

Mendocino Historical Review Board

c/o Planning & Building Services
120 West Fir Street
Fort Bragg, CA 95437
964-5379



Mendocino Historical Review Board Adopted Action Minutes – December 4, 2023

ACTION MINUTES – DECEMBER 4, 2023

These are action minutes. For a complete transcript of the meeting, please request a copy of the digital recording. The meeting recording is available for viewing on the Mendocino County YouTube page, at <https://www.youtube.com/MendocinoCountyVideo> and a recording of this meeting is available at the Planning and Building Department upon request. There is a fee of \$10.00 per recording.

The Action Minutes were approved, with clarifications, at the March 4, 2024 MHRB meeting.

1. **Call to Order.**

The Review Board convened at 4:32 p.m. for its scheduled site views. The sites viewed were Agenda Items 9a* and 9b*. All Review Board Members were present, including Vice Chair Madrigal, Kappler and Saunders. Planner Waldman and Planner Cliser were present. Dan potash, a member of the public was also present. The site views concluded at 4:53 p.m.

The Review Board reconvened at 7:02 p.m. for its scheduled regular meeting.

2. **Roll Call.**

Present:

Review Board Members: Chair Roth, Vice Chair Madrigal, Kappler and Saunders.

Planning and Building Services Staff: Planner Waldman and Planner Cliser.

3. **Determination of Legal Notice.** The meeting was properly noticed.

4. **Approval of Minutes.**

4a. **November 2023 Draft Minutes** were adopted as drafted. Following a motion by Vice Chair Madrigal to approve the December 2023 Draft Minutes, and seconded by Review Board Member Saunders, Review Board unanimously approved the motion (4-0) by voice vote.

5. **Correspondence.** None.

6. **Report from the Chair.** None.

7. **Public Expression.** None.

8. **Consent Calendar.** None.

9. **Public Hearing Items**

9a. CASE#: MHRB_2023-0014 (Continued from 10-2-2023)*DATE FILED:** 8/8/2023**OWNER:** ISHVI AUM**APPLICANT / AGENT:** SUNNY CHANCELLOR**REQUEST:** Mendocino Historical Review Board Permit request for removal of barn door and addition of windows to south elevation; Replacement of barn door with new entry, new downcast can lighting in new entry, and addition of windows to east elevation; Replacement of shingle siding on north elevation with horizontal board; Replacement of corrugated roof with composite roof. Note: This parcel is listed in the Mendocino Town Plan Appendix 1 and includes a Category I Historic Structure, the Pete Anderson House, and a Category IIa Historic Structure, Mendosa's Warehouse.**ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:** CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT**LOCATION:** 10550 Lansing Street, Mendocino; APN: 119-160-31**SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT:** 5 (Williams)**STAFF PLANNER:** MARK CLISER**PRESENTERS:** Planner Cliser; Owner, Ishvi Aum.**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Anthony Crowell, Erin Keller (presented a photograph), Sara Bodnar, Susan Keller, Catherine McMillan (presented a photograph), Kelly Grimes, John Paul McMillan, Allison McMillan, Taylor Riggs, Julian Lopez and Charlie Angel.

Written comments submitted by John Cavanaugh (email).

Planner Waldman requested any photographs presented to the Review Board Members be emailed to Planning Staff for the record.

During the late afternoon of the Hearing Day, posted online, yet not mentioned during the MHRB Hearing, additional written comments were submitted to Planning and Building Services by Lee Edmundson (email with photographs). Chair Roth provided a printed photograph to Staff for the record.

REVIEW BOARD DISCUSSION: Review Board Member Kappler supported the windows and goals of the applicant yet requested the barn door on Lansing Street remain. Review Board Member Saunders asked the owner multiple questions including: 1) Are the windows proposed in the same location as previous windows? and 2) Do we know the intent of the warehouse changes and the impact to the adjacent residents? Owner Ishvi Aum responded that the existing structural framing at the south wall is different at each location of the previous windows. Aum added the intent of use is not being determined at this hearing and the proposed changes should not impact adjacent residents. Vice Chair Madrigal supported the goals and hopes of the applicant and requests they consider the Review Boards suggestions.

Chari Roth also supported the windows and goals yet requested the barn door on Lansing Street remain.

REVIEW BOARD ACTION: Vice Chair Madrigal moved to approve the revised project as proposed with changes to conditions of approval within the Staff Report presented at the October 2, 2023 MHRB Hearing. Said changes include:

Condition 11 to be Condition 10 and revised to state *"All new window frames and doors shall be made from wood"; and*

Condition 12 to be Condition 11.

The motion was seconded by Review Board Member Saunders. By roll call vote, the Review Board approved the motion (3-1), Kappler dissenting.

5-minute Break – meeting reconvened at 8:03 p.m.

***9b. CASE#:** MHRB_2023-0019
DATE FILED: 11/16/2023
OWNER: MICHAEL & MARILYN HUTTLESTON
APPLICANT: REDWOOD ROOFERS
AGENT: COASTLINE MANAGEMENT, INC.
REQUEST: Mendocino Historical Review Board Permit to install black composition shingles to replace failing metal roofing. Note: The site is listed as a Category I historic resource in Appendix 1 of the Mendocino Town Plan, the Shell Garage 1923.
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Categorically Exempt
LOCATION: 10450 Lansing Street, Mendocino APN: 119-236-05
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT: 5 (Williams)
STAFF PLANNER: MARK CLISER

PRESENTERS: Planner Cliser; Agent, Dakota Murray of Redwood Roofers presented photographs.

Planner Waldman requested any photographs presented to the Review Board Members be emailed to Planning Staff for the record.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Ishvi Aum, Malcom McDonald and Sarah Bodnar

Written comments submitted by Kathleen Cameron (email).

REVIEW BOARD DISCUSSION: Review Board Member Kappler asked multiple questions of the Agent, including: 1) How long the roof had been metal and 2) Why the applicant is not requesting metal now? and 3) Are there other metal roofing materials available. Review Board Member Kappler recommended the preservation of the historical look. Vice Chair Madrigal expressed concern of materials and the coastal elements. Madrigal asked Review Board members and Staff if other metal roofs have been approved by the MHRB. Review Board Member Saunders expressed doubt that the existing metal roof failed the 20-30 year life expectancy, as past MHRB permit history indicates the last roof repair was in 1989.

Chair Roth asked Mr. Murray for recommendations of alternative metal roofing Materials.

Review Board Member Saunders stated that the past permit history within the Staff Report indicates the existing metal roof has lasted approximately 20-30 years, the typical life of any roof, supporting the idea of retaining a metal roof at the Category I Structure.

The Agent, Dakota Murray, referenced the photographs he presented, indicating the original structure was replaced around 1923 and has had a metal roof throughout the building's lifespan. Mr. Murray added costs for metal roofing material and coastal environment elements are a factor for the Owner. Mr. Murray initially stated other metal materials are not available, then revised that standing seam and treated corrugated metal roofing materials are available. He added that the request for composite shingles versus corrugated or standing seam metal roofing and the owners concerns are cost and installation.

Staff Planners Waldman and Cliser both provided that MHRB has approved metal roofing under MHRB_2023-0011 (Baugn) in November 2023, and rear yard structures allowed to have metal roofing per MHRB_2021-0009 (Blair House). Planner Waldman offered that a tie vote equals a denial of the request and the Owner and their agent could request a continuance with alternatives rather than a denial

REVIEW BOARD ACTION: Vice Chair Madrigal made a motion for approval with a recommendation to revise condition of approval #6 within the staff report by omitting "... *black (Owens Corning Duration Max, Carbon) or...*". As no second was made by any Review Board

Member, Chair Roth provided the option to continue the item to a date certain, to avoid a split vote, resulting in denial.

Review Board Member Kappler made a motion to continue the item to date certain of February 5, 2024, to allow the applicant to review costs, MHRB suggestions, and life spans. The motion for continuance was seconded by Review Board Member Saunders. By roll call vote, the Review Board unanimously approved the motion for continuance to a date certain of February 5, 2024 (4-0).

10. Matters from the Board.

- 10a. Sign Copy Interpretation of “similar” in color and design:** At the November 6, 2023 MHRB Hearing, the public and Review Board Members requested clarifications on the interpretation of the word “similar” as stated within the *Sign Copy Changes Exemption Policy Memorandum*, effective on November 6, 2023.

PRESENTERS: Planners Waldman and Cliser.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Ishvi Aum and Sarah Bodnar.

Written comments submitted by Rick Sacks (email).

REVIEW BOARD DISCUSSION: Review Board Member Kappler commented that the time the Review Board and Staff have spent reviewing the Sign Copy Policy is excessive. Review Board Member Kappler requested the sentence stating “*Staff will also accept two other colors with in either combination*” be removed (1st paragraph, 5th line under “Staff Clarification”).

Chair Roth recommends the Review Board allow Planning Staff to continue to interpret the sign copy exemptions as stated under MCC Section 20.760.040(H).

Review Board Member Saunders stated the word similar is ambiguous. Saunders provided that the Review Board is trying to allow Planning Staff the freedom to review proposed signs for consistency with Section 20.760.040(H). He added that the intent is to allow color changes.

Review Board Member Madrigal asked Sarah Bodnar about her sign and why her sign has not been approved. Ms. Bodnar responded that the color change is not able to be approved as a sign copy exempt from MCC Section 20.760.040(H).

Planner Waldman reiterated Staffs question on the Review Boards interpretation of the word “similar” with an example of the “Shell Sign”. Planner Waldman asked for the Review Boards direction regarding the Review Boards intent to allow color changes not consistent with MCC Section 20.760.040(H)(2).

Planner Cliser requested confirmation from the Review Board that the sentence “*Staff will also accept two other colors in either combination*” be struck (1st paragraph, 5th line under “Staff Clarification) and if the applicant is proposing fewer colors than what were previously approved, that would be acceptable.

Chair Roth says the memorandum captures the intent of the Review Board, which states: “*Additional colors will be allowed provided they not are “fluorescent, metallic, iridescent, or otherwise “modern” colors”.*”

REVIEW BOARD ACTION: Chair Roth confirms the memorandum captures the intent of the Review Board, which states: “*Additional colors will be allowed provided they not are “fluorescent, metallic, iridescent, or otherwise “modern” colors”.*” The Review Board requested the sentence stating “*Staff will also accept two other colors with in either combination*” be removed (1st paragraph, 5th line under “Staff Clarification). Chair Roth further added the intent

of the Review Board regarding sign copies is that signs can proposing fewer colors than what were previously approved, that would be acceptable.

No Motion was made only clarification from the Review Board to Staff.

10b. Window & Door Materials 12-2023:

PRESENTERS: None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

REVIEW BOARD DISCUSSION: Chair Roth and Vice Chair Madrigal thanked Staff for the reminder of past discussion regarding Window and Door Materials.

REVIEW BOARD ACTION: No Motion only clarification from the Review Board to Staff.

10c. Vice Chair Madrigal stated she is receiving inquiries from potential Review Board Applicants and the County Clerk has some “hold ups”.

10d. Review Board Member Saunders is also receiving inquiries from potential Review Board Applicants and the County Clerk has some “hold ups”.

10e. Chair Roth asked Staff to have MHRB Member Requirements be on the January 2024 Agenda.

11. Matters from the Staff.

11a. Planner Waldman thanked the Review Board for reviewing and discussing the Sign Copy and Window & Door Memorandums. Planner Waldman provided the Review Board an update regarding previously requested items, 1) Owners, not just residents be allowed to hold one (1) seat at the Review Board, 2) Direction on allowed window materials, and 3) Process to revise MHRB Guidelines. Staff stated these three (3) memos are under review with Planning and Building Services Director and County Counsel.

Saunders requested information on inter-agency meetings with MHRB, MCCSD and other agencies regarding Tents. Planner Waldman updated the Review Board that these are also under review with the Director and County Counsel.

12. Adjournment: Chair Roth adjourn the meeting at 9:32 p.m.