



MINUTES
CITY OF NORCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CONFERENCE ROOM "A" – 2870 CLARK AVENUE
REGULAR MEETING
FEBRUARY 2, 2009

1. CALL TO ORDER: Called to order at 10:01 a.m. by Chair Bash
2. ROLL CALL: Members Present: Gini Austerman, Kevin Bash, Linda Dixon and Matt Potter. Sue Bacon arrived at 10:04 a.m.
3. STAFF PRESENT: Economic Development Director Brian Oulman, Recording Secretary Mary Boyce and Historic Preservation Consultant Bill Wilkman
4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Vice Chair Gini Austerman
5. PUBLIC COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS: None
6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: **M/S Dixon/Potter** approving the January 13, 2009 minutes. Motion carried by a 4-0 vote. Commissioner Bacon had not yet arrived.
7. DISCUSSION OF DRAFT NORCO CULTURAL RESOURCES ORDINANCE:

Consultant Wilkman went over the draft Title 20, Cultural Resources Ordinance with the Commission. He stated it would be its own Title, not in the City's Zoning Code, and the importance of having a separate Ordinance was for obtaining State Certified Local Government (CLG) status. He structured the Ordinance based on a State publication about what Cultural Resources Ordinances should contain. He also used existing regulations from the City's Title 18.

In reference to Chapter 20.15, Landmarks, Section 20.15.010, Landmark Designation Criteria, Consultant Wilkman stated that the highest level of designation on a local level was the landmark designation. To receive this designation, there would have to be a public meeting process with the Commission and a public hearing process with the City Council, with Council deciding whether or not to make the designation. Chair Bash asked if the Commission could be bypassed in this process. Consultant Wilkman stated that all applications for landmark status must go through the Commission.

Discussion followed regarding the age requirements and the basic benchmark of 50 years. Consultant Wilkman and Vice Chair Austerman said the Commission was not required to use the benchmark. A resource less than 50 years old could be designated a Landmark. Discussion continued regarding the different levels of designation and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process relating to Landmark designation.

Consultant Wilkman commented on the criteria section of Chapter 20.20, Point of Historical Interest. The process is the same as the Landmark designation process, but there is a lower level for qualifying a resource a Point of Historical Interest.

Consultant Wilkman commented on Chapter 20.30, Certificate of Appropriateness Process. He stated this section pertained to altering a resource that has been designated a Landmark or Point of Historical Interest. This process ensures that the resource maintains its historic integrity.

Consultant Wilkman said Section 20.30.020, E., allows the Cultural Resources Administrator to review and approve minor alterations. If the Administrator believes more public review is justified, the application could be referred to the Commission. Discussion followed about non-contributing structures, whether this process applied to the interior of a resource, reasonable application of this section, and the duty to maintain a designated resource.

Consultant Wilkman stated that Section 20.30.050, Application of the State Historic Building Code, allows modifications, additions or alterations necessary for preservation to be made without meeting current building codes. He said Section 20.30.070, Principles and Standards of Site Development and Design Review, lists the criteria to use in evaluating a Certificate of Appropriateness or Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness.

Regarding Section 20.30.080, Application Processing Time Limits, Consultant Wilkman said the Commission would have 45 days to process an application for Certificate of Appropriateness, and the Cultural Resource Administrator would have 21 days to process an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness.

Section 20.30.100, Review of Substantial Adverse Changes, applies to both Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest. For structure demolition, the CEQA process would have to be followed. CEQA would not apply if an immediate safety hazard existed, and the demolition was the only feasible means to secure public safety.

Consultant Wilkman stated Section 20.30.110 allows anyone affected by a recommendation of the Historic Preservation Commission or Cultural Resources Administrator to file an appeal to City Council.

Chapter 20.35, Preservation Incentives, allows City Council to establish preservation incentives to encourage owners to designate, maintain, preserve, rehabilitate, and improve a Landmark or contributing structure. Consultant Wilkman stated Section 20.35.020 also enables the City Council to establish a Mills Act Program, which allows an owner of a Landmark or contributing structure to receive a reduction in property taxes provided the reduced amount is put back

into the restoration. These incentives do not apply to Points of Historical Interest. This is one way to encourage owners of Points of Historical Interest to upgrade to Landmark status. Consultant Wilkman also stated Chapter 20.40 deals with enforcement and penalties, allowing for both criminal misdemeanor and/or civil claims.

Consultant Wilkman stated that staff was still reviewing the draft Ordinance, and it would be coming back to the Commission for final review.

8. NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER (CORONA DIVISION) HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMPLIANCE UPDATE:

Director Oulman stated he received a letter from S. Landaas, Hazardous Waste Program Manager of the Department of the Navy at Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach requesting input regarding potential historic properties and a meeting in February 2009.

Consultant Wilkman stated the Navy was going to re-survey its property to include the Navy's World War II-era hospital complex and Cold War-era activities. Wilkman said he had asked Bill Manley, Architectural Historian for the Navy, to attend the Commission meeting, but Mr. Manley was not available. He said he provided Mr. Manley with the schedule of future meetings so he could attend at a future date.

Discussion followed about the previous survey that was done, whether the prison property would be evaluated, what the boundaries of the survey would be and the opportunity Commissioners would have to give input.

9. LAKE NORCONIAN CLUB FOUNDATION UPDATE:

Chair Bash briefed the Commission on the Foundation's current activities. He said the Foundation (LNCF) was working on Founders Day, grant writing, fund raising, suing the State of California, and communicating with Lauren Bricker, Professor of Architectural History at Cal Poly Pomona, regarding the possibility of having students survey the California Rehabilitation Center's World War II and later structures for possible addition to the National Register District already in place at the CRC.

He informed the Commission that February 2nd was the 80th anniversary of the opening of the Norconian Club Hotel, which opened February 2, 1929; and that Foundation members would be visiting Rex Clark's daughter to present her with proclamations and having dinner with Rex Clark's grandson.

10. OTHER MATTERS:

Linda Dixon asked Chair Bash to mention the proclamations being presented at the LNCF dinner. Chair Bash stated there would be proclamations and/or letters from State Senator Benoit, City of Norco, Riverside County Supervisor Tavaglione, Congressman Calvert and Riverside Community College.

Consultant Wilkman reiterated the Commission's priorities for the upcoming year:

- Adopt a new Cultural Resources Ordinance
- Achieve Certified Local Government (CLG) status
- Develop a historic survey plan for the City
- Adopt a strategic plan for the preservation of the Norconian
- Adopt a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone
- Secure grants for furthering efforts to preserve the Norconian
- Secure grants for furthering Norco's preservation program

Commissioner Potter inquired about the Commission's involvement in the survey of potential historic properties in the City of Norco. Consultant Wilkman stated the Commission would be involved in the development of a survey strategy, the review of future surveys, and possibly in the conduct of surveys themselves. Consultant Wilkman stated that until there was a survey there was no basis for deciding what could be designated. He also stated adopting a strategic plan for the preservation of the Norconian was necessary for acquiring grants.

Discussion followed regarding the Turch Grant. Director Oulman said he was waiting for a return telephone call from a David Turch & Associates' colleague. Chair Bash said David Turch was a lobbyist in Washington, D.C., and that \$1.8 million, earmarked for the Norconian Club Hotel, was attached to a federal transportation spending bill.

Consultant Wilkman addressed the issue of historic homes being modified. Unless a property has been designated a historical resource, the Commission has no authority to stop the modification. He emphasized the importance of developing a historic survey plan so that resources would not be lost.

Consultant Wilkman stated that a new survey and application would have to be completed to obtain national historic landmark status for the Norconian Historic District. There was discussion about Lauren Bricker, Professor of Architectural History at Cal Poly Pomona, offering her services and her students to conduct the survey on the State side of the property. Questions remain about the cost of the survey and how it would be paid. Director Oulman stated he had spoken to the City Manager about the cost, which needed to be included in the City's budget process. The Director suggested that the proposal for the survey go

through the Lake Norconian Club Foundation. An estimated cost needed to be submitted by the end of February in order to be included in the City's upcoming budget process. Chair Bash said he would email Lauren Bricker.

In accordance with Title 2 regarding the City's historical artifacts, Consultant Wilkman stated the Commission's authority is property based and does not include artifacts, archives, collections, etc. He said the Commission's purpose was to identify and monitor properties and ensure that land-related property was properly surveyed, and that pursuant to the Norco Historical Society's (NHS) agreement with the City, artifacts come under the authority of the NHS.

Chair Bash and Commissioner Potter inquired if Title 2 could be changed. Chair Bash stated a lot of artifacts were being mistreated and mishandled, that it was imperative that criteria for the preservation of artifacts be understood and implemented, and that City artifacts be made accessible. He thought the City should designate a viable non-profit organization like the Norco Regional Conservancy (NRC) as the keeper of the artifacts. Criteria for archival preservation, storage and documentation could then be established for the myriad artifacts that exist within the City. The NRC could have a dedicated section to document, digitalize, and catalogue the artifacts.

There was discussion about how other cities catalogue, handle and archive historical artifacts, and the role of their Historic Preservation Commissions in this process. Consultant Wilkman said artifact handling was typically done by a museum or curator and not directly associated with a Commission. Discussion followed about the role of Norco's Historical Society regarding the categorization of artifacts, the Society's agreement with the City, and the Society's non-compliance status with the State of California.

Chair Bash requested that this issue be agendaized for further discussion and action. It was the consensus of the Commission that it should be able to make recommendations regarding artifacts and archives. Director Oulman and Consultant Wilkman stated the issue would be agendaized for the next Commission meeting.

The Commissioners were asked for approval on the layout and information for their Commission business cards. Approval was given so the cards could be printed.

Chair Bash referred the Commissioners to Resolution No. 2008-86 about their \$50 compensation per quarter for Commission service and to Ordinance No. 902, Section 2.26.060, C., which governs Commission absences. There was discussion about the number of absences allowed.

11. SETTING OF NEXT MEETING: March 2, 2009 at 4:00 p.m.
12. ADJOURNMENT: **M/S Dixon/Bacon** to adjourn at 11:45 a.m. Motion carried.

/mb-71641