

Special Meeting Date
HERITAGE PRESERVATION BOARD
August 3, 2015

ROLL CALL

Chair Cunningham called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Present: Board Members: Lelia Lanctot, Jon Knorpp, Scott Morgan, Dirk Mueller, Sallyanne Wilson, Hillary Culhane, and Chair Cunningham

Absent: Board Members: None

Staff: Senior Planner/Recording Secretary Kristin Teiche, Consulting Historic Architect, Jerri Holan. Director of Public Works Mary Grace Houlihan

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was none.

PLANNING STAFF'S ORAL REPORT

Planner Teiche reported on the following

- 234-286 Magnolia Avenue - Lark Creek Shops. The Planning Commission approved the Design Review and Variance Application for remodeling of this site on July 28, 2015. They incorporated all of the Heritage Preservation Board's recommendations into the approval. In particular, they required the restaurant at 286 Magnolia Avenue to be brought in for Design Review once a tenant is selected. The front patio must incorporate some design details in keeping with the remainder of the center to tie this building visually with the complex.
- 234 Magnolia Avenue - Perry's Restaurant. Staff has received and is reviewing a landscape plan for Perry's Restaurant. The major features have been retained and it generally appears appropriate.
- 219 Hawthorne Ave. Staff has been contacted by a new project architect for this site and is anticipating submittal of a new application within the next few weeks.
- 285 Magnolia Avenue – Progress has been made on the building permit application, and permits will be issued soon.
- 143 Madrone Avenue – Progress has been made on the building permit application and staff expects permits to be issued soon, pending his address of a few plan check comments.

Board Member Morgan asked staff what was happening at the City parking lot at Ward and Magnolia Avenue. City Engineer Houlihan stated the lot was being rebuilt to all current standards and codes and will be enlarged to accommodate more parking.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

H/DR 15-34; 400 & 420 Magnolia Avenue, Larkspur; APN: 020-263-05 & 06; City of Larkspur, Applicant; City of Larkspur, Owner; SD (Storefront Downtown) Zoning District. (Continued from July 9, 2015)

Chair Cunningham introduced Director of Public Works Mary Grace Houlihan who is representing the application on behalf of the City of Larkspur. He noted that the window subcommittee, comprised of himself and Board Member Knorpp met with Ms. Houlihan and her architectural consultant the prior week to review recommended window options.

Director Houlihan provided the Board with a power point presentation. The presentation included:

1. A Photographic review of City Hall to identify window condition and those proposed for replacement in the current physical year. Windows to be replaced included:
 - All windows and the sliding glass door on the front;
 - All windows on the south side elevation. Using a historic photograph provided by the Heritage Preservation Board, she proposed replacing the casement windows on the south side (second floor) with double hung in keeping with the historic photograph.
 - The ground floor windows at the rear, serving the Library;
 - All windows on both floors at the north front corner, supporting the Finance/Managers office and the break/copy room above.
 - The replacement door for the sliding glass door at the front elevation will be a double French door, to match that depicted on the historic photograph.
 - The second floor windows at the rear, and remaining windows on the north side, will not be replaced at this time.
2. An overview of the various goals and requirements to insure the historic building is appropriately rehabilitated, and continues to provide City staff and the public with a safe and sound structure.
3. An overview of the window manufacturers who could meet the goals and requirements.

Director Houlihan recommended the window manufacturer who best met the City's needs was Jeld Wen Windows. These windows would be wood, dual pane, and closely match the historic window pattern and mutton style. All exterior trim can be matched exactly. Additionally, the selected window include a 20 year warranty, are engineered to allow cleaning from the inside, and could be delivered in the preferred time frame so they can be installed before the rainy season.

Director Houlihan then introduced Paul Didonato from ATI Architects and Engineering who gave a more detailed presentation regarding the possible window manufacturers that were explored.

4. Review of the replacement program for Fire Station No. 15:
 - New windows would match the design of the existing. On the sides and rear, these are primarily double hung with divided lites on the upper sash (3 lites over 1).
 - It was noted that they are still attempting to identify the original style of the front windows on the second floor. They are currently aluminum sliders. The sizing does not allow for double hung. He recommended using casement style to best fit the existing opening.

Alternatively, he would use wood windows that look like a casement window but would slide open.

Chair Cunningham noted that he has seen an old newspaper clipping that shows the front elevation. He will look for this clipping and, if found, provide it to Director Houlihan. City Engineer Houlihan noted that the City may have original construction plans for the fire station.

If not able to locate this picture to identify the exact window style and design, the Board and Director Houlihan agreed the goal is to replicate the original window style to the greatest extent possible.

The Board asked about proposed building color for the exterior paint. Ms. Houlihan indicated that she was willing to investigate the original building color. Generally, it was agreed that the City did not have to match the exact historic color. Historic Architect Holan noted the building color should be consistent with a historic restoration color. Director Houlihan added that it must be prepared by a manufacturer who could continue to produce the color in the future, when needed. The Board agreed to defer this discussion until the past colors have been investigated.

James Holmes, Larkspur Resident, addressed the Board and noted that the two buildings were constructed during different eras and it is likely there were originally some differences in window style and building color. He also noted that he read there were some original windows remaining at the back of the fire station that have bars in them. These are rumored to have been windows to a holding cell and should be retained in place.

M/s Boardmembers Morgan/Mueller moved, and approved 7-0-0, to recommend approval of the window replacement as presented and the purchase of the Jeld Wen Windows as recommended by the City Engineer.

The Board then agreed that the Window Committee can continue to meet and confer with Director Houlihan if additional questions should arise.

H/DR 15-19; 5 Murray Lane, Larkspur; APN: 020-0321-13; Polsky Perlstein Architects, Applicant; Chad and Leah Solter, Owners; R-1 (First Residential) Zoning District. Applicant is requesting approval to relocate a historic residence toward the Murray Lane frontage, construct additions at the rear of the historic home, add a detached garage, and install site landscaping.

Planner Teiche provided the Board with a synopsis of the staff report.

Architect Jered Polsky provided the Board with a description of the site and proposed project. As follows:

- Condition of existing historic home is deteriorating;
- Murray Lane is a private street, but home will be moved from rear of lot to Murray Lane frontage where it will be more visible.
- Additions were purposely placed at rear to preserve the historic structure. Design is single story and the attachment is minimal to differentiate it.
- Existing historic oak trees limited size and shape, so they designed a long addition that wove through the trees.
- His interpretation of the Standards is that the addition should be distinct and easily differentiated, and they have accomplished this with the design. The low elevation would not overwhelm the historic home.
- It will be difficult to see the historic home or the additions due to the location, the approved home at 1 Murray Lane, and the existing tree line located along the Estelle Avenue frontage.

He presented the Board with a photomontage of the home on the site. The only place you can get a good look at the addition would be from the future rear yard at 1 Murray Lane.

- Proposed a fairly complex hipped roof system to lower elevation and improve the interior space by allowing vaulted ceilings. He stated a hipped roof would result in a taller massing.
- Not trying to copy the historic home, only be in flavor with it.
- Do not want double hung windows on addition as they double as egress windows for fire code. They are also harder to open and close. Do have different mutton pattern, but this could be amended to better reflect that of the old house.
- This is 24,000 square foot lot, proposed FAR is .15. Not a huge home for the site, fits in the trees, and the neighbors are in full support.

Board Member Wilson asked Mr. Polsky if they had considered using any other roof form.

Mr. Polsky indicated that they opted for a gable roof as it is simpler, cleaner, and permits greater ceiling heights inside.

Board Member Morgan asked the historic architect to discuss her concerns.

Historic Architect Holan indicated she found the addition did not respect the geometry of the Victorian cottage, the roofline should be hipped to pay tribute to its style and the windows needed to better echo the historic windows in proportion and appearance.

Polsky indicated that all the windows on the addition are the same proportion, they are all divided except those that have an upper transom. They could divide the bottom sash on these.

Chair Cunningham invited members of the audience to speak:

Margaret Hagen, 601 College Avenue provided the following comments:

- She thinks both houses at 1 and 5 Murray Lane will be a wonderful addition to the neighborhood;
- She was concerned about potential damage to oak trees located across Murray Lane from the proposed developments at 1 and 5 Murray Lane:
- How will drainage in the street be improved;
- Will there be a turnaround added at the end of the roadway. Cars get to the end and have difficulty turning around.

Planner Teiche noted that her issues were not under the purview of the Heritage Preservation Board. She asked that Ms. Hagen turn in a written list of concerns so staff could address them with the Planning Commission or Department of Public Works.

Mr. Chad Solter, applicant and future owner of 1 Murray Lane. Mr. Solter provided the following comments:

- It's been interesting and fun process due to the private lane;
- Development at 1 and 5 Murray Lane will be a family compound;
- Important to note that very few individuals walk or drive down Murray Lane who may look at the historic home;
- Neighbors are happy with the plans;
- Trees are young and beautiful and they want a design that preserves them;

James Holmes, Larkspur resident expressed the following opinions:

- Surprised home is only a B and not an A, considering the architecture, the well document history and the family who lived there.
- Building was moved to current location in 1970 not 1978;
- Anytime you have preservation proposal two basic dilemmas 1) design is to be consistent and harmonious; 2) design should stand out as later addition in contrast to historic structure. These are rather in conflict.
- Have to be careful with approval so there is no loss of historic merit;
- Likes design of addition. Minimal link that reads as two buildings. Anything else would overwhelm the historic structure.
- Recommends approval with the understanding that this is about all that ever can be done.
- To certain extent this type of add-on, that looks tacked on, is common in farm house structures.
- Long low gable roof is as unobtrusive yet harmonious as you can get. A more detailed design would detract from historic structure.
- The long spread out design helps to insure the retention of this lot as a single family lot.

There being no further public comment, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board. Jered Polsky Architect was invited to join the Board at the table to answer any additional questions.

Chair Cunningham noted that he thought the doors on the detached garage were too detailed for such a simple Victorian cottage. He asked if the pattern could be simplified.

Mr. Polsky agreed this could be done.

Chair Cunningham then asked about the addition of the spire on the garage. The Board and the applicant agreed that the spire could be removed as suggested by the historic architect.

Board Member Culhane mentioned the “lovely” front porch and noted that this element was not carried through anywhere on the addition.

Mr. Polsky generally indicated that this element was distinct and he did not find it appropriate to mimic this element anywhere on the addition.

There was some discussion regarding the gable ended dormers in the addition and if they could be hipped to better tie the structure visually with the historic structure. It was pointed out that the west elevation is more readily seen from Murray Lane. The master bath gable end could be a hipped roof to better harmonize with the historic structure.

On the east side elevation, Mr. Polsky stated it was important that gable ended dormer should remain, and not be changed to a hip roof.

Board Member Morgan noted that even with these small adjustments, the addition is very distinct. These minimal changes will not alter this.

Staff Planner Teiche asked if the Board could each take a turn discussing the broader issues raised by the historic architect, and discussed on page 3 of the staff report, before the finer changes are addressed.

Board Member Knorpp noted that just because the addition could not be readily seen, you can do something very different from the historic structure. The addition should be sympathetic and

compatible. That said, he agreed there are some adjustment that can give it a more compatibility without sacrificing the proposed design. He also agrees that the oak trees do dictate much of what can be done, and the proposed addition deals well with this. The length of the addition and potential for more height, if a hipped roof is required, do not bother him.

Board Member Lanctot would like to have seen the addition completed in smaller components more like a farm setting. She can't imagine this was the only option.

Board Member Morgan indicated that the fact they are willing to move the house forward and rehabilitate it is very important and goes a long way with him. The design of the addition is very distinct. Not sure the design is compatible or incompatible, but also not sure it's his job to impose his taste on the design. This is a small house and the single story addition seems better than a two story addition which could dwarf the historic house. If you want to create two distinct structures, they have done a good job of this. The garage will be in the same style which is appropriate. Looking at this from a general compatibility standpoint the additions are acceptable

Ms. Holan noted that new additions should be compatible in scale, size and proportion. This addition is very distinct, being horizontal and lengthy where the historic home is vertical and square. There are ways to insure compatibility without imposing personal taste. Her concern is related to the geometry of the home verses that of the addition.

Chair Cunningham noted that the Boards concern is to insure the addition is not too jarringly distinct. Hence his comment regarding the garage spire.

Board Member Culhane asked Jerry Holan if she would be more comfortable with a non-angled addition. Ms. Holan noted that was not an issue on its own. It's the length of the addition and its linear massing that concerns her.

Jered Polsky pointed out the location of the Oak trees limit the placement options and he believes they have proposed to build where they can on this site to preserve the trees. This design is not overly large for the neighborhood. They prefer to have only one building, not several smaller components scattered through the trees.

Board member Culhane stated she preferred the addition to retain the lower height, as proposed.

Board Member Wilson noted there are restrictions on the site due to the trees and shape of the lot. Because the house will be moved forward, this is what you will see. They have created something that will be beautiful, will protect the environment, and the massing will not be readily visible.

Board member Knorpp stated his real issue is the length of the addition. However, he agrees with Board member Morgan that he does not want to impose his taste. If the cross dormers had a hip roof, to pay more respect to the historic home, it would improve compatibility.

Chair Cunningham expressed concerns about the appearance of the addition when viewed from Murray Lane and Estelle Ave. Jered Polsky indicated that Mr. Cunningham's point would apply if there were not so many trees that screen the development.

Board Member Mueller asked how long it took the applicant to come up with the proposed design. Mr. Polsky indicated it has been in process for months. Board Member Mueller stated it impresses him how long it takes to get to the hearing stage for a new development. He found there is tension between being distinct and being compatible. He likes that the house is moving forward, that they will rehabilitate it. It is hard for him to second guess the applicant. He thinks overall they have done a pretty good job trying to accommodate the site and historic issues.

Board Members asked Planner Teiche about the review process. Planner Teiche indicated that the applicants had been provided Jerri's comments during the initial review but had opted not to alter the proposed design of the addition to address these concerns.

Chair Cunningham addressed the Boards options to proceed as laid out in the staff report.

Board Member Lanctot indicated she would prefer to see some modification that address the historic architects concerns. She has seen some homes in Mill Valley that have broken up the massing into smaller pieces. They are intriguing and it is not impossible. However, what is before them is a whole different design.

Board Member Morgan noted he approached the issue of compatibility in a more practical manner. They are preserving a really important structure. The structures appear to be separated and distinct by design, and he is satisfied with this approach.

Board Member Knorpp agreed in concept. He thinks there are too many site constraints to address all the historic architects concerns at this point in the process. He is sorry they did not attempt to address them during the review phase. He could support the design with small modifications. They are moving the house forward and it will become the "trophy" of the lot.

Board Member Culhane noted she wished they could have had a discussion at the beginning when they were designing the addition. It's almost too late to ask for substantial changes, it would be a burden to the applicant. She did not agree there were no other options. There was room still to alter the design and avoid the trees. She appreciates the prominence of the historic structure and how the additions are subordinate to it. This is a nice design and she could accept it.

Chair Cunningham stated he truly wished the applicant had taken some of Jerri's design suggestions more to heart. He also feels somewhat obliged to move forward more or less with what they have.

Board Member Knorpp stated that the Board should not make a decision on the grounds that the applicant would be burdened if required to make the "right" decision. The decision should be because it is the right decision for the property and historic structure, not because the Board is settling.

Board Member Culhane stated she did not feel she was settling. The house was being brought forward with the addition trailing off behind. Some minor changes should be required.

Planner Teiche asked the Board to address the window styles on the addition.

Board Member Wilson stated she did not have a problem with them.

Chair Cunningham noted he sees a lot of busy windows on the addition compared to the simpler windows on the historic structure.

After further discussion with the historic architect, Jerri Holan, the Board determined that the divided pattern of the new windows should match the simpler design of the historic home (fewer lites and muntins). It was clarified that the window lites per casement window shall be reduced to four for smaller windows or six lites for larger windows.

The Board then discussed if the prominent gable end on the east side should be hipped. Jered Polsky indicated he believed the gable end is better for the house. They did not want the addition to look exactly like the historic home or those in the surrounding neighborhood in Kentfield.

Board Member Knorpp noted it was a concern of his, but he wanted to see how the other Board Members felt.

Board Member Lanctot noted that it did not seem to matter since the addition is so distinct.

Board Member Culhane indicated she is ok with the gable end. The flat roof connection, open patio and trellises provides a “pallet cleanser” that allows for the transition to the new addition and its gabled roofline.

Board Member Wilson agreed with Board Member Culhane.

Board Member Morgan agreed that the gable ended dormer can remain.

Planner Teiche provided the Board with a synopsis of their agreed upon design amendments.

M/s Board Members Morgan/Wilson moved and approved (7-0-0) application DR/H 15-19 as proposed, subject to the following amendments:

- *West Elevation. The gable ended roofline over the bathroom bay projection shall be hipped;*
- *Garage. The proposed spire on the cupola shall be removed;*
- *The busy pattern of the garage doors shall be simplified;*
- *The windows for the proposed addition shall have fewer divided lites per casement window to better reflect the historic home. Smaller windows shall generally have 4 lites and larger windows may have up to 6 lites.*

BUSINESS ITEMS

Board Member Reports. None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M/s Wilson/Knorpp moved and approved 7-0-0 the minutes of June 11, 2015, June 22, 2015 & July 9, 2015, subject to the requested revisions.

NEXT MEETING DATE: September 10, 2015

Adjourn 10:45 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Kristin Teiche, Senior Planner/Recording Secretary

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were duly and regularly adopted during the September 10, 2015 meeting of the Heritage Preservation Board.

Kristin Teiche, Senior Planner/Recording Secretary