

**HERITAGE PRESERVATION BOARD**  
**September 8, 2016**

**ROLL CALL**

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

Present: Board Members: Jon Knorpp, Scott Morgan, Richard Storek, Vice Chair Dirk Mueller, Chair Hillary Culhane

Absent: Board Members: Lelia Lanctot, Charles Sink

Staff: Senior Planner/Recording Secretary Kristin Teiche, Director of Public Works Julian Skinner

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

James Holmes announced to the Board that the structures at 136 Madrone Avenue are proposed for demolition. He provided a brief synopsis of the history of this site and suggested that, although this property did not make the historic inventory when previously evaluated, it deserved a second look. He asked the Heritage Board to consider re-evaluation of the buildings, as they were important not only architecturally, and by their contribution to the neighborhood, but because Helen Wilson, a past City Employee and Librarian lived there. He distributed a letter from Helen Heitkamp recommending re-evaluation. Staff noted the 2006 evaluation prepared by Dan Peterson rated this property a D and gave it 20 points.

Board Member Morgan noted that the Board has the update of Larkspur's inventory on the agenda, and are currently focusing on Madrone Canyon. He would like to discuss this matter under this Business Item No. 1 and the Board agreed.

**PLANNING STAFF'S ORAL REPORT**

Due to the busy agenda, staff's oral report was deferred to the end of the meeting, time permitting.

**HEARING/DISCUSSION ITEMS** (*Approximately 1 hour*)

**1. Advisory Review; 549 Magnolia Avenue, Lark Theatre; Bruce Fullerton, Architect and Ms. Mary Clyde, Applicants;**

Architect Bruce Fullerton presented the proposal to the Board. After consideration of the design details and additional commentary provide by Julian Skinner, Director of Public Works, the Board provided the following motion:

*M/s Morgan/Storek moved to recommend approval 5-2-0 (Lanctot and Sink absent) of the proposed sidewalk improvements in front of the Lark Theatre and the use of this area as a gathering or seating area as this improvement is consistent with the downtown historic district.*

**2. Advisory Review; Historic Downtown Recycling Trash Receptacles; Julian Skinner, Director of Public Works.**

Director of Public Works Julian Skinner presented the staff report and explained the reason the City is looking to add new recycling receptacles in the historic district and provided a recommendation on the preferred trash unit and color.

At the conclusion of their discussion, the Board provided the following motion:

*M/s Knorpp/Morgan moved and approved 5-2-0 (Board Members Lanctot and Sink absent) installation of new recycling receptacles in the historic downtown subject to the selection of the Option A style can to be in keeping with those approved for City parks, with a dark finish such as black or charcoal color. Further, it is recommended the City investigate if the cans may be dual purpose, with a shared lid that accepts both recycles and regular waste, to facilitate the removal and replacement of the cement trash cans currently in use.*

3. **H/DR/UP 16-37; 286 Magnolia Avenue; APN: 021-104-34; Mr. Fabrizio Laudati, Applicant; Westshore Investments, LLC, Owners; GD (Garden Downtown) Zoning District.** Applicant is requesting historic review, design review and conditional use permit for remodeling of the front patio of this existing restaurant site, and to permit outdoor dining at the front patio and rear deck. The subject building is part of the Historic Lark Creek commercial retail center. This center (excluding 286 Magnolia Avenue), was previously approved for remodeling under permit H/DR/V 15-37.

Senior Planner Teiche presented the staff report. Architect Douglas Mighell, applicant presented additional information and answered questions from the Board. He noted that the use of the patio enclosure and front patio seating all year round was critical to the survival of the small restaurant as the interior seating is not sufficient. It was noted that the color of the canvas was an issue, and the business owners were willing to change the color after the existing material has exhausted its life.

After hearing from the business owners and other interested persons, the Board closed the public hearing and discussed the project at length. At the end of this discussion, the Board provided the following motion:

*M/s Knorpp/Storek moved and recommended approval 5-2-0 (Board Members Lanctot and Sink absent) of application DR/H 16-37 as presented on the submitted plans, and subject to the following:*

- *The existing trellis may remain in place;*
- *The applicant may reuse the existing canvas enclosure, but the green color shall be painted or dyed black so that it is consistent with the awning color on the remainder of the Lark Creek Shops site. The future replacement of this canvas awning and side panels shall incorporate black canvas or, if changed, the color currently installed at the remainder of the Lark Creek Shops site.*
- *The proposed lattice screening depicted at the north side of the patio on Sheet 3, Elevations 1a and 4a shall be replaced with solid fence panels.*
- *Proposed landscaping is recommended as proposed, including the installation of a second wisteria vine;*
- *Proposed railing and pickets shall match that installed at the remainder of the site.*

## **BUSINESS ITEMS**

1. **Update of Larkspur's Historic Resources Inventory.**

The Board deferred discussion to the October 13 meeting. Staff will e-mail the revised list and assign a list of homes for each Board Member to look over and prepare a preliminary evaluation.

Board Member Knorpp re-opened a discussion regarding 136 Madrone Avenue and James Holmes request that the Board re-evaluate this property for historic significance.

Planner Teiche circulated the 2006 evaluation forms prepared by then historic architect Dan Peterson, as part of the update of the Historic Resources Inventory. At that time Mr. Peterson assigned this property a score of 20 points under the NRHP rating system and a D based upon Larkspur's local inventory rating system, due to the amount of desecration that had occurred to the site.

Board Member Knorpp asked if the Board has the right to re-evaluate this property in light of the fact that the current property owner bought the property in good faith with the understanding they could demolish the structures and redevelop the site.

Board Member Morgan stated he believes their job is offer people certainty as much as possible. Stopping progress on a development permit application to initiate historic evaluation should not be the Board's regular practice.

Board Member Mueller did not agree entirely with Board Member Morgan as there are always exceptions.

Board Member Morgan indicated that the City would also prefer the inventory be complete and provide some certainty. To achieve this the Board needs a large sum of money to fund a final review and adoption of a revised inventory. Most Board Members are not qualified to complete this work.

Chair Culhane indicated she would prefer to require re-evaluation when justified, as she would hate to lose a building.

Board Member Knorpp agrees that re-evaluation is acceptable, but not when a property owner is in the public hearing process for demolition and new development.

Board Member Storek indicated the Board has the right to make adjustments. However this is just a very awkward time to do it. He also opined that any time a home is considered for addition to the inventory, it can still adversely affect the property owner's plans.

Board Member Knorpp noted that when the Board starts the public hearing process for the inventory update, the property owners that would be affected will have an opportunity to comment and participate in the process. This participatory, public hearing process regarding the evaluation would not be possible for 136 Madrone Ave.

Board Member Morgan agreed, if the Board recommended re-evaluation, then the public hearing process is stopped to permit time for the evaluation by the Historic Architect. He does not favor this process as it is hard on the property owner and may adversely affect their plans and investment.

Board Member Mueller thanked James Holmes for speaking up and bringing this matter to the forefront.

Mr. Holmes agreed that this is not the best timing for re-evaluation. He also noted that the real estate advertisement almost always identified the property as historic or heritage, so the buyer is effectively put on notice. The ultimate issue is not whether it is currently on the inventory but whether or not it meets the criteria to be listed. He believes the hearing process related to the proposed design will allow time for the City to complete an historic review and not hold up the project.

Planner Teiche noted she needs clear direction from the Board. She suggested the Board review the previous evaluation and pictures and provide an opinion as to whether the previous evaluation may have overlooked key factors and is in error. If this is the case, the building will be re-evaluated. Staff will inform the Planning Director and the public hearing will be postponed to permit time for evaluation

by the current Historic Architect. If it does not merit inclusion, then this ends the historic review process. If it does, it could impact the proposed project.

Board Member Knorpp moved to recommend that the evaluation of the house at 136 Madrone Avenue not be changed and that its current evaluation by Dan Peterson should stand.

Board Member Mueller seconded this motion.

Chair Culhane noted this would mean the loss of the house. Board Member Knorpp concurred.

Mr. Holmes noted that the Board is not required to make a recommendation. He would actually prefer this. Board Member Knorpp noted he is in agreement with Board Member Morgan that certainty for buyers is a number one priority. He supports the recommendation provided by Dan Peterson and believes it should stand.

Board Member Morgan noted he supports this approach absent some truly compelling situation. This action is simply the Board affirming the work of the previous historic architect and Board Members

Board Member Morgan noted that the motion means staff would inform the Planning Director of the Board recommendation. The issue was being pushed by Mr. Holmes and he believes the Board needs to make its stand clear.

Board Member Storek agreed, he noted historic evaluation is very subjective.

Board Member Morgan clarified that the Board relied on an expert, hired by the City, when this building was originally evaluated and not added to the inventory. It is important the Board be predictable and consistent in their activities.

Chair Culhane noted she is of two minds. She feels the Board must honor the integrity of the existing inventory although she hates to see a structure like this being slated for demolition. She also appreciates that the purchaser had previously investigated and relied on the City's record for historic status, before purchasing the house.

Mr. Holmes noted that the current inventory is under-inclusive and some buildings currently listed on the inventory are questionable. He discussed his family property and the evaluation that added these homes to the inventory. He felt one of his properties was given a B score and did not deserve it.

Board Member Knorpp noted that the Board is attempting to respect the inventory and the evaluations. The buildings listed on the inventory are not there by accident, but by commission, not omission.

Mr. Holmes asked that the Board then not take a position, or formal action, on this matter.

After discussing this request, the Board determined a motion was appropriate. It was noted that there was no vote on Board Member Knorpp's motion. Board Member Storek noted it was moved and seconded, a vote should occur.

Board Member Morgan suggested that Board Member Knorpp withdraw the motion. Board Member Knorpp withdrew his previous motion.

Board Member Knorpp indicated that he believes the Board should vote to provide clarity to the Planning Commission. Board Member Morgan noted this is an opportunity to make a statement regarding the need to update the inventory. Chair Culhane agreed.

*M/s Morgan/Knorpp moved and approved 5-2-0 (Board Members Lanctot and Sink absent) to not elect to pursue a re-evaluation of the structures at 136 Madrone Avenue. The Board further stated that this matter raises the larger issue that work must progress to create a more comprehensive Historic Resources Inventory. Additional evaluations should include structures not yet considered, as well as some previously evaluated and rejected, which meet a baseline criteria to support a formal review or reconsideration.*

The Board then discussed the need for additional funding from the City to insure a competent expert can prepare the evaluations of additional structures.

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

Per Planner Teiche's request:

*M/s Storek/Knorpp moved and approved 5-2-0 (Board Members Lanctot and Sink absent) to approve re-payment to Board Member Lanctot for the purchase of refreshments for the historic awards ceremony with the Larkspur City Council.*

All other discussion items and reports were deferred to the regular meeting of October 13, 2016.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**      None

**NEXT MEETING DATE:**      October 13, 2016

**Adjourn:** *M/s Storek/Knorpp moved and the Board approved 6-2-0 (Board Members Lanctot and Sink absent) to adjourn the meeting of the Heritage Preservation Board at 10:55 PM*

Respectfully submitted,

Kristin Teiche, Senior Planner/Recording Secretary

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were duly and regularly adopted during the October 13, 2016 meeting of the Heritage Preservation Board.



---

Kristin Teiche, Senior Planner/Recording Secretary