

**From:** [Ruthann Lehrer](#)  
**To:** [Roger Genser](#); [Barry Rosenbaum](#); [Amy Beth Green](#); [Dolly Sloan](#); [Jodi Summers](#); [Kenneth Breisch](#); [Richard Brand](#); [Planning Commission Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [Stephanie Reich](#)  
**Subject:** Item 10D on Landmarks Commission Agenda, 10/12/20  
**Date:** Monday, October 12, 2020 9:35:03 AM

---

EXTERNAL

Oct. 12, 2020

Item 10D

Dear Chair Genser and Commissioners,

The peer assessment report states that architect Kenneth N. Lind was a notable architect, and cites examples of his awards and other work. Isn't there a match here with criteria 5?

To classify the architecture as a Stucco Box Apartment fails to do justice to many of the design refinements of this building. I remember noting some of its unique architectural features when walking the district at the time that the historic district was being planned. I was struck by the multi-tiered cascading stair that flows from the building to the street, and the round pool situated inside a recessed frame where the surrounding walls flicker from the water's reflections – a light show! Both are visible from the sidewalk, as is the unique abstract sculptural ornament that floats on the flat façade wall - biomorphic shapes reminiscent of the art of Miro or Arp. The applicant might do further study in considering this example of Mid-Century Modernism as reflective of criteria 2 or 4.

I hope you will continue this item and allow the applicant to submit additional information.

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