

From: [glenn darby](#)  
To: [Planning Commission Comments](#)  
Subject: YES to Landmark for 305 San Vicente Blvd.--please!  
Date: Saturday, October 10, 2020 4:02:42 PM

---

EXTERNAL

Hello,

First, I hope you are all well and keeping safe.

As a long time resident at 305 San Vicente Blvd., I am thrilled the building is up for the honor of a City Landmark.

We feel our building is very unique in it's mid century architecture--especially the open air indoor hallways(even more important with the pandemic).

I don't believe there is another building like it in the city or probably the county.

And, something special most people miss is the sign out front--partially destroyed, that reads: "Imperial Apartments. " That in itself is worthy of protection--and possibly refurbishment.

Thank you for considering a place we've called home for over the past 26 years as a City Landmark.

Warm Regards~

Glenn Darby

305 San Vicente Blvd. Resident





**From:** [Ruthann Lehrer](#)  
**To:** [Roger Genser](#); [Barry Rosenbaum](#); [Dolly Sloan](#); [Amy Beth Green](#); [Jodi Summers](#); [Kenneth Breisch](#); [Richard Brand](#); [Planning Commission Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [Stephanie Reich](#)  
**Subject:** Item 10C on 10/12/20 Landmarks Commission agenda  
**Date:** Monday, October 12, 2020 9:34:03 AM

---

EXTERNAL

October 12, 2020

Item 10C, 305 San Vicente Boulevard Landmark Designation Application

Chair Genser and Commissioners,

Our landmarks ordinance does not require that significance for an architect must relate to their work in Santa Monica, as implied in the peer review report and by staff. Criteria 5 states “It is a significant or a representative example of the work or product of a notable builder, designer or architect.” Considering the range and scope of Reisbord’s career, his entire body of work may well be considered notable under this criterion.

The peer review doesn’t consider the architectural design itself as potentially meeting either criteria 2 or 4, one or both of which may be applicable. The applicant’s consultant provides a brief but compelling architectural description, but applies the analysis only to criteria 5:

The Imperial Apartments exemplify Reisbord’s use of the Mid-Century Modern style as applied to the multi-story apartment housing type. The building’s simple but striking geometric forms create a dynamic composition on both the exterior facade and interior courtyard. The courtyard in particular demonstrates his affinity for combining bold, geometric forms and simple details that when viewed together create a surprisingly intricately designed space and interesting composition of solid and void. The courtyard walkways are also strategically arranged to provide efficient circulation and shelter within the otherwise open courtyard space, all while achieving an elegant design of intersecting volumes and planes. The Imperial Apartments is, therefore, a representative work of notable architect Sam Reisbord and eligible for designation as a Santa Monica Landmark under Criterion 5.

The building is a later design phase of courtyard housing than the contributors to the San Vicente Courtyard Apartments Historic District, but that fact may be worthy of analysis as indicative of the evolution of courtyard housing in Santa Monica.

I hope that the Commission will continue this matter to a future public hearing and allow the applicant an opportunity to return with a strengthened application. The applicant could be advised to present their own findings under the landmarks criteria for designation.

Sincerely,  
Ruthann Lehrer



**From:** [Carol Lemlein](#)  
**To:** [Roger Genser](#); [Barry Rosenbaum](#); [Amy Beth Green](#); [dolly.sloan@smgov.net](mailto:dolly.sloan@smgov.net); [jodiknew@gmail.com](mailto:jodiknew@gmail.com); [Kenneth Breisch](#); [Richard Brand](#); [Planning Commission Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [Stephanie Reich](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Items 10B, 10C, and 10D on Landmarks Commission Agenda, 10/12/20  
**Date:** Monday, October 12, 2020 10:21:26 AM

---

EXTERNAL

Dear Landmarks Commission,

This letter addresses concerns raised by the three landmark designation applications, Items 10A, 10B and 10C. It was gratifying to see in these three designation applications on tonight's agenda that staff has streamlined the application process to make it more tenable for reduced staff capacity and more affordable for applicants.

My colleague Ruthann Lehrer, long the Architectural Historian on this Commission, has sent you specific recommendations regarding aspects of the properties which have been overlooked, which we believe to be at least partially the result of the process issues described below.

The approach staff has taken is dependent on a revised landmark designation application, which we don't have. As we can see by the results presented tonight, use of the current application for the streamlined process may not result in submissions with enough factual information upon which to make a determination. For this new process to be effective, the new application should address the criteria specifically and stress the need for documentation. Historically, the city's landmark designation application has been focused on providing a platform for any person, not only professionals, to present what they *believe* makes a property worthy of designation. Now we are requiring presentation of thoroughly researched facts that support designation. It's a whole new ballgame.

When the application form is revised to include a statement of findings according to the criteria for designation, the consultant's review of the materials should not be only a peer review of the research methodology, it should also be a peer review of the conclusions. Where the peer report finds deficiencies in the research or conclusions, the report can be presented to the applicant in order for them to correct the deficiencies before it is placed on the Commission agenda.

In the applications before you tonight, the applicants hired professional historic preservation consultants who are fully capable of presenting the kind of information, and drawing the necessary conclusions as suggested were lacking in the city consult's peer review. It would appear that they were not aware that that was the information called for in the application stage.

We suggest that the commission continue all three applications, to allow the applicant to present the complete information they would have presented if it had been clear in the application it was required.

Sincerely,

Carol Lemlein

Santa Monica Conservancy Advocacy Committee