

Exhibit B

This page intentionally left blank.

**Before the Historic Resources Review Board in and for the
County of Monterey, State of California**

Resolution No. 22-008

**ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF MTY
(PLN220174)**

Resolution by the Monterey County Historic Resources Review Board (HRRB) recommending approval of a Use Permit to allow alterations at the Mission San Antonio de Padua, consisting of: demolition of a circa 1935 caretaker unit; and partial excavation and treatment of the foundations of the historic "Majordomo" residence, which are partially covered by the caretaker unit.

WHEREAS, this matter was heard by the Historic Resources Review Board (HRRB) of the County of Monterey on November 3, 2022, pursuant to 21.54.040.B. and Title 18 Section 18.25.170 of the Monterey County Code.

WHEREAS, the project is located 1 Mission Road, Jolon (Assessor's Parcel Number 201-021-002-000), end of Mission Road, South County Area Plan, and the Mission San Antonio de Padua has been listed on the Monterey County Register of Historic Resources, as a Historical Landmark on the California Register of Historical resources, and on the National Register of Historical Places.

WHEREAS, Brett Brenkwitz (applicants agent) filed with the County of Monterey, an application for a Use Permit to allow alterations at the Mission San Antonio de Padua, consisting of: demolishing a circa 1935 caretaker unit; and partially excavating and treating the foundations of the historic "Majordomo" residence, which are partially covered by the caretaker unit.

WHEREAS, the Mission San Antonio de Pauda is a historical California mission constructed in the early 1800's and re-constructed primarily between 1948 and 1952. The project proposes to demolish the non-contributing 1935 caretaker unit (formerly contractor's office), partially excavate and treat the foundations of the underlying "Majordomo" residence, and install educational signage identifying these foundations.

WHEREAS, a historical resource assessment was previously prepared January 2010 by Architectural Resources Group (ARG) for the entire mission (LIB130010 / Exhibit C). ARG's report indicates that while the unit was built within the period of the significance for the mission between 1810 and 1952, it does not follow its form, and designates it as a non-contributing feature. Such features are described as *"... elements or features that have been remodeled, altered or added after the period of significance (see next section), and where additional alteration would not have a negative effect on the original integrity of the building. In some cases, removal of the noncontributing features has a positive effect on the building's overall integrity."*

WHEREAS, a phase II historical assessment specifically focused on the proposed project was prepared by Kent L. Seavey dated June 10, 2022. It describes the caretaker unit as a one-story adobe-framed building with a T shaped plan and low pitched red tile roof known as “The Casita”. This report concurs that the 1935 unit is non-contributing, and concludes that it should be deemed a non historic feature. The also describes the current state of the unit as deteriorated: the unreinforced cement foundation is cracked throughout, the floor boards have been riven by pests and dry rot, and mold is present throughout the ceiling and walls. As the caretaker unit lacks both historical significance and integrity, it’s removal would not adversely affect the historic, archaeological, architectural, or engineering significance of the mission.

WHEREAS, underneath the 1935 caretaker unit are the foundations of the mission’s “Majordmo” residence. The role of the Majordomo (or Mayordomo) as an economic administrator within the mission system was established as early as the 1770’s. Each mission appointed a Majordomo, generally a soldier from the mission guards. They became the accounting manager, oversaw the agricultural and crafting operations, directed work, and reported to the missionary regarding temporal affairs.

WHEREAS, after the demolition of the existing caretakers unit, the project proposes to excavate and partially treat the underlying foundation of the Majordomo residence: the overlying earth on top of the foundations would be excavated; they would then be repaired with a similar material as needed, with the top of the foundation sloped so that water sheds away; the foundations would then be capped with a lime plaster and several layers of lime wash; and a six square foot rustic metal and rustic wood frame sign interpretive sign would be installed.

WHEREAS, this treatment approach would be similar to the foundations of other accessory structures at the mission. It has both a preservation and educational function. The lime wash acts as a sacrificial layer that protects the foundations from the elements and vandalism, and their visibility would allow visitors to better understand they layout and function of mission spaces. The project historian reviewed this approach (Exhibit E) and concluded it was consistent with National Parks Service Preservation Brief #5 on Abohe Buildings and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

WHEREAS, the excavation would take place in an area the County has mapped as having a high sensitivity to archaeological resources and is approximately 70 feet northeast of the mission graveyard. Therefore, an archaeological report was prepared for the project by Robert L. Hoover, Ph.D., and David N. Hoover, M.A. (LIB220248). Archaeological reports are confidential in order to protect potential archaeological resources, however, the report recommends removal of the 1935 caretaker unit, and recommends excavation work be monitored by qualified archaeological and Salinian tribal cultural monitors. Staff recommends this monitoring be incorporated into the project as conditions of approval. Therefore, as conditioned, revealing these foundations would not adversely affect the historic, archaeological, architectural, or engineering significance of the mission.

WHEREAS, at the conclusion of the hearing, the matter was submitted to the HRRB for a recommendation. Having considered all the written and documentary information submitted, oral testimony, and other evidence presented before the HRRB, the HRRB rendered its decision

to adopt findings and evidence to recommend approval of the Use Permit subject to the following findings:

- Finding: The proposed alteration, as conditioned, does not significantly and adversely affect the historic, archaeological, architectural, or engineering integrity of the resource.
- Finding: The proposed work is found to be consistent with the purposes of Monterey County Code Chapter 18.25 and will neither adversely affect the significant architectural features of the designated resource nor adversely affect the character of historical, architectural, or aesthetic interest or value of the designated resource and its site.
- Finding: The use and exterior of the proposed improvements will not adversely affect and will be compatible with the use and exterior of existing designated historical resources, improvements, buildings, natural features, and structures on such site.

Evidence:

1. Regulations for Historic Resources Zoning Districts or “HR” Districts as contained in Monterey County Code Chapter 21.54.
2. Regulations for the Preservation of Historic Resources as contained in Monterey County Code Chapter 18.25.
3. Draft Focused Historic Structure Report (LIB130010) prepared by Architectural Resources Group (ARG), San Francisco, CA, January, 2010.
4. Phase II historic assessment (LIB220249) prepared by Kent Seavey, Pacific Grove, CA, November 30, 2020.
5. Archaeological Assessment and Recommendations for Contractor’s Office Demolition (LIB220174) prepared by Robert L. Hoover, Ph.D., and David N. Hoover, M.A., 2022.
6. Letter from Brett Brenkwitz dated August 24, 2022.
7. The application, plans, and supporting materials submitted by the project applicant to Monterey County HCD-Planning for the proposed development found in project file PLN220174.
8. Oral testimony and HRRB discussion during the public hearing and the administrative record.

THEREFORE, it is the decision of the Monterey County Historic Resources Review Board to recommend approval of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Mty Use Permit (PLN220174) subject to the following conditions:

1. A qualified archaeological monitor (i.e., an archaeologist registered with the Register of Professional Archaeologists [RPA] or a Registered Archaeologist [RA] under the supervision of an RPA) shall be present and observe all soil disturbance for all grading and excavation activities. If at any time, potentially significant archaeological resources or intact features are discovered, the monitor shall temporarily halt work until the find can be evaluated by the archaeological monitor. If the find is determined to be significant, work shall remain halted until a plan of action has been formulated, with the concurrence of HCD-Planning, and implemented.

2. To ensure that Tribal Cultural Resources incur a less than significant impact if encountered, a Tribal Monitor approved by the appropriate tribe traditionally and culturally affiliated with the vicinity of the subject parcel and that has consulted with the County and designated one lead contact person in accordance with AB 52 requirements, or other appropriately NAHC-recognized representative, shall be on-site and observe all project-related grading and excavation to identify findings with tribal cultural significance. This Tribal Monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt work in order to examine any potentially significant cultural materials or features. If resources are discovered, the owner/applicant/contractor shall refer to and comply with HCD-Planning Standard Condition PD003(B) as applicable. This mitigation is not intended to alleviate responsibility of the owner or its agents from contacting the County Coroner and complying with State law if human remains are discovered.

Passed and adopted on this **3rd day of November 2022**, upon motion of Kellie Morgantini and seconded by Salvador Munoz, by the following vote:

AYES: Judy MacClelland, John Scourkes, Salvador Munoz, Sheila Lee Prader, Michael Bilich, Belinda Taluban, Kellie Morgantini

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

DocuSigned by:
Philip Angelo
16955456DE57483...

Attest

Philip Angelo, HRRB Secretary
November 3, 2022