HERITAGE PRESERVATION BOARD
April 9, 2015

ROLL CALL

Chair Cunningham called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Board Members: Lelia Lanctot, Sallyanne Wilson, Vice Chair Hillary Culhane, Scott Morgan, Chair Richard Cunningham

Absent: Board Members: Dirk Mueller

Staff: Planner/Recording Secretary Kristin Teiche, Jerri Holan Consulting Historic Architect

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was none.

PLANNING STAFF'S ORAL REPORT

Staff Planner Teiche informed the Board of the following:

- Vacant Board Seat. Planner Teiche announced that the Council will interview for the vacant Heritage Board seat on April 15. A second set of interviews with a fourth person will be held May 6. Appointment should follow soon after.

- Lark Creek Shops. Planner Teiche provided the Board with the status of the Lark Creek Shops regarding the remodeling of the front parking and landscape area. Staff has issued a stop work order, and met with the property manager and architect at the site. The final decision on what permits are required will depend upon what is proposed on the plans.

  The Board then held a general conversation regarding painting of buildings in the Historic District and what review may be required prior to painting.

- Board Budget. Staff reviewed the status of the Board's yearly budget and remaining funds for consulting services.

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

1. **Study Session; 105 King Street; APN: 021-101-41; Mr. Bill Love; Applicant/Owner; Polsky Perlstein Architects; GD (Garden Downtown) Zoning District.** Applicant is requesting a study session to discuss a preliminary design and options for proposed accessory building(s) on a property located in the Downtown Historic District and listed on the National Register of historic places.

   Chair Cunningham introduced the item and invited Mr. Bill Love to join the Board at their table. He stated for the record that a study session is not binding and no formal decision can be made by the Board.

   Mr. Love apologized for not having installed story poles. He was unable to address this due to having been out of town. He then provided the following comments:

- He generally explained the design approach and noted that although the building is in the same location he hoped the Board would agree that the new design was an appropriate balanced solution that addresses his needs and the Board's concerns over the previous design.
- He noted that he looked into the Board's prior suggestion for adding a unit and/or garage in the basement. He discovered this would be cost prohibitive and the garage could not function properly due to existing pool placement and site improvements.
- He believes placement of a unit in the rear yard would undermine his privacy and other more recent landscape features, such as the fire pit.

When questioned by Chair Cunningham he explained the pool room within the proposed structure would have a vaulted ceiling, and agreed it was a taller gable roof structure than required for this single story room. Mr. Love indicated that this could be reconsidered, although he thought the steeply pitched roof was aesthetically more pleasing.

Chair Cunningham noted that he remained concerned about the massing of the proposed design.

Chair Cunningham invited comments from members of the audience. There being none, the discussion returned to the table.

Vice Chair Culhane asked about the setback regulations.

Mr. Love reiterated his belief that the options for placing a detached structure at an alternative location were too constrained and could not meet his program.

The Board continued to ask questions regarding the proposed design. It was noted that the structure would house multiple uses (pool house, second unit and recreation room) and Board Members questioned Mr. Love about breaking up the uses into separate smaller structures at alternative locations.

Board Member Morgan asked if some of the square footage could be extended between the pool and side property line where its massing would not be visible. Mr. Love indicated this was not his preference as the layout and design would be awkward. He would prefer to break the structure into two buildings. He suggested a separate pool room further in toward the rear corner, where the yard area is approximately 20 feet wide.

Board Member Morgan provided the following comments:

- He found the design resulted in a large mass.
- He was concerned about the views of this structure from Magnolia Avenue. However he wondered if the perspective provided in the plans does not really reflect the views you have from the street, and if it may not be as visually prominent as it appears in the plans.
- He thought the roofline parallel to the street appeared quite large and the gable end that faced the street and ran back into the property appeared much smaller.

Board Member Lanctot agreed the pitched roof facing toward Magnolia Avenue with the exposed gable end was attractive and hid the mass behind it.

Vice Chair Culhane noted that when you look at the house, the eye is drawn to the details. The accessory structure was plain and needed detail that would draw the eye and detract from the mass.

Mr. Love noted that he simplified the appearance so it would not compete with the historic home.

Board Member Lanctot again noted that the structure, although reduced, looked pretty big. Mr. Love stated that he could investigate ways to present the massing differently.

Board Member Wilson noted that the Board was charged with insuring new structures would be compatible with the zoning district, historic downtown, and historic home. It was necessary to be careful about the spatial relationships. The proposed structure was not truly accessory to the site and historic home due to its size and height. This site was a farm at one time. Accessory structures are consistent with the history of the site, if the scale and mass fit together. She questioned if there were other ways to accommodate the applicant's needs without putting it all in one structure.

Consulting Historic Architect, Jerri Holan, noted the Standards address this. Accessory structures should be behind the main house and should be smaller in stature. She agreed with Board Member Wilson that the current design did not comply with the Standards.

Mr. Love noted that the Board and City needs to balance his property rights with the historic nature of the site. He noted the zoning regulations permit more than he is proposing. He did not think a garage was too much to ask.

Board Member Wilson agreed that a garage can be accommodated. The Board is charged with preservation of the historic character of the district, the home and the site. As such, the Board must consider all sides. She does not find the design presented tonight to be appropriate in the historic site and district.

Board Member Culhane stated she understands the need for the garage. However, it is unclear why all the needs have to be in one large structure.

Mr. Love noted it is a question of efficient use of space. He is eliminating the massing of another structure elsewhere on the site. He sees the Board's point, and agrees a separate structure for the pool house could be considered. Although, aesthetically, he does find it is as pleasing or efficient for the site.

Chair Cunningham noted that the Board hears a range of applications and has routinely allowed some flexibility in the application of the Standards and design in order to reach a compromise. He referenced the recent hearing for 143 Madrone Avenue as an example. He complimented Mr. Love on the existing condition of the property and his care and attention to the residential structure.

Consulting Historic Architect, Jerri Holan, noted that there is no more important resource in the Historic Downtown than the home at 105 King Street. The Standards address additions and placement of additions repeatedly, and direct that new structures should be placed behind the historic resource.

Mr. Love asked for clarification on whether he can propose a garage in his existing parking area, at the current location. He did not think it was too much to ask, historical Standards or not. The Board has agreed they intend to allow some compromise.

Chair Cunningham expressed reservations about committing to an answer.

Board Member Culhane noted that if the garage was single story, less obtrusive, set back, and not in conflict with the historic residence this seems possible. Historically, there were outbuildings on the original farm.

Chair Cunningham and the historic architect discussed the type and location of other original outbuildings (now gone) and noted that these structures were separated by quite a distance, unlike the proposed garage/second unit/pool house structure.

Staff Planner Teiche asked if the applicant proposed a small two car garage, approximately 400 square feet, tucked back in the corner of the parking area and away from the home, is that ok.

Consulting Historic Architect noted that this approach could be acceptable. The project architect could explore other locations for the other uses.

Ms. Holan and Mr. Love both noted that a garage off King Street is problematic due to the historic rock wall, and the change in grade. However, Ms. Holan stated that a small structure could be placed further in so that it would not disrupt views of the three historic King Street homes.

Mr. Love requested some direction on the roofline for the garage in the parking area. He prefers the same profile with the gable end facing the street.

Planner Teiche stated the Board should comment on the massing, and if it is appropriate and in keeping with the Standards.

Chair Cunningham stated the placement of a garage with the narrow profile facing the street and garage doors facing the house could be appropriate. He clarified that he remains very troubled by the addition of any substantial mass out front of the home in this location. Placement of the structure should have been considered from the start when there were more options available.

Mr. Love asked about second floor roof dormers so he can accommodate the second unit above the garage.

Chair Cunningham noted the dormers added much more massing.

Staff Planner Teiche noted the time and asked the Board provide Mr. Love with a synopsis of their comments, based upon the Standards.

Board Member Lanctot noted that she preferred to see a smaller accessory structure.

Board Member Wilson noted that an accessory structure by definition is smaller and must truly be “accessory”. She agreed any structure needed to be as small as possible.

Chair Cunningham expanded on the definition of accessory structure and noted that it should be subservient to the main residence and less conspicuous.

Board Member Morgan agreed that a garage is acceptable in the proposed location with the gable end facing toward the street. It should have a lower roof to look more accessory and to reduce the massing. It may not be possible to provide living space above the garage. As it would be a narrow profile, it could be longer, heading into the lot to accommodate additional space. Perhaps it could even be pulled forward some.

Planner Teiche, noted that pulling the structure forward is contrary to the direction that has been provided during the main discussion.

Consulting Historic Architect Holan, generally went through the standards to explain how they direct new additions and structures should be placed on historic property. New elements should not destroy the historic relationship of the historic structure with the street. Also, with a Victorian landscape, there

are no structures placed in the front yards. Additions and detached structures should be at the rear, behind the residence and the two front facades that face Magnolia and King Street.

When questions by Mr. Love she agreed that a very discreet, small, single story garage, in the existing parking area, could meet the Standards.

There was a general consensus by the Board that a small single story garage could be designed to meet the standards.

The Board then adjourned for a five minute break.

ONGOING BUSINESS ITEMS

2. Update of Larkspur's Historic Resources Inventory. Board to continue discussing the process and work program necessary to implement a future update of Larkspur's Historic Resources Inventory.

Staff Planner Teiche presented a survey of properties that are 50 years and older as gathered from Marin Map, which pulls information from the Assessor-Recorder records. She noted that she added in all the properties currently listed on the historic inventory, as well as those previously evaluated that were not added to the inventory.

Chair Cunningham noted that he sent the Board Members homework by asking them to compare the list with the addresses and houses on a block in their neighborhoods. There was general discussion regarding:

- Addresses that were, and were not, listed in the survey but known to be of historic interest;
- The impacts of designating a structure as historic, and methods to inform a potential home buyer;
- Whether some neighborhoods could be more readily eliminated, such as Greenbrae.

Board Member Morgan excused himself and left the meeting due to other commitments and the late hour (9:10 PM).

Chair Cunningham indicated he was interested in hiring a person who could fine tune the research criteria to collect the additional addresses that have been omitted.

Consulting Historic Architect Holan noted the existing survey is a great start and the Board can walk the streets and add and eliminate addresses.

There was some additional direction to adjust the existing columns and to add a column to reference the page number of the historic book.

Chair Cunningham closed the discussion and noted that the Board needed to complete some fine tuning of the survey. Consulting Historic Architect Holan noted the Board and volunteers should walk the streets and make corrections.

3. Board Member Reports. Board members to share and discuss information and attachments related to historic preservation.

There were none.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

M/s Wilson/Cunningham moved, and the Board approved 4-2-0 (Morgan and Mueller absent) to approve the March 12, 2105 minutes as amended.

Adjourn

Meeting ended at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristin Teiche, Senior Planner
Acting Recording Secretary