

County of Monterey

County of Monterey Government Center
1441 Schilling Place, Salinas, CA 93901
Via Teleconference/Zoom



Meeting Agenda - Final

SPECIAL MEETING

Thursday, January 12, 2023

11:30 AM

Historic Resources Review Board

IMPORTANT NOTICE REGARDING COVID-19 AND PARTICIPATION IN THE HISTORIC RESOURCES REVIEW BOARD MEETING

County of Monterey Historic Resources Review Board will be held by teleconference in order to minimize the spread of the COVID-19 virus, in accordance with the State of Emergency proclaimed by Governor Newsom on March 4, 2020, Executive Order N-29-20 issued by Governor Newsom on March 17, 2020, and the Shelter in Place Order issued by the County of Monterey Health Officer on March 17, 2020, as may be periodically amended.

To participate in this County of Monterey Historic Resources Review Board meeting, the public are invited to observe and address the Board telephonically or electronically. Instructions for public participation are below:

Participate via Zoom Meeting Link:

[https://montereycty.zoom.us/j/93415405671?](https://montereycty.zoom.us/j/93415405671?pwd=YnZpQXNndDU5TmdJSVJ0ZmcraWljUT09&from=addon)

[pwd=YnZpQXNndDU5TmdJSVJ0ZmcraWljUT09&from=addon](https://montereycty.zoom.us/j/93415405671?pwd=YnZpQXNndDU5TmdJSVJ0ZmcraWljUT09&from=addon)

Participate via Phone: 1-669-900-6833

Meeting ID Access Code: 934 1540 5671

Password (if required): 594890

Public Participation Instructions:

The meeting will be conducted via teleconference using the Zoom program, and Board Members will attend electronically or telephonically. The meeting will have no physical location to physically attend. The public may observe the Zoom meeting via computer by clicking on the meeting link listed above, or the public may listen via phone by dialing the phone number listed above and then when prompted, entering the Meeting ID Access Code listed above as well. You will be asked for a "Participant ID". You do not need a Participant ID to join the meeting, press the pound key (#) again and you will be automatically connected.

Member of the public wishes to comment on a particular agenda item, the public is strongly encouraged to submit their comments in writing via email to the County Housing and Community Development at <mailto:hrrbhearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us> by 2:00 p.m. on the Wednesday prior to the Board meeting. To assist County staff in identifying the agenda item to which the comment relates, the public is requested to indicate the Historic Resources Review Board date and agenda number in the subject line. Comments received by the 2:00 p.m. Wednesday deadline will be distributed to the Board and will be placed in the record.

Applicants and members of the public wishing to comment on a specific agenda item while the matter is being heard during the meeting may participate by any of the following means:

a. When the Chair calls for public comment on an agenda item, the Secretary of the Board or his or

her designee will first ascertain who wants to testify (among those who are in the meeting electronically or telephonically) and will then call on speakers and unmute their device one at a time. Public speakers including the applicant may be broadcast in audio form only.

Members of the public who wish to make a general public comment for items not on the day's agenda may submit their comment via email, preferably limited to 250 words or less, to the Secretary of the Commission at hrrbhearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us. The Historic Resources Review Board date and "general comment" should be indicated in the subject line. The comment will be placed in the record for the meeting, and every effort will be made to read the comment into the record at the appropriate time on the agenda.

Individuals with disabilities who desire to request a reasonable accommodation or modification to observe or participate in the meeting may make such request by sending an email to support staff at hrrbhearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us. The request should be made no later than 2:00 p.m. on the Wednesday prior to the meeting date in order to provide time for the County to address the request.

INTERPRETATION SERVICE POLICY: The County of Monterey Historic Resources Review Board invites and encourages the participation of County of Monterey residents at its meetings. If you require the assistance of an interpreter, please contact the County of Monterey Housing and Community Development Department located in the County of Monterey Government Center, 1441 Schilling Place, 2nd Floor South, Salinas - or by phone at (831) 755-5025. The Clerk will make every effort to accommodate requests for interpreter assistance. Requests should be made as soon as possible, and at a minimum 24 hours in advance of any meeting of the Historic Resources Review Board.

DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION: Documents relating to agenda items that are distributed to the Board less than 72 hours prior to the meeting are available by request by sending an email to hrrbhearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us

If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 USC Sec. 12132) and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. For information regarding how, to whom and when a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting may make a request for disability-related modification or accommodation including auxiliary aids or services or if you have any questions about any of the items listed on this agenda please call the County of Monterey Housing and Community Development at (831) 755-5025.

AVISO IMPORTANTE SOBRE COVID-19 Y PARTICIPACIÓN EN LA REUNIÓN DE LA JUNTA DE REVISIÓN DE RECURSOS HISTÓRICOS

La junta de revisión de recursos históricos (The Historic Resources Review Board) del Condado de Monterey se llevará a cabo por teleconferencia para minimizar la propagación del virus COVID-19,

de acuerdo con el Estado de Emergencia proclamado por el Gobernador Newsom el 4 de Marzo del 2020, Orden Ejecutiva N-29-20 emitida por el Gobernador Newsom el 17 de Marzo del 2020, y la Orden de Refugio en el Lugar (aka "Quedate en Casa") emitida por el Oficial de Salud del Condado de Monterey el 17 de Marzo del 2020, según se pueda enmendar periódicamente.

Para participar en esta junta de revisión de recursos históricos del Condado de Monterey, el público está invitado a observar y estar frente a la junta de revisión de recursos históricos telefónicamente o vía electrónicamente. Las instrucciones para la participación pública están a continuación:

Instrucciones de participación pública:

La reunión se llevará a cabo por teleconferencia utilizando el programa Zoom, y los miembros de la junta de revisión de recursos históricos asistirán por vía electrónica o telefónica. La reunión no tendrá un lugar físico para asistir físicamente. El público puede observar la reunión Zoom a través de computadora haciendo clic en el siguiente enlace:

<https://montereycty.zoom.us/j/93415405671?pwd=YnZpQXNndDU5TmdJSVJ0ZmcraWljUT09>
Contraseña 594890, o el público puede escuchar a través del teléfono llamando al 1-669-900-6833 y cuando se le solicite el código de acceso para entrar a la reunión, presione los siguientes números: 945 1540 5671. Se le pedirá una "identificación de participante". No necesita una identificación de participante para unirse a la reunión, presione la tecla numeral (#) nuevamente y se conectará automáticamente.

1. Si un miembro del público desea comentar sobre un tema de la agenda en particular, se le recomienda que envíe sus comentarios por escrito en correo electrónico a la Vivienda y Desarrollo Comunitario del Condado (Housing and Community Development) a hrrbhearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us antes de las 2:00 P.M. el Miércoles antes de la junta de revisión de recursos históricos. Para ayudar al personal del Condado, favor de identificar el número del proyecto de la agenda con el cual se relaciona el comentario, se solicita al público que indique la fecha de la junta de revisión de recursos históricos y el número de la agenda en la línea de asunto cuando envíe su correo electrónico. Comentarios recibidos después de la fecha límite del Miércoles a las 2 P.M. serán distribuidos a los miembros de la junta de revisión de recursos históricos y serán colocados en el registro.

2. Los aplicantes del proyecto y miembros del público que desean comentar en un proyecto específico, mientras que el proyecto se este presentando durante la reunión, pueden participar por cualquiera de los siguientes medios:

a. Cuando la junta de revisión de recursos históricos acepte comentarios públicos sobre un tema de la agenda, el miembro de la junta o su designado, primero determinará quién quiere comentar (entre los que están en la reunión por vía electrónica o telefónica) y luego llamará a los participantes y activará el micrófono, uno a la vez. Todos los participantes, incluyendo el aplicante del proyecto, serán transmitidos por audio en altavoz solamente.

b. Si los participantes u otros miembros del público tienen documentos que desean distribuir a los

miembros de la junta de revisión de recursos históricos (Historic Resource Review Board) para un tema o proyecto de la agenda, se les recomienda enviar dichos documentos antes de las 2:00 P.M. el Miercoles antes de la reunión a: hrrbhearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us. Para ayudar al personal del Condado, favor de indetificar el numero del proyecto de la agenda con el cual se relaciona el comentario, se solicita al público que indique la fecha de la junta de revisión de recursos históricos y el número de la agenda en la línea de asunto cuando envíe su correo electrónico.

c. Si los aplicantes o miembros del público desean presentar documentos o presentaciones de PowerPoint mientras hablan, deben enviar el documento electrónicamente antes de las 2:00 P.M. del Miercoles antes de la reunión a hrrbhearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us. Si es recibido después de ese plazo, el personal hará los mejores esfuerzos, pero no puede garantizar que esté disponible su PowerPoint para presentar durante la reunión de la junta de revisión de recursos históricos.

d. Mientras se escucha el proyecto, un miembro del público puede enviar un comentario por correo electrónico, preferiblemente limitado a 250 palabras o menos, a la Secretaria de la junta de revisión de recursos históricos a hrrbhearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us. Para ayudar al personal a identificar el proyecto de la agenda con el cual se relaciona el comentario, se solicita al público que indique la fecha de la junta de revisión de recursos históricos y el número del proyecto en la agenda en la línea de asunto. Si el comentario se recibe antes del cierre del comentario público, se hará todo lo posible para leer el comentario en el registro, pero algunos comentarios pueden no leerse en voz alta debido a limitaciones de tiempo o duración del comentario (si el comentario supera las 250 palabras). Los comentarios recibidos antes del cierre del período de comentarios públicos sobre un proyecto de la agenda serán parte del registro de ese proyecto.

3. Los miembros del público que deseen hacer un comentario público general para los temas que no están en la agenda del día pueden enviar su comentario por correo electrónico, preferiblemente limitado a 250 palabras o menos, a los miembros de la junta de revisión de recursos históricos en hrrbhearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us. La fecha de la junta de revisión de recursos históricos y el "comentario general" debe ser indicado en la línea de asunto. El comentario se colocará en el registro de la reunión, y se hará un gran esfuerzo para leer el comentario en voz alta para su registro verbalmente en el momento apropiado de la agenda.

4. Las personas con discapacidades que deseen solicitar una modificación o modificación razonable para observar o participar en la reunión pueden realizar dicha solicitud enviando un correo electrónico a hrrbhearingcomments@co.monterey.ca.us. La solicitud debe hacerse a más tardar el mediodía del Martes antes de a la junta de revisión de recursos históricos para dar tiempo al Condado para que atienda la solicitud .

5. El president de la junta puede establecer reglas razonables según sea necesario para llevar a cabo la reunión de manera ordenada.

Los miembros de la junta de revisión de recursos históricos del Condado de Monterey invita y apoya la participación de los residentes del Condado de Monterey en sus reuniones. Si usted requiere la asistencia de un interprete, por favor comuníquese con el Departamento de Vivienda y Desarrollo

Comunitario localizado en el Centro de Gobierno del Condado de Monterey, (County of Monterey Government Center), 1441 Schilling Place, Segundo Piso Sur, Salinas – o por teléfono al (831) 755-5025. La Asistente hará el esfuerzo para acomodar los pedidos de asistencia de un interprete. Los pedidos se deberán hacer lo mas pronto posible, y a lo mínimo 24 horas de anticipo para cualquier reunión de la junta de revisión de recursos históricos.

The Recommended Action indicates the staff recommendation at the time the agenda was prepared. That recommendation does not limit the Housing Resources Review Board’s alternative actions on any matter before it.

NOTE: All agenda titles related to numbered items are live web links. Click on the title to be directed to corresponding Staff Report

Participate via Zoom Meeting Link:

**[https://montereycty.zoom.us/j/93415405671?
pwd=YnZpQXNndDU5TmdJSVJ0ZmcraWljUT09&from=addon](https://montereycty.zoom.us/j/93415405671?pwd=YnZpQXNndDU5TmdJSVJ0ZmcraWljUT09&from=addon)**

Participate via Phone: 1-669-900-6833

Meeting ID Access Code: 934 1540 5671

Password (if required): 594890

11:30 A.M. - CALL TO ORDER**ROLL CALL**

John Scourkes (Chair)
Kellie Morgantini (Vice Chair)
Michael Bilich
Judy MacClelland
Sheila Lee Prader
Salvador Munoz
Belinda Taluban

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Historic Resources Review Board (HRRB) will receive public comment on non-agenda items within the purview of the HRRB. The Chair may limit the length of individual presentations.

AGENDA ADDITIONS, DELETIONS AND CORRECTIONS

The Board Clerk will announce agenda corrections, deletions and proposed additions, which may be acted on by the Historic Resources Review Board as provided in Sections 54954.2 of the California Government Code.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

SCHEDULED MATTERS**1. PLN100338 - SIGNAL HILL LLC**

Provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission related to the approval of the Signal Hill LLC Reduced Height Alternative project.

Project Location: 1170 Signal Hill Road, Pebble Beach, CA 93953 Assessor's Parcel Number 008-261-007-000, Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan, Coastal Zone.

Proposed CEQA Action: Find the mitigation measures for Historic Resources are effective in reducing the impacts to the demolition of the Arthur and Kathleen Connell House.

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
 [Exhibit A - Draft Resolution](#)
 [Exhibit B - Final EIR for Signal Hill LLC](#)

OTHER MATTERS

BOARD COMMENTS, REQUEST AND REFERRALS

This is a time set aside for members of the HRRB to comment, request, or refer a matter that is on or not on the agenda. At this time, members may also request that an item be added to a future HRRB agenda.

DEPARTMENT UPDATE

This is a time set aside for staff to give updates or comments on on-going projects, potential future projects, or HRRB meeting procedures.

ADJOURNMENT

For additional information, or if you are unable to attend the meeting, please contact Phil Angelo at (831) 784-5731. Should you have any questions regarding a specific project please contact the staff person or planner assigned to the project at (831) 755-5025.

NEXT REGULAR HRRB MEETING

February 2, 2023



County of Monterey

Item No.1

Board Report

Board of Supervisors
Chambers
168 W. Alisal St., 1st Floor
Salinas, CA 93901

Legistar File Number: 23-048

January 12, 2023

Introduced: 1/11/2023

Current Status: Agenda Ready

Version: 1

Matter Type: General Agenda Item

PLN100338 - SIGNAL HILL LLC

Provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission related to the approval of the Signal Hill LLC Reduced Height Alternative project.

Project Location: 1170 Signal Hill Road, Pebble Beach, CA 93953 Assessor's Parcel Number 008-261-007-000, Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan, Coastal Zone.

Proposed CEQA Action: Find the mitigation measures for Historic Resources are effective in reducing the impacts to the demolition of the Arthur and Kathleen Connell House.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Monterey County Historic Resources Review Board (HRRB) adopt a Resolution recommending that the Planning Commission approve the Signal Hill LLC Reduced Height Alternative project and find the mitigation measures for Historic Resources are effective in reducing the impacts to demolition of the Arthur and Kathleen Connell House.

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Project Owner: Massy Mehdipour

APN: 008-261-007-000

Parcel Size: 2.2 acres

Flagged and Staked: Photographic simulations in EIR

SUMMARY:

The Signal Hill LLC project proposes demolition of a 4,124 square foot single family residence and the construction of a new three level 11,933 square foot single family. Several entitlements and resource impacts associated with the proposed development have been identified and evaluated during staff review, but for purposes of Historic Resources Review Board (HRRB) review, this report focuses on historical resources. The existing residence was designed by Richard Neutra for Arthur and Kathleen Connell and was found eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

BACKGROUND:

The Signal Hill LLC project includes a proposal to demolish an existing dwelling and construct a new dwelling at 1770 Signal Hill Road in Pebble Beach. On August 4, 2011, staff informed HRRB of the request and asked it to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission on the project. Instead, the HRRB recommended that the existing house (the one proposed for demolition) qualified as an historic resource. After review, the HRRB recommended that "the residence appeared to be significant under Criterion 3 of the California Register of Historical Resources."

The County deemed the Signal Hill LLC application complete in August 2013. Subsequently, staff determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was required pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and released a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR in February 2015. A Draft EIR was prepared for the project and circulated for public review in 2018. Many comments were received on the Draft EIR during the comment period. Staff reviewed all the comments and responded to those comments in a Final EIR. The Final EIR was circulated in November 2022, including via email to all HRRB members.

The HRRB also reviewed the project in August and September 2015, after the existing house was vandalized, resulting in significant damage. In mid-September 2015, the HRRB approved Resolution No. 15CP01861 (Signal Hill, LLC), recommending that the Monterey County Building official approve a Mothball Protection Plan (Mothball Plan) for a single-family dwelling. The Mothball Plan addressed temporary structure stabilization and weatherization with the goal of reducing deteriorating conditions while the permit application was under consideration. The owner/applicant carried out all the measures in the Mothball Plan, although the County required some corrective actions and maintenance of the Mothball Plan measures since installation. Despite the Applicant's implementation of the Mothball Plan, the structure remains uninhabitable and substandard, as determined by the Chief of Building.

The HRRB received updates on the Signal Hill LLC project status and Mothball Plan in May and July of 2022. Most recently, on December 1, 2022, the HRRB requested that the project be added to the January 5, 2023 regular meeting agenda for a review and recommendation on the project. However, at the January 5, 2023 meeting, HRRB could not establish a quorum to conduct this review. Consequently, this matter was continued to a Special Meeting set for January 12, 2023.

DISCUSSION:

The Signal Hill LLC application was submitted in 2010, and at the time, it was not known to the property owner that the existing residence would be considered historic. The HRRB voted that the existing residence at the project site should be reviewed for historic determination in 2011. A final version of the project application for the demolition of the "Connell House" and construction of a new dwelling was deemed complete in August of 2013. The structure was nominated for eligibility on the National Register of Historic Places and found eligible for listing by the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places in 2014, rendering it a protected historical resource. After learning of the historic determination, the property owner opted to move forward with the original proposal. Consequently, staff required the preparation of an EIR. The EIR concluded that the demolition of the Connell House would constitute a significant impact on the environment. After the determination to prepare an EIR but before the EIR was prepared, the existing house was vandalized and continued to be in disrepair due to a general lack of maintenance. Today the Connell House is difficult to repair and unsafe for occupancy, significantly damaged and in an advanced state of decay. Specifically, the damage to supporting walls, the decay to nearly all aspects of the home (e.g. mold, broken windows and non-functioning HVAC system) are not easily or inexpensively fixed or repaired.

As the demolition of the Connell House would be a significant and unavoidable impact on the environment, the proposed project, including such demolition, may only be approved if the Planning Commission; 1) certifies the EIR, 2) adopts the necessary CEQA findings, 3) adopts

Statement of Overriding Considerations, that would justify approval notwithstanding the irremediable impact, and 3) adopts the EIR's recommended mitigation measures to at least minimize the historic impacts to the extent feasible. As such, the HRRB is asked to review the two EIR mitigation measures that require:

1. Documentation and recordation of the historic structure following the Historic American Buildings Survey guidelines; and
2. Development of web-based information documenting the history and features of the Connell House

These two mitigation measures were also presented to the HRRB in May 2022.

Alternatives to Demolition:

There are several project alternatives considered in the EIR prepared for the project. Some of the alternatives were eliminated from further consideration because they were found to be infeasible, did not reduce impacts, or they had other conflicts with adopted regulations (Alternatives 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8). Feasible alternatives (1, 4, 6, 9, and 10) include:

- “Preservation” (Alternative 1)
- “Project Integration” (Alternative 4)
- “Reduced Project” (Alternative 6)
- “Reduced Height” (Alternative 9) and
- “No project” (Alternative 10)

The three Alternatives that avoid complete demolition of the Connell House are “Preservation,” “Project Integration,” and “No Project.” The “No Project” alternative would leave the Connell House in its current condition with no work performed. Due to the condition of the existing structure, the “No Project” alternative is not desirable. The following discussion describes the other two non-demolition Alternatives, “Preservation” and “Project Integration,” followed by staff's analysis of those alternatives.

Alternative 1 - Preservation

The project's Draft EIR concluded that the environmentally superior alternative would be onsite “Preservation” (Alternative 1). The “Preservation” alternative is described in Chapter 9 of the FEIR, starting on page 9.1-4. Preservation would involve treatment for the Connell House with a combination of the four standards described in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Preservation, Restoration, Reconstruction, and Rehabilitation), with restoration being the most closely followed. Restoration would involve retaining extant design elements, accommodating reconstruction of important missing elements, bringing the building up to code, and allowing it, when restored, to convey its significance as a Neutra-designed residence.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that restoration may be considered when 1) the property's design, architectural, or historical significance during a particular period outweighs the potential loss of extant materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods; 2) there is substantial physical and documentary evidence supporting this option; and 3) contemporary alterations and additions are not planned. The Preservation

Alternative would retain some original elements and replace others in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's standards. Specifically, some of the original materials could be incorporated into the reconstruction, including most portions of the foundation system, the lower-level floor slab, most of the exterior stucco walls at the lower level and some at the upper level, structural roof framing, remaining original window frames, masonry fireplace, and first floor framing in the north wing. Reconstruction would require either removal or shoring of those elements in place; other identified elements would be replaced with new materials.

Alternative 4 - Project Integration

This alternative would include integration of the Connell House into the proposed project. The structure (or portions of the structure) would be retained and integrated into the design of the new construction in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. This alternative would necessitate:

- Documentation of primary and secondary character-defining elevations, spaces, and features to identify opportunities and constraints for additions and expanded living space, and
- Participation at conceptual, schematic, and design development phases of an analysis performed by a qualified architectural historian and/or historic architect.

This alternative could include full or partial project integration. Full integration could include, for example, adding on to the existing structure, adding additional full or partial floors or levels, supplementing additional living space by enclosing the courtyard or outside patio areas, or developing a separate addition to the structure connected by a breezeway or stairs.

Partial integration could include, for example, preserving/reconstructing components in the western, most visible elevation, including the prominent bands of fenestration on the first and second stories, the ground-level terrace, second-level balcony, characteristic roofline, and juxtaposition of transparent and opaque surfaces while all or a portion of the remaining components would be demolished to facilitate construction of the new residence. Other character-defining features of the residence could be preserved, such as the north entry or the exterior façade, while interior portions of the structure would be renovated and remodeled. No specific plans for this alternative are currently available.

Staff's Analysis of Alternatives

The house is currently uninhabitable and has been deemed hazardous by the Building Official. The current condition of the home makes it difficult to restore or preserve its historic significance because substantial repairs and partial reconstruction would be required that would entail an effort comparable to reconstruction. This situation, combined with the applicants' desires and objectives for the property, make for complicated social, economic, and technical considerations in deciding how to carry out this project. Staff suggests that while the "Preservation" alternative in the EIR appears on to be the least environmentally damaging option, and, not taking costs or social aspects of the project into account, is feasible, the property owner has clearly expressed that they will not actually implement this alternative. They have also indicated that they will not pursue the "Project Integration" alternative. This means that should a project be approved that does not involve demolition of the existing structure; it is possible that the near-term outcome would be similar to the "No Project" alternative which would include continuation of a hazardous structure in a state of disrepair. Potential long-term

impacts are difficult to predict.

The Connell House has been significantly damaged and is in an advanced state of decay. The damage to supporting walls and decay to nearly all aspects of the home are not easily fixed or repaired. Restoration or rehabilitation of the structure would likely include demolition of significant portions of the home and require some replication of historic elements of the home in reconstruction. The Connell House structural evaluation by Simpson, Gumpertz, and Heger (Appendix F of the Final EIR) presents the results of an independent investigation to determine the building's structural condition, its safety, and to opine whether the structure can be practically repaired and restored, or moved to another site. The report, dated 2016, found that the "shoring and protection that has been put in place is at best a short term solution." Restoration of the structure was found technically feasible, and this informed the EIR's analysis. The report also stated that such a restoration would "likely entail an effort comparable to the structure's original construction." In the seven years since this structural evaluation of the Connell House, the cost of such an undertaking has increased. The feasibility of any alternative involving restoration has greatly lessened.

Staff finds the social aspect of investment-backed expectations of the property owner to be a compelling reason for a Statement of Overriding Considerations, as well. The current owner purchased the property in 2004. An application to demolish and rebuild the house was filed with the County in 2010. A nomination for listing on the National Register was filed with the State Office of Historic Preservation and the house was found eligible for listing as a historic resource at the State and National levels on April 22, 2014. The treatment of the property with previous permits, such as the 825 square foot addition in the early 1990s, and the treatment of other properties in the vicinity to modernize and expand footprint and height supports a conclusion that an applicant's objectives for the site are reasonable. The preferred alternative of the EIR could, if adopted, arguably undermine the property owner's investment-backed expectations.

The current proposal includes restoration of 1.62 acres of native sand dune habitat on the site in addition to a financial contribution to a mitigation program that is applied to offsite sand dune habitat mitigation. Sand Dune habitat restoration is desirable for ecological sustainability and is not likely to occur should the applicant's proposal be denied in favor of a preservation or restoration alternative.

Based on the above discussion, potential social, economic, and technical considerations surrounding this development include:

- The current condition of the property
- Objectives and investment backed expectations of the property owner
- Native sand dune habitat restoration
- Consistency with the treatment of similarly situated properties in the vicinity
- Cost of Preservation or Project Integration alternatives
- Property tax revenue for government services

CEQA

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared for the project. As a recommending

body, the HRRB is asked to find that the mitigation measures for Historic Resources are effective in reducing the impacts to demolition of the Arthur and Kathleen Connell House.

Prepared by: Mary Israel, Supervising Planner
Approved by: Erik V. Lundquist, HCD Director

The following attachments are on file with Housing and Community Development:

Exhibit A - Draft HRRB Resolution recommending approval to the Planning Commission
(Alternative 9, Reduced Height of the EIR)

Exhibit B - Final EIR for the Signal Hill LLC project (*provided electronically via link below*)

The Final EIR can be found on the Monterey County HCD website at:

[www.co.monterey.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/117619/6380369318198000](http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/117619/638036931819800000)
00



Board Report

Legistar File Number: 23-048

January 12, 2023

Introduced: 1/11/2023

Current Status: Agenda Ready

Version: 1

Matter Type: General Agenda Item

PLN100338 - SIGNAL HILL LLC

Provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission related to the approval of the Signal Hill LLC Reduced Height Alternative project.

Project Location: 1170 Signal Hill Road, Pebble Beach, CA 93953 Assessor's Parcel Number 008-261-007-000, Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan, Coastal Zone.

Proposed CEQA Action: Find the mitigation measures for Historic Resources are effective in reducing the impacts to the demolition of the Arthur and Kathleen Connell House.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Monterey County Historic Resources Review Board (HRRB) adopt a Resolution recommending that the Planning Commission approve the Signal Hill LLC Reduced Height Alternative project and find the mitigation measures for Historic Resources are effective in reducing the impacts to demolition of the Arthur and Kathleen Connell House.

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Project Owner: Massy Mehdipour

APN: 008-261-007-000

Parcel Size: 2.2 acres

Flagged and Staked: Photographic simulations in EIR

SUMMARY:

The Signal Hill LLC project proposes demolition of a 4,124 square foot single family residence and the construction of a new three level 11,933 square foot single family. Several entitlements and resource impacts associated with the proposed development have been identified and evaluated during staff review, but for purposes of Historic Resources Review Board (HRRB) review, this report focuses on historical resources. The existing residence was designed by Richard Neutra for Arthur and Kathleen Connell and was found eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

BACKGROUND:

The Signal Hill LLC project includes a proposal to demolish an existing dwelling and construct a new dwelling at 1770 Signal Hill Road in Pebble Beach. On August 4, 2011, staff informed HRRB of the request and asked it to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission on the project. Instead, the HRRB recommended that the existing house (the one proposed for demolition) qualified as an historic resource. After review, the HRRB recommended that "the residence appeared to be significant under Criterion 3 of the California Register of Historical Resources."

The County deemed the Signal Hill LLC application complete in August 2013. Subsequently, staff determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was required pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and released a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR in February 2015. A Draft EIR was prepared for the project and circulated for public review in 2018. Many comments were received on the Draft EIR during the comment period. Staff reviewed all the comments and responded to those comments in a Final EIR. The Final EIR was circulated in November 2022, including via email to all HRRB members.

The HRRB also reviewed the project in August and September 2015, after the existing house was vandalized, resulting in significant damage. In mid-September 2015, the HRRB approved Resolution No. 15CP01861 (Signal Hill, LLC), recommending that the Monterey County Building official approve a Mothball Protection Plan (Mothball Plan) for a single-family dwelling. The Mothball Plan addressed temporary structure stabilization and weatherization with the goal of reducing deteriorating conditions while the permit application was under consideration. The owner/applicant carried out all the measures in the Mothball Plan, although the County required some corrective actions and maintenance of the Mothball Plan measures since installation. Despite the Applicant's implementation of the Mothball Plan, the structure remains uninhabitable and substandard, as determined by the Chief of Building.

The HRRB received updates on the Signal Hill LLC project status and Mothball Plan in May and July of 2022. Most recently, on December 1, 2022, the HRRB requested that the project be added to the January 5, 2023 regular meeting agenda for a review and recommendation on the project. However, at the January 5, 2023 meeting, HRRB could not establish a quorum to conduct this review. Consequently, this matter was continued to a Special Meeting set for January 12, 2023.

DISCUSSION:

The Signal Hill LLC application was submitted in 2010, and at the time, it was not known to the property owner that the existing residence would be considered historic. The HRRB voted that the existing residence at the project site should be reviewed for historic determination 2011. A final version of the project application for the demolition of the "Connell House" and construction of a new dwelling was deemed complete in August of 2013. The structure was nominated for eligibility on the National Register of Historic Places and found eligible for listing by the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places in 2014, rendering it a protected historical resource. After learning of the historic determination, the property owner opted to move forward with the original proposal. Consequently, staff required the preparation of an EIR. The EIR concluded that the demolition of the Connell House would constitute a significant impact on the environment. After the determination to prepare an EIR but before the EIR was prepared, the existing house was vandalized and continued to be in disrepair due to a general lack of maintenance. Today the Connell House is difficult to repair and unsafe for occupancy, significantly damaged and in an advanced state of decay. Specifically, the damage to supporting walls, the decay to nearly all aspects of the home (e.g. mold, broken windows and non-functioning HVAC system) are not easily or inexpensively fixed or repaired.

As the demolition of the Connell House would be a significant and unavoidable impact on the environment, the proposed project, including such demolition, may only be approved if the Planning Commission; 1) certifies the EIR, 2) adopts the necessary CEQA findings, 3) adopts Statement of

Overriding Considerations, that would justify approval notwithstanding the irremediable impact, and 3) adopts the EIR's recommended mitigation measures to at least minimize the historic impacts to the extent feasible. As such, the HRRB is asked to review the two EIR mitigation measures that require:

1. Documentation and recordation of the historic structure following the Historic American Buildings Survey guidelines; and
2. Development of web-based information documenting the history and features of the Connell House

These two mitigation measures were also presented to the HRRB in May 2022.

Alternatives to Demolition:

There are several project alternatives considered in the EIR prepared for the project. Some of the alternatives were eliminated from further consideration because they were found to be infeasible, did not reduce impacts, or they had other conflicts with adopted regulations (Alternatives 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8). Feasible alternatives (1, 4, 6, 9, and 10) include:

- “Preservation” (Alternative 1)
- “Project Integration” (Alternative 4)
- “Reduced Project” (Alternative 6)
- “Reduced Height” (Alternative 9) and
- “No project” (Alternative 10)

The three Alternatives that avoid complete demolition of the Connell House are “Preservation,” “Project Integration,” and “No Project.” The “No Project” alternative would leave the Connell House in its current condition with no work performed. Due to the condition of the existing structure, the “No Project” alternative is not desirable. The following discussion describes the other two non-demolition Alternatives, “Preservation” and “Project Integration,” followed by staff's analysis of those alternatives.

Alternative 1 - Preservation

The project's Draft EIR concluded that the environmentally superior alternative would be onsite “Preservation” (Alternative 1). The “Preservation” alternative is described in Chapter 9 of the FEIR, starting on page 9.1-4. Preservation would involve treatment for the Connell House with a combination of the four standards described in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Preservation, Restoration, Reconstruction, and Rehabilitation), with restoration being the most closely followed. Restoration would involve retaining extant design elements, accommodating reconstruction of important missing elements, bringing the building up to code, and allowing it, when restored, to convey its significance as a Neutra-designed residence.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that restoration may be considered when 1) the property's design, architectural, or historical significance during a particular period outweighs the potential loss of extant materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods; 2) there is substantial physical and documentary evidence supporting this option; and 3) contemporary alterations and additions are not planned. The Preservation Alternative would retain

some original elements and replace others in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's standards. Specifically, some of the original materials could be incorporated into the reconstruction, including most portions of the foundation system, the lower-level floor slab, most of the exterior stucco walls at the lower level and some at the upper level, structural roof framing, remaining original window frames, masonry fireplace, and first floor framing in the north wing. Reconstruction would require either removal or shoring of those elements in place; other identified elements would be replaced with new materials.

Alternative 4 - Project Integration

This alternative would include integration of the Connell House into the proposed project. The structure (or portions of the structure) would be retained and integrated into the design of the new construction in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. This alternative would necessitate:

- Documentation of primary and secondary character-defining elevations, spaces, and features to identify opportunities and constraints for additions and expanded living space, and
- Participation at conceptual, schematic, and design development phases of an analysis performed by a qualified architectural historian and/or historic architect.

This alternative could include full or partial project integration. Full integration could include, for example, adding on to the existing structure, adding additional full or partial floors or levels, supplementing additional living space by enclosing the courtyard or outside patio areas, or developing a separate addition to the structure connected by a breezeway or stairs.

Partial integration could include, for example, preserving/reconstructing components in the western, most visible elevation, including the prominent bands of fenestration on the first and second stories, the ground-level terrace, second-level balcony, characteristic roofline, and juxtaposition of transparent and opaque surfaces while all or a portion of the remaining components would be demolished to facilitate construction of the new residence. Other character-defining features of the residence could be preserved, such as the north entry or the exterior façade, while interior portions of the structure would be renovated and remodeled. No specific plans for this alternative are currently available.

Staff's Analysis of Alternatives

The house is currently uninhabitable and has been deemed hazardous by the Building Official. The current condition of the home makes it difficult to restore or preserve its historic significance because substantial repairs and partial reconstruction would be required that would entail an effort comparable to reconstruction. This situation, combined with the applicants' desires and objectives for the property, make for complicated social, economic, and technical considerations in deciding how to carry out this project. Staff suggests that while the "Preservation" alternative in the EIR appears on to be the least environmentally damaging option, and, not taking costs or social aspects of the project into account, is feasible, the property owner has clearly expressed that they will not actually implement this alternative. They have also indicated that they will not pursue the "Project Integration" alternative. This means that should a project be approved that does not involve demolition of the existing structure; it is possible that the near-term outcome would be similar to the "No Project" alternative which would include continuation of a hazardous structure in a state of disrepair. Potential long-term impacts are difficult to predict.

The Connell House has been significantly damaged and is in an advanced state of decay. The damage to supporting walls and decay to nearly all aspects of the home are not easily fixed or repaired. Restoration or rehabilitation of the structure would likely include demolition of significant portions of the home and require some replication of historic elements of the home in reconstruction. The Connell House structural evaluation by Simpson, Gumpertz, and Heger (Appendix F of the Final EIR) presents the results of an independent investigation to determine the building's structural condition, its safety, and to opine whether the structure can be practically repaired and restored, or moved to another site. The report, dated 2016, found that the "shoring and protection that has been put in place is at best a short term solution." Restoration of the structure was found technically feasible, and this informed the EIR's analysis. The report also stated that such a restoration would "likely entail an effort comparable to the structure's original construction." In the seven years since this structural evaluation of the Connell House, the cost of such an undertaking has increased. The feasibility of any alternative involving restoration has greatly lessened.

Staff finds the social aspect of investment-backed expectations of the property owner to be a compelling reason for a Statement of Overriding Considerations, as well. The current owner purchased the property in 2004. An application to demolish and rebuild the house was filed with the County in 2010. A nomination for listing on the National Register was filed with the State Office of Historic Preservation and the house was found eligible for listing as a historic resource at the State and National levels on April 22, 2014. The treatment of the property with previous permits, such as the 825 square foot addition in the early 1990s, and the treatment of other properties in the vicinity to modernize and expand footprint and height supports a conclusion that an applicant's objectives for the site are reasonable. The preferred alternative of the EIR could, if adopted, arguably undermine the property owner's investment-backed expectations.

The current proposal includes restoration of 1.62 acres of native sand dune habitat on the site in addition to a financial contribution to a mitigation program that is applied to offsite sand dune habitat mitigation. Sand Dune habitat restoration is desirable for ecological sustainability and is not likely to occur should the applicant's proposal be denied in favor of a preservation or restoration alternative.

Based on the above discussion, potential social, economic, and technical considerations surrounding this development include:

- The current condition of the property
- Objectives and investment backed expectations of the property owner
- Native sand dune habitat restoration
- Consistency with the treatment of similarly situated properties in the vicinity
- Cost of Preservation or Project Integration alternatives
- Property tax revenue for government services

CEQA

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared for the project. As a recommending body, the HRRB is asked to find that the mitigation measures for Historic Resources are effective in reducing

the impacts to demolition of the Arthur and Kathleen Connell House.

Prepared by: Mary Israel, Supervising Planner
Approved by: Erik V. Lundquist, HCD Director

The following attachments are on file with Housing and Community Development:

Exhibit A - Draft HRRB Resolution recommending approval to the Planning Commission
(Alternative 9, Reduced Height of the EIR)

Exhibit B - Final EIR for the Signal Hill LLC project (*provided electronically via link below*)

The Final EIR can be found on the Monterey County HCD website at:

www.co.monterey.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/117619/638036931819800000

Exhibit A

This page intentionally left blank.

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

Resolution No. 23-

PLN100338 SIGNAL HILL LLC

Resolution by the Monterey County Historic Resources Review Board (HRRB):

1. Finding the mitigation measures for Historic Resources in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Signal Hill LLC project (SCH No. 2015021054) are effective in reducing the impacts to the demolition of the Arthur and Kathleen Connell House; and
2. Recommending that the Planning Commission approve a Combined Development Permit, consisting of: demolition of a 4,124 square foot single family residence designed by Richard Neutra; construction of a new three level 11,933 square foot single family residence including an attached three-car garage, a 986 square foot entry court, 106 square feet of uncovered terraces, approximately 2,600 square feet of covered terraces, new driveway, and approximately 1,700 cubic yards of grading (1,200 cubic yards cut/500 cubic yards fill) and restoration of approximately 1.67 acre of native dune habitat; Coastal Development Permits to allow development within 100 feet of environmentally sensitive habitat, development on slopes exceeding 30 percent, development within 750 feet of a known archeological resources, Ridgeline Development and removal of three Monterey Cypress trees.

WHEREAS, On November 8, 2010, Massy Mehdipour (applicant) filed with the County of Monterey, an application for a Combined Development Permit consisting of: 1) Coastal Administrative Permit and Design Approval for the demolition of an existing 4,124 square foot single family residence and the construction of a new three level 11,933 square foot single family residence including an attached three-car garage, a 986 square foot entry court, 106 square feet of uncovered terraces, approximately 2,600 square feet of covered terraces, new driveway, and

approximately 2,040 cubic yards of grading (1,210 cubic yards cut/830 cubic yards fill); 2) Coastal Development Permit for development within 100 feet of environmentally sensitive habitat; development includes restoration of native dune habitat in dunes outside the building area; 3) Coastal Development Permit for development on slopes exceeding 30%; 4) Coastal Development Permit for ridgeline development; 5) Coastal Development Permit for development within 750 feet of a known archeological resource; and 6) Coastal Development Permit for the removal of three Monterey Cypress trees;

WHEREAS, the project is located 1170 Signal Hill Road, Pebble Beach (Assessor's Parcel Number 008-261-007-000), Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan; and

WHEREAS, on August 4, 2011, the Historic Resources Review Board (HRRB) for Monterey County voted 7-0 to recommend that the existing house at 1170 Signal Hill Road, which was designed by Richard Neutra for Arthur and Kathleen Connell (the Connell House) appears to be a significant historic resource under Criterion 3 of the California Register of Historical Resources for its architecture; and

WHEREAS, on June 13, 2014, the State Historic Resources Commission determined that the Connell house is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) and as a result of the eligibility for the National Register, the property was listed in the California Register of Historical Resources pursuant to Section 4851(a)(2) of the California Code of Regulations; and

WHEREAS, in or around June 2015, the Connell house was damaged by an act of vandalism. The vandalism damaged the structural integrity of supporting walls. Temporary shoring and weatherization measures, referred to the Mothball Protection Plan, were required to be implemented to stabilize the house while the application for the Combined Development Permit is under consideration. Those measures have been installed and inspected; however, the house has been deemed unsafe by the Building Official and remains unsafe as of January 5, 2023; and

WHEREAS, the application for the Combined Development Permit includes demolition of the Connell House which would address the unsafe condition of the existing structure; and

WHEREAS, demolition of a historic resource (the Connell House) would constitute an adverse environmental impact to the resource and as such, an Environmental Impact Report has been prepared for the project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS, a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was circulated for public review and comment from February 18 to March 20, 2015 (State Clearing House No. 2015021054); and

WHEREAS, comments received on the DEIR have been considered and are responded to in a Final Environmental Impact Report for the project (FEIR); and

WHEREAS, the draft Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was prepared by the County and circulated for decision maker and commenting agency review on November 21,

2022.

WHEREAS, this matter was heard by the Historic Resources Review Board (HRRB) of the County of Monterey on January 12, 2023, pursuant to Chapter 18.25 of the Monterey County Code; and

WHEREAS, the HRRB has considered the FEIR prior to forwarding their recommendation to the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, the HRRB has considered and rejected alternatives to demolition of the Connell house as outlined in the FEIR for the project. Alternative to demolition include “No Project” (Alternative 10), “Preservation” (Alternative 1), and “Project Integration” (Alternative 4); and

WHEREAS, feasible measures are proposed that reduce impacts to historic resources to the extent feasible. These measures are made conditions of approval and include:

- Documentation of the Connell House using the most recent guidelines of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)
- Development of web-based information documenting the history and features of the Connell House

These mitigation measures do not reduce the impacts to a level of insignificance; and

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 Combined Development Permit subject to the following findings:

Finding: HRRB reviewed the proposed Historic Resources Mitigation Measures and found that they mitigate for the impact to the extent feasible though they do not mitigate the impact to a less than-significant level while still allowing demolition, assuming the Planning Commission adopts a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Evidence:

1. Final Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse No. 2015021054) including the Appendix D, Historical Resources background Information, as posted on the HCD website.
2. Appendix F to the Final EIR, demonstrating the economic and physical difficulty of preserving the historic significance of the structure.
3. Objectives and investment-backed expectations of the property owner, which include a desire and plan to demolish the existing structure and build a new structure designed by Ricardo Legorreta.
4. Ecological benefits of approving the project including restoration of native sand dune habitat.
5. Consistency with the treatment of similarly situated properties in the vicinity (Pebble Beach) by allowing redevelopment of the property with a larger custom dwelling.

6. Property tax revenue for government services that will be generated by allowing construction of the proposed dwelling at the site.
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 PLN100338.
8. Information contained in the Mothball Protection Plan applicable to the property, stored in Accela under File Nos. 15CP01861 and 15CP01785.
9. Oral testimony and HRRB discussion during the public hearing and the administrative record.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, it is the decision of the Monterey County HRRB to:

1. Find the mitigation measures for Historic Resources in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Signal Hill LLC project (SCH No. 2015021054) are effective in reducing the impacts to the demolition of the Arthur and Kathleen Connell House; and
2. Recommend that the Planning Commission approve a Combined Development Permit, consisting of: demolition of a 4,124 square foot single family residence designed by Richard Neutra; construction of a new three level 11,933 square foot single family residence including an attached three-car garage, a 986 square foot entry court, 106 square feet of uncovered terraces, approximately 2,600 square feet of covered terraces, new driveway, and approximately 1,700 cubic yards of grading (1,200 cubic yards cut/500 cubic yards fill) and restoration of approximately 1.67 acre of native dune habitat; Coastal Development Permits to allow development within 100 feet of environmentally sensitive habitat, development on slopes exceeding 30 percent, development within 750 feet of a known archeological resources, Ridgeline Development and removal of three Monterey Cypress trees.

In forwarding this recommendation, the HRRB expresses regret for the conditions and circumstances that have made impractical alternatives to the demolition of the Connell House.

Passed and adopted on this **12th day of January, 2023**, upon motion of _____, seconded by _____, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Attest

Philip Angelo, HRRB Secretary

January 12, 2023

Exhibit B

The Final EIR can be found on the
Monterey County HCD website at:
[www.co.monterey.ca.us/home/
showpublisheddocument/117619/63
8036931819800000](http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/117619/638036931819800000)

This page intentionally left blank.