



MINUTES
CITY OF SANTA MONICA
LANDMARKS COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

VIA TELECONFERENCE PURSUANT TO

EXECUTIVE ORDER N-29-20 ISSUED BY
GOVERNOR GAVIN NEWSOM

MONDAY, MAY 10, 2021

MEETING BEGINS AT 7:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION:

Chair Genser called the meeting to order at [7:05 PM](#)

1. ROLL CALL

Present:

Richard Brand
Kenneth Breisch
Roger Genser, Chair
Amy Green
Barry Rosenbaum, Chair Pro Tempore
Dolores Sloan
Jodi Summers

Also Present:

Stephanie Reich, AIA, LEED, AP, Design and Historic Preservation Planner
Heidi von Tongeln, Deputy City Attorney
Regina Szilak, Associate Planner
Melissa Zak, Staff Assistant III

2. REPORT FROM STAFF:

[7:08 PM](#)

Stephanie Reich, Design and Historic Preservation Planner, reminded the Commission that there have been appeals of decisions on 305 San Vicente Boulevard (denial) and Compass Rose (designation), both not yet scheduled for hearing by the City Council. She reported that there have been administrative Certificate of Appropriateness (C of A) approvals for replacement fences at 2009 La Mesa Drive, 406 Adelaide Drive, and an approval of a rear addition at 1215

Wilshire Boulevard. She reminded the Commission that a substantial number of Planning staff have been working exclusively on the Housing Element Update with upcoming Commission and Council presentations, and informed the Commission that the City Council will have a discussion item regarding the mural at City Hall on May 12, 2021. Ms. Reich also stated that she understands that the City Council anticipates returning to some form of in-person meetings on June 8, 2021, but the actual form of the meeting remains unclear. She also said that she is unsure what provisions, if any, will be made for Boards and Commissions regarding in-person meetings and will keep the Commissioners posted on developments. She stated the next meeting will be on July 12, 2021.

3. COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS

7:12 PM

Commissioner Brand stated there was nothing to report from Architectural Review Board meetings. Chair Genser added to staff's statement that the City Council would discuss temporarily covering the mural at City Hall the following evening. He also reported that the Executive Director of the Santa Monica Pier Corporation has resigned. He also informed the Commission that the Pier Bridge Replacement Project has been modified to respond to concerns of the State Office of Historic Preservation and is concerned that the preferred option may have negative visual impacts on the Hippodrome.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

March 8, 2021

7:49 PM

Commissioners provided corrections. Chair Pro Tempore Rosenbaum made a motion to approve with corrections. Chair Genser seconded the motion. A roll call was held for the motion and approved by the following vote:

AYES: Brand, Breisch, Genser, Green, Rosenbaum, Sloan, Summers

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

5. APPROVAL OF STATEMENTS OF OFFICIAL ACTION:

5-A. Certificate of Appropriateness 20ENT-0294, 1659 Ocean Front Walk

Placement of a blade sign for the multi-family residence known as the Purser Apartments, a designated City Landmark, in accordance with S.M.M.C 9.27.030 (C). The proposed blade sign is similar to an original sign previously removed and requires a Sign Adjustment.

[7:50 PM](#)

Commissioners provided corrections. Commissioner Sloan made a motion to approve with corrections. Commissioner Green seconded the motion. A roll call was held for the motion and approved by the following vote:

AYES: Brand, Breisch, Genser, Green, Rosenbaum, Sloan, Summers

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

5-B. Certificate of Appropriateness 21ENT-0024, 9 Vicente Terrace

An addition, rehabilitation, and partial demolition of a single-family residence, a designated City Landmark, in accordance with S.M.M.C 9.27.030 (C).

Commissioners provided corrections. Chair Genser made a motion to approve with corrections. Commissioner Brand seconded the motion. A roll call was held for the motion and approved by the following vote:

AYES: Brand, Breisch, Genser, Green, Rosenbaum, Sloan, Summers

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

6. PUBLIC INPUT: (On items not on agenda and within the jurisdiction of the Commission)

None.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR:

None.

8. OLD BUSINESS:

None.

9. NEW BUSINESS/PUBLIC HEARINGS:

9-A. Landmark Designation Application 20ENT-0265 and 20ENT-0266 for the properties located at 1132-1142 Princeton Street to determine whether the multi-unit residential building, in whole or in part, should be designated as a City Landmark and, if so designated, whether an associated Landmark Parcel should be defined and described in order to preserve, maintain, protect, or safeguard the Landmark. The Landmarks Commission will consider the application based on whether the application, research, and public testimony presented demonstrate

that the building meets one or more of the required criteria for Landmark designation pursuant to SMMC Section 9.56.100(A).

[7:28 PM](#)

Commissioner provided *ex parte* communication disclosures:

Commissioners Brand, Sloan, Green, Breisch, Summers, and Chair Genser visited the site.

Chair Pro Tempore Rosenbaum made a motion to grant the applicant team 12 minutes to present. Commissioner Brand seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a voice vote.

Ms. Reich presented the staff report outlining how the City's consultant, GPA Consulting, found, and staff agrees, that the analysis of the property shows it does not appear to meet the findings for designation of the property as a City Landmark and recommended denial. Ms. Reich also noted that as this was one of the first properties of its era and of the style identified as Minimal Traditional under consideration by the Commission, the Commission should be mindful that, while each property under consideration is unique, their decision would set a precedent for future decisions. She further noted that in the past the Commission has interpreted the term "exemplifies" as being a unique, or significant example rather than simply an example of a building type or style.

Robert Chattel, Leslie Heumann, and Nels Youngborg of Chattel, Inc. provided a presentation including analysis supporting designation of the property under criteria 1, 3, 4, and 5, as noted in the application materials.

Melissa Zak, Staff Assistant III, read public comment into the record from Michele Garber and Nina Fresco.

The Commissioners deliberated on all the points made by the presentations and written material. Commissioners agreed the parcels had an interesting configuration of buildings that reflected the garden-apartment typology likely more than the courtyard typology, and that the two residential structures are very handsome buildings. Additionally, there was agreement that there are lot of courtyard-type buildings still existing within the City and that the subject properties do not represent a great example of the building type or style. They also agreed that the association with the resident, Ethel Bruce, was not sufficient to find for Criterion 3, and that as it was not a significant or representative example of the work of the architect Martin Stern Jr. the property could not be found to meet Criterion 5.

The Commissioners also appeared to agree that if the property were worthy of designation, the configuration would be an important aspect of the property and that the garages, although not included in the application or notice, would have to be recognized in some manner.

Ms. Reich and Heidi von Tongeln, Deputy City Attorney, clarified that while the garages should not be separately identified as individual structures as they weren't noticed as under consideration, they would be included in the regulatory framework if the parcel was included in the designation and the garages called out as character-defining features.

Commissioner Brand made a motion to deny Landmark designation based on the staff report. Chair Pro Tempore Rosenbaum seconded the motion.

Chair Genser made a substitute motion to designate under criteria #1 and include the parcel, without 3 and 5. Commissioner Breisch seconded the motion.

Ms. von Tongeln clarified that the substitute motion included the parcel and the garages as character-defining features.

A roll call was held for the substitute motion to approve the designation failed by the following vote:

AYES: Breisch, Genser, Green
NAYS: Brand, Rosenbaum, Sloan
ABSTAIN: Summers
ABSENT: None

A roll call was held for the original motion to deny the designation failed by the following vote:

AYES: Brand, Rosenbaum, Sloan
NAYS: Breisch, Genser, Green
ABSTAIN: Summers
ABSENT: None

Having taken a vote to designate the property, and another to deny the designation, both motions failed to gain support of the majority of the Commission, resulting in a "technical" denial.

- 9-B. Landmark/Structure of Merit Designation 20ENT-0309, 2401 22nd Street** to determine whether the subject residential building, in whole or in part, should be designated as a City Landmark or Structure of Merit and, if designated as a Landmark, whether an associated Landmark Parcel should be defined and described in order to preserve, maintain, protect, or safeguard the Landmark. The Landmarks Commission will consider whether, based on written materials and public testimony presented, that the building meets one or more of the required criteria for Landmark designation pursuant to SMMC Section 9.56.100(A), or criteria for Structure of Merit designation pursuant to SMMC Section 9.56.080.

[9:05 PM](#)

Commissioner provided *ex parte* communication disclosures:
Commissioners Breisch, Sloan, Green, Summers, and Chair Genser visited the property.

Ms. Reich presented the staff report, outlining how the City's consultant, Architectural Resources Group (ARG) , found, and staff agrees, that in the analysis of the property it does not appear to meet the findings for designation of the property as a City Landmark. She noted that ARG found that the property appears to meet criteria 9.56.080 B. 3. The structure contributes to a potential Historic District. Ms. Reich explained that while a close reading suggests the property would meet this finding, staff disagrees with this analysis. Staff stated that the property would not stand on its own as a Structure of Merit. Further, while the structure may contribute to a potential historic district, as there are hundreds of potential contributors to the potential Sunset Park Historic District the loss of this property would not impact the viability of the potential district.

In her staff report, Ms. Reich noted that a few features of the building have been removed since the original photos for the demolition permit application were taken. She stated that if these modifications were made after the nomination application was submitted, it would be a Code violation. However, there is no evidence when these modifications occurred, and that they would not have required a building permit. She also stated that the current state of the property is under consideration by the Commission.

Chair Pro Tempore Rosenbaum asked what the property owner is allowed to do to the property after the demolition application is submitted.

Deputy City Attorney von Tongeln identified that there is a Code Enforcement process and that this had been reported to Code Enforcement.

Chair Pro Tempore made a motion to grant a total of 8 minutes for each side to present to the Commission. Chair Genser seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a voice vote.

Nina Fresco presented on behalf of the applicant. She stated that "Minimal Traditional" is a broad style that was happening nationwide in the 30s and 40s, and that the differences reflect the context of those places.

William Robertson, property owner made a presentation in support of denial, pointing out that their historic preservation consultant, Page and Turnbull, also found for denial. Regarding the modifications on the property, he noted that black widow spiders were throughout the features in question, requiring removal. He also noted that the bay window was broken and that all the modifications were done in early December and were necessary for the safety of the residents.

The property owner and then the applicant provided rebuttal.

Chair Pro Tempore Rosenbaum noted that he would consider designating the property solely as a potential contributor to a potential district.

Commissioner Brand made a motion to deny the property as a Landmark or Structure of Merit based on the findings in the staff report. Commissioner Summers seconded the motion.

Chair Pro Tempore Rosenbaum stated that he was not prepared to make a substitute motion although he thought there may be evidence for the property as a Structure of Merit.

Commissioner Breisch stated that while he thought the property likely contributes to a potential historic district, he does not believe it merits designation as a Structure of Merit.

Ms. Reich and Ms. von Tongeln explained that if criteria 9.56.080 B.3 is the only criteria for which a finding can be made, a designation would dissolve after 90 days if an application to designate the district was not filed.

A roll call was held for the motion and approved by the following vote:

AYES: Brand, Breisch, Green, Sloan, Summers

NAYS: Genser, Rosenbaum

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

Motion to deny the property as a Landmark or Structure of Merit approved.

- 9-C. Certificate of Appropriateness 21ENT-0054, 1527 17th Street** Consideration of design approval of a proposed two-story addition and subterranean parking to the rear and rehabilitation of the existing Craftsman-style single-unit residence, a designated Landmark.

[10:07 PM](#)

Commissioners provided the following *ex parte* disclosures:

Commissioners Breisch, Green, Sloan, Summers, and Chair Genser visited the property.

Commissioners Brand, Green, and Sloan met with the applicant team.

The Commission granted 10 minutes total to the applicant team for presentation and rebuttal.

Ms. Reich presented the staff report including that it appears to comply with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and recommended approval of the project.

Howard Laks, Howard Laks Architects and Amanda Duane of GPA presented the project on behalf of the applicant team. Mr. Laks also explained that there are a variety of size and scale of buildings in the immediate neighborhood, and that the scale of the project fits the neighborhood.

Chair Pro Tempore Rosenbaum referred to the written public input from the Santa Monica Conservancy which provided specific detail on how the Landmark building should be protected during construction and stated that he wanted to ensure the protection of the Landmark.

Ms. Reich noted the condition included in the staff report that refers to the best practices noted in the City's consultant's (HRG) report will ensure the Landmark building is protected. She also noted that the HRG report supported the categorical exemption under CEQA.

Commissioner Brand stated that the current proposal has responded to comments provided by the Commission in the Preliminary review and has done a good job. Chair Genser agreed with Commissioner Brand.

Commissioner Brand made a motion to approve. Commissioner Green seconded the motion and staff recommendation. A roll call was held for the motion and approved by the following vote:

AYES: Brand, Breisch, Green, Sloan, Summers, Genser, Rosenbaum

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

10. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- 10-A** Discussion and possible action regarding Landmarks Commission budget priorities, including potential recommendations to City Council in advance of budget study session, and possible appointment of a Commissioner or Commissioners to speak to the City Council on behalf of the Commission on budget priorities.

10:51 PM

Staff stated that there has been no change in direction from Council or CMO regarding the budget. She also stated that since the situation regarding returning to in-person meetings is in flux, changing the way public comment is received would cause confusion.

Chair Pro Tempore Rosenbaum discussed the letter presented to City Council prior to their initial Budget Study Session in March.

The Commission agreed to maintain the letter as presented. Commissioner Sloan recommended modifying the letter regarding the Landmarks Commission budget priorities and potential recommendations to the City Council to acknowledge it's the second time the Council will be seeing it. Chair Genser was elected to represent the Commission.

[11:05 PM](#)

Chair Genser made a motion to continue the meeting past 11:00 PM. The motion was unanimously approved by a voice vote.

- 10-B** Discussion and possible action regarding the actions taken by the City Council at its April 27, 2021 meeting regarding Boards and Commissions practices, including next steps, potential recommendations to City Council, and possible appointment of a Commissioner or Commissioners to speak to the City Council on behalf of the Commission.

[11:06 PM](#)

Commissioner Summers exited the meeting.

Ms. Reich explained that the Commission Working Group (CWG) was formed before the pandemic to review the numerous advisory boards and commissions and the CWG had provided recommendations to the City Clerk. She reported that staff had initially been working with the City Clerk's office to encourage them to recognize the difference between advisory boards and boards and commission that serve a quasi-judicial function, such as the Landmarks Commission. She stated that the City Clerk's office was focused solely on consistency and did not appear to agree to recognize those differences. She also stated that on May 11, 2021, the Council would discuss the creation of a subcommittee of the Council to review the recommendations from the City Clerk's office.

Commissioner Sloan stated support for the creation of an ad-hoc committee being formed by Council and looked forward to providing input. She volunteered to draft a statement in support of the creation of an ad-hoc subcommittee including concerns regarding the points Ms. Reich raised in her remarks. Commissioner Sloan said she would submit a draft to Chair Genser and staff for review.

Deputy City Attorney von Tongeln stated that issues under ad-hoc subcommittee and other procedural issues will be brought back for consideration earlier.

The Commissioners agreed with this approach.

- 11. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:** None.

- 12. **NEXT MEETING DATE AND COMMISSION AGENDA:** Regular Meeting of the Landmarks Commission: 7:00 p.m. Monday, July 12, 2021
- 13. **ADJOURNMENT:** Chair Genser adjourned the meeting at [11:34 PM](#) on Monday, May 10, 2021.

Attest:

DocuSigned by:



2EE98F2BEE1D46B
Wendy Radwan
Recording Secretary

Approved:

DocuSigned by:



FC084B50FF3A44F
Roger Genser
Chair