were taken from the OHP website as examples.
- Commissioner Vicars reiterated that the examples were taken from the OHP website.
- Marshall Echols stated that they were.
- Commissioner Bunse stated that she would highly recommend adopting existing guidelines and criteria with modifications to those criteria based on anything relevant to the history of the City of Woodland. The evaluation criteria for historic resources should be based on the California Register or the National Register or a combination thereof. The Commission and Staff can add to that if they feel those criteria do not capture anything that is specific to the City of Woodland. Commissioner Bunse highly recommends reviewing example ordinances that exist which incorporate the three levels of criteria, local, state, and federal.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that SHPO had an example ordinance on their website.
- Marshall Echols stated that the SHPO website has a template, which then has links to various cities with prime examples of ordinances.
- Commissioner Vicars commented that she understood and appreciated the research. The previous letter that the City received from SHPO stated specific parts of the ordinance which needed to be addressed. She stated she would feel more comfortable starting from the "mock-up" that SHPO provided rather that another city's ordinance.

HPC MINUTES 11 4/16/08

- Commissioner Brookshear clarified that Marshall Echols stated the on the website for SHPO there was not a "mock-up" but an outline.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that she understood what Marshall Echols was stating. She felt that Staff and the Commission should begin with the outline at SHPO and compare the City's ordinance and see where we fit the criteria and what we need to change. The outline from SHPO will have problems for the Commission because of some of the buy in we need from City Council.
- Commissioner Orlins questioned if the purpose of amending the ordinance was to become a member of the Certified Local Government or are there multiple reasons for doing so.
- Cindy Norris stated that ultimately the reason for amending the ordinance is to become a member of the Certified Local Government, but she believes that it is also mentioned in the General Plan that the ordinance update is required. Staff has submitted a draft application to SHPO for Certified Local Government. We have discussed the application with Cindy Woodward and she has given us a list of changes that need to be made. Staff will review the list of changes, analyze the key elements and discuss how to address them in the City's ordinance.
- Commissioner Orlins stated he wanted to be clear that what we are discussing is in fact part of the same process as previously discussed.
- Commissioner Brookshear stated that admission to the Certified Local Government was an
 inspiration for the ordinance amendment. However, she also feels that it would clarify the roll of
 the Historical Preservation Commission and what recommendations they are being asked to make.
 Commissioner Brookshear stated that when the Commission and Staff review the comments on
 the ordinance she would specifically like to address integrity.
- Cindy Norris asked if Commissioner Brookshear could clarify her statement.
- Commissioner Brookshear stated she was speaking of historic integrity. Buildings that have historic status meet historic integrity requirements. Buildings with multiple modifications should not make the list. The guidelines for nominating a building to the California Register incorporate the National Register guidelines. Our ordinance also needs different rankings of items.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that the City needs a sharper definition section to help identify these issues when they come up. He stated that the idea for providing examples from different cities was so that the Commission could pull ideas and incorporate into the City of Woodland ordinance. He also stated that Staff will begin with the template that SHPO provides.
- Commissioner Butler commented that there is not at this time a statement in the City's ordinance regarding adding property to the inventory. He stated that the Commission was unaware of certain properties that were on the list at Yolo County. He also recommended researching other city ordinances that have rehabilitation for historical buildings and inquire regarding how the City could fund this rehabilitation ordinance.
- Jimmy Stillman stated he would address all of the Commissioners comments and concerns with the appropriate Staff and what outcome can be achieved.
- Commissioner Brookshear commented that it would be good to enforce and encourage preservation to dovetail with the façade enhancements already being done.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that Staff will continue the ordinance update and work with the SHPO website.
- Commissioner Vicars stated that all of the Commissioners receive a copy of original comments from SHPO prior to this item coming before the Historical Preservation Commission again.
- Jimmy Stillman stated that the ordinance amendments would probably come before the Commission at the June 11th meeting, including the previous comments and any further update.
- Commissioner Orlins questioned if Staff had an estimated cost value of the City Center Lofts Project. He stated he was looking for a ballpark figure.

HPC MINUTES 12 4/16/08

- Jimmy Stillman stated at this point in time there is no estimated value, but it could be in the millions.
- Commissioner Vicars felt that the estimate would be between \$20-30 million dollars.
- Jimmy Stillman commented that Staff appreciated the Commissioners flexibility in changing the date of this meeting from April 9th to April 16th.

The being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:02 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Stillman Associate Planner

HPC MINUTES 13 4/16/08