1. Call to Order- 3:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call
   HRC Members: Claudia Sawyer (Chair), Mark Travaille, Joseph Rock (Vice-Chair), Jill Kleiss (Secretary), Wilda Northrop, Mimi Sheridan, Rick Steres

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Approval of HRC Minutes
   a. November 28, 2018 Minutes
      Recommended Action: Approve minutes

5. Public Comments
   a. Written Correspondence
      Communications relevant to HRC jurisdiction, but not related to a matter on this agenda, are attached under this agenda item.
   b. Oral Communications
      Comments from the audience will not receive HRC action. Comments must deal with matters subject to the jurisdiction of the HRC and will be limited to three (3) minutes. Comments regarding agenda items shall be heard prior to the consideration of such items at the time such items are called. Whenever possible, letters should be submitted to the HRC in advance of the meeting.

6. Reports of Council Liaison

7. Items to be Continued or Withdrawn
   None.

8. Consent Agenda
   a. Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 18-0977 for 1213 Funston
      Description: Initial Historic Screening
      Applicant/Owner: Frances Bellows
      CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA
      Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.
      Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory
b. Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 18-0982 for 240 Sinex Ave.
   Description: Initial Historic Screening
   Applicant/Owner: Allan Aaseh
   CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA
   Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.
   Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory

9. Regular Agenda

a. Training on “What is Integrity” in the Context of Guidelines for Evaluation of Potentially Historic Properties

10. Reports of HRC Members

11. Reports of Staff


The City of Pacific Grove does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. City Hall is an accessible facility. A limited number of devices are available to assist those who are deaf or hard of hearing.

GENERAL NOTICE
Please note that Section 65009(b)(2) of the California Government Code provides that legal challenges to the City's action on a project may be limited to only those issues raised in testimony during the public hearing process. HRC will not consider any new items after 9:00 p.m. Any items remaining on the agenda will be continued either to the next regular meeting or to a special meeting at the discretion of HRC. This meeting is open to the public and all interested persons are welcome to attend.

NOTICE TO APPLICANTS
Judicial Time Limits: This serves as written notice that Pacific Grove Municipal Code (PGMC) §1.20.010 incorporates §1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure of the State of California and provides a ninety-day limitation for judicial review of any final administrative decision by the council, or any board, commissioner, or officer of the city.
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1. Called to Order- 3:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call
   HRC Members: Claudia Sawyer (Chair), Mark Travaille, Joseph Rock (Vice-Chair), Jill Kleiss (Secretary), Wilda Northrop, Mimi Sheridan, Rick Steres

   Member Kleiss arrived at the meeting at 3:01 pm and was not present during Roll Call.

3. Approval of Agenda

   Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner, changed the determination criteria from 2A to 1 for item 8D (i.e. 1246 Del Monte Blvd) on the Consent Agenda.

   Upon request by Vice-Chair Rock, item 8B (i.e. 165 12th St) was moved off the Consent Agenda.

   On a motion by Vice-Chair Rock, seconded by Member Steres, the Committee voted 7-0-0 to approve the agenda as amended. Motion passed.

4. Approval of HRC Minutes
   a. October 31, 2018 Minutes
      Recommended Action: Approve minutes

      On a motion by Vice-Chair Rock, seconded by Member Sheridan, the Committee voted 7-0-0 to approve the October 31, 2018. Motion passed.

5. Public Comments
   a. Written Correspondence
      None.

   b. Oral Communications
      None.

6. Reports of Council Liaison
   None.

7. Items to be Continued or Withdrawn
   None.
8. Consent Agenda

Due to a potential conflict on two items, Member Steres recused himself from action on the consent agenda.

a. Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 18-0900 for 636 Sunset Dr
   Description: Initial Historic Screening
   Applicant/Owner: Dustin Conner
   CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA
   Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.
   Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory.

b. Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 18-0909 for 165 12th St
   Description: Initial Historic Screening
   Applicant/Owner: Sefa Isik
   CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA
   Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.
   Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory.

c. Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 18-0914 for 1135 Del Monte Blvd
   Description: Initial Historic Screening
   Applicant/Owner: Rick Steres / Gary & Suzanne Miller
   CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA
   Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.
   Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory.

d. Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 18-0943 for 1246 Del Monte Blvd
   Description: Initial Historic Screening
   Applicant/Owner: Joshua Stewman / Paul & Jennifer Silverglate
   CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA
   Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.
   Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory.

e. Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 18-0958 for 2816 Forest Hill Blvd
   Description: Initial Historic Screening
   Applicant/Owner: Jeff Langham
   CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA
   Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.
   Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory.

Upon request by Vice-Chair Rock, item 8B (i.e. 165 12th St) was moved off the Consent Agenda.

On a motion by Vice-Chair Rock, seconded by Member Northrop, the Committee voted 6-0-0-1 (Member Steres recused) to approve the Consent Agenda as amended. Motion passed.
9. Regular Agenda

a. Previously item 8B on the Consent Agenda

   Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 18-0909 for 165 12th St
   Description: Initial Historic Screening
   Applicant/Owner: Sefa Isik
   CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA
   Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.
   Recommended action: Determine ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory.
   The Committee discussed the item.

   On a motion by Vice-Chair Rock, seconded by Member Steres, the Committee voted 7-0-0 to find 165 12th St ineligible for the Historic Resources Inventory because the property has undergone significant alterations to the primary or most visible façade. Motion passed.

b. Previously item 9a on the Regular Agenda

   Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 18-0919 for 148 Forest Ave
   Description: Initial Historic Screening
   Applicant/Owner: Alan Turpen
   CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA
   Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.
   Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.
   Chair Sawyer opened the floor to public comment.

   Alan Turpen, property owner, spoke

   Chair Sawyer closed the floor to public.

   On a motion by Member Travaille, seconded by Vice-Chair Rock, the Committee voted 7-0-0 to find that a determination of ineligibility could not be made. Motion passed.

c. Previously item 9b on the Regular Agenda

   Initial Historic Screening Request No. IHS 18-0952 for 1661 Sunset
   Description: Initial Historic Screening
   Applicant/Owner: Mark Elstob / King Foundation
   CEQA status: Not a project under CEQA
   Staff reference: Mark Brodeur, Director Community and Economic Development Dept.
   Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.
   Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner, noted the two errata’s that were initiated and emailed pertaining 1661 Sunset Dr.

   Chair Sawyer opened the meeting for public comment. Mark Lord, realtor, spoke on behalf of the project. The Chair closed the meeting for public comment.

   The Committee discussed the item.
On a motion by Member Travaille, seconded by Member Sheridan, the Committee voted 7-0-0 to find that a determination of ineligibility could not be made. Motion passed.

d. Previously item 9c on the Regular Agenda
Architectural Permit and Historic Preservation Permit No. 18-0789 – 307 Congress Ave
Description: A 126 sq. ft. addition to the rear of an existing one-story residence listed on the City’s Historic Resources Inventory. The Historic Preservation Permit includes an exception to continue to allow nonconforming parking and setback conditions.
Zone District/General Plan Designation: R-3 / High Density Residential (29.0 du/ac)
Coastal Zone: No
Historic Resources Inventory: Yes
CEQA status: Exempt per CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15331 and 15301, Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation and Minor Alterations, respectively.
Staff reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
Applicant/Owner: Aaron Tollefson, Applicant
Recommended action: Approve the project subject to the recommended findings, conditions, and Sections 15331 and 15301 CEQA exemption(s).

Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner, provided a brief verbal report.

Chair Sawyer opened the meeting for public comment.

George Piombo, property owner, spoke in favor of the project.

Chair Sawyer closed the meeting for public comment.

The Committee discussed the item.

On a motion by Vice-Chair Rock, seconded by Steres, the Committee voted 7-0-0 to approve Architectural Permit and Historic Preservation Permit No. 18-0789 subject to the conditions as amended:

1. Existing Materials. The project shall retain all existing exterior materials that were not authorized by this permit to be changed. In-kind replacement of materials, in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, is authorized. The steel pole front porch support shall be replaced with an appropriate wood post.

2. Replacement of Front Walk. Pervious materials shall be used when replacing the existing brick front walk.

3. North Side Window Installation. The new addition window shall match existing wood, one-over-one windows.

Motion passed.

10. Reports of HRC Members

Chair Sawyer provided a status update on the Downtown Commercial Design Guidelines project.
11. Reports of Staff

Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner, reported that the initial draft of the HRI Update project document will be available for administrative review by staff and the HRI Advisory Group in early December. Chair Sawyer added that the HRI Advisory Group is scheduled to meet December 12th.

12. Adjourned 4:01 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE.

_________________________________ ____________________
Jill Kleiss, Secretary Date
Address: 1213 Funston Ave APN: 007-565-011
Owner: Frances Bellows Applicant: same

HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE (HRC) RECOMMENDATION:

At the December 19, 2018, HRC meeting, the Committee prepared the following Preliminary Determination of Ineligibility and forwarded the recommendation to the Community Development Director:

☑ Determined to be ineligible as an “Historical Resource,” due to the following criteria:

1. The property has undergone significant alterations to the primary or most visible façade, as evidenced through original plans, photographs or Sanborn maps.
   - ________________ (description of known alteration)
   - ________________ (type of documentation)

2a. The property does not exhibit the architectural characteristics of the styles described in Section 7.3 of the General Plan or Section IV of the Historic Context Statement;

   or

2b. The property does not exhibit unique architectural, site or locational characteristics.

3. The property is not associated with important persons, events or architecture.

☐ Determination of ineligibility cannot be made.

HRC Comments:

______________________________
Claudia Sawyer, HRC Chair

______________________________
Date

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR (CDD) DETERMINATION:

Based on the recommendation above, the CDD Director, or their designee:

☐ Made a determination of ineligibility, which will remain in effect for 10 years from the date of approval.

☐ Found that a determination of ineligibility cannot be made, and a Phase 1 Historic Assessment (DPR 523 Form) is required.

______________________________
Mark Brodeur, CEDD Director

______________________________
Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address:</th>
<th>123 Funston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN:</td>
<td>007-505-011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Will the project create, add, or replace impervious surface?**

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

**Will the project impact any tree(s) on site?**

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

**Applicant:**

- Name: Frances Bellows
- Phone: 510-320-2790
- Email: frbellows@gmail.com
- Mailing Address: 1610 Franklin St, Berkeley CA 94703

**Owner:**

- Name: Application
- Phone: 
- Email: 
- Mailing Address: 

**Permit Request:**

- [ ] CRD: Counter Determination
- [ ] AP: Architectural Permit
- [ ] AAP: Administrative AP
- [ ] ADC: Arch Design Change
- [ ] ASP: Admin Sign Permit
- [ ] SP: Sign Permit
- [ ] UP: Use Permit
- [ ] AUP: Administrative UP
- [ ] ADU: Acc. Dwelling Unit
- [ ] LLA: Lot Line Adjustment
- [x] IHS: Initial Historic Screening
- [ ] HPP: Historic Preservation
- [ ] A: Appeal
- [ ] TPD: Tree Permit W/ Dev't
- [ ] EIR: Environmental Impact
- [ ] VAR: Variance
- [ ] MMP: Mitigation Monitoring
- [ ] Stormwater Permit
- [ ] Other: 
- [ ] Other: 

**CEQA Determination:**

- [x] Exempt
- [ ] Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration
- [ ] Environmental Impact Report

**Review Authority:**

- [ ] Staff
- [x] HRC
- [ ] ZA
- [ ] PC
- [x] SPROC
- [x] CC
- [ ] ARB

**Active Permits:**

- [ ] Active Planning Permit
- [x] Active Building Permit
- [ ] Active Code Violation Permit #:

**Overlay Zones:**

- [ ] Butterfly Zone
- [ ] Coastal Zone
- [ ] Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS)
- [ ] Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESH)

**Property Information**

- Lot: 13
- Block: 13
- GP: MD, (17.476 acres)
- Tract: Del Monte Park
- Lot Size: 4,383 sf

**Staff Use Only:**

- Received by: Aed
- Assigned to: CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE COMMUNITY DEV DEPT

**Received:** NOV 26 2018

**PAID:** $499.28

**Total Fees:** $432
INDEMNIFICATION CONDITION

In consideration for City review and approval of application in this matter, the Owner/Applicant shall indemnify, defend, protect and hold harmless the City, its elected and appointed officials, officers, agents, and employees (collectively "Indemnitees"), using counsel approved in writing by the City, from and against, any and all liabilities, claims, actions, causes of action, proceedings, suits, damages, judgments, liens, levies, costs and expenses of whatever nature, including reasonable attorneys' fees and disbursements which may accrue against Indemnitees by reason of the City's processing, approval or denial of the request and application in this matter. Indemnification shall include, but shall not be limited to any action, or proceeding brought to attack, set aside, void, annul, limit, or inhibit the approval of the application referenced above, and shall expressly include causes of action under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The obligation to indemnify shall include, but not be limited to, all costs relating to preparing administrative records, investigations, responses to discovery, retention of experts, and other costs, including attorney's fees or obligations related to this matter, including actions brought by the Owner/Applicant and also extend to any expense incurred in establishing the City's right to indemnification. City expenses shall be paid by Owner/Applicant upon City request notwithstanding final disposition of the matter has not yet occurred. If the City is later determined to not be entitled to indemnification, the City shall repay amounts so advanced.

This indemnification condition is the Owner/Applicant's inducement to the City to process and approve the application, which approval would otherwise be withheld by City due to its concern for liability or expense that may result from performance of the City's duties. Should any dispute arise regarding interpretation of this condition, the prevailing party shall recover all reasonable costs incurred, including court costs, attorney fees and related expenses. Recovery of expenses shall be as additional costs awarded to the prevailing party, and shall not require initiation of a separate legal proceeding.

This indemnification condition shall not require the Owner/Applicant to indemnify the City or other Indemnities: (a) to the extent that an obligation is actually paid by an insurer pursuant to an insurance policy; (b) in connection with any remuneration paid to the City, if it shall be finally adjudged that such remuneration was in violation of law; or (c) on account of the City's misconduct if such misconduct shall be finally adjudged to have been knowingly fraudulent, deliberately dishonest or willful.

Any permit or other approval given by the City to the Owner/Applicant Guarantor shall be valid only so long as this indemnification condition is given full force and effect. If this indemnification condition is revoked, the permit or other approval of the City shall then become null and void.

Owner/Applicant represents it (and any subsidiary) is (a) duly formed and organized, (b) validly existing and in good standing under state law, and (c) has all necessary power to execute and deliver this document and perform its obligations. Owner/Applicant also represents it is authorized to enter into this agreement by all requisite partnership, corporate or other action, and its terms are a valid and legally binding obligation. Neither execution nor delivery of this document nor performance of its obligations will violate any law or provision of any agreement, articles of incorporation, by-laws or other organizational or governing documents relating to Owner/Applicant, nor conflict with any court order relating to Owner/Applicant.

Applicant Signature: [Signature]  Date: 11-26-18

Owner Signature (Required): [Signature]  Date: 11-26-18
**Planning Permit Fee Calculation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Select</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Permit – Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Architectural Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – no new square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – new square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Historic Screening</td>
<td></td>
<td>$432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Sign Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Permit and Amendments – Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance and Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Variance and Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Permit with Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td>25% of base permit fee or $1,000 whichever is greater plus noticing costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Update Fee</th>
<th>5% of Permit Fee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Exemption Fee</td>
<td>$266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Buffer Zone</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone</td>
<td>25% of Permit Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Special Biological Significance</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area</td>
<td>15% of Permit Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Mailings</td>
<td>$0.48 * (# of Mailings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Herald Ad</td>
<td>$334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County filing fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File maintenance fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Fees:** $432

revised 8/16/2018
City of Pacific Grove  
Community Development Department  
300 Forest Ave., Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Report of Initial Historic Screening

Address 1213 Funston  
APN 007-565-011

Block 13  Lot 13  Date 12/5/18

City of Pacific Grove CDD Office Data:

Assessors Maps Yes  Historic Files Yes
1978 Historic Inventory N/A  1928 Block Files N/A
Assessment files by APN No  Alpha by owner No
Mo. Co. Assessor File 1950  1947-1967 Building Permit register N/A
1966-1972 Building Permit File N/A

Building Permit # 1910  Date 4/25/1977  Project Carport&remodel

Owner Mohammed Berzinji  Builder owner

Building Permit #  Date Project

Owner  Builder

Building Permit #  Date Project

Owner  Builder

Building Permit #  Date Project

Owner  Builder

1
### Heritage Society Barn Materials:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No Records</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>1897</th>
<th>1905</th>
<th>1914</th>
<th>1926</th>
<th>1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanborn Maps</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessors files</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (and Topic) files</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Collection Index</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo. Co. Census 1900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Research Books</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block and Lot Files</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Files by Address</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board and Batten Index</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration 1894</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk Directory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Acres Map 1926</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 Census</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pacific Grove Library Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No Records</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>1897</th>
<th>1905</th>
<th>1914</th>
<th>1926</th>
<th>1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polk Directories 1926 to 1988</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Index Card File</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Microfilm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo. Co Directory 1875</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Register of Mo. Co 1875</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuttle Photo Collection</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Photo Collection</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Steve Honegger, Heritage Society of Pacific Grove
ALL PLUMBING SHALL BE MADE TO CONFORM TO CODES AND STANDARDS.
ALL ELECTRICAL SHALL BE MADE TO CONFORM TO CODES AND STANDARDS.
ALL FRAMING LUMBER TO BE #2 OR BETTER
ALL NAILING AS IN 25-P UBC

PROPOSED CARPORT AND BUILDING RENOVATION

FOR: MOHAMMED BERZINJI
1213 FUNSTON ST, PACIFIC GROVE, CA.
AP#: 7-565-11

DRAWN BY: NEAL O. KRUSE
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APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

ASSessor's No. 7565-11

Location Of Work 1213 Fursten
Lot 13

Owner M. Berizig

Owner Builder Surcharge
A SURCHARGE OF 10% OR $3.00, WHICHVER IS GREATER IS REQUIRED BECAUSE OF THE INCREASED NUMBER OF INSPECTIONS NECESSARY ON OWNER BUILDER PERMITS

Owner Builder Valuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNER BUILDER</th>
<th>VALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SURCHARGE</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMIT FEES</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN CK.</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMIP PENALTIES</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION OF WORK AUTHORIZED

This permit does not include any signs or flood lighting. Grade lines as shown on drawing accompanying this application are assumed to be correct. If actual grade lines are not the same as shown, revised drawings showing correct grade lines, cuts, and fills, together with complete details of retaining walls and wall footings required must be resubmitted to this division for approval. In conformity with the provisions of Section 3800 of the Labor Code of the State of California, applicant shall file with the Building Inspector the certificates, designated in (1) and (2) below and/or shall indicate item (3), (4), or (5) whichever is applicable:

(1) Certificate of Consent of Self-Insured Issued by the Director of Industrial Relations.
(2) Certificate (or exact duplicate copy) of Workmen's Compensation Insurance Issued by an Admitted Insurer

Owner Builder

Warning: Trees on the streets of Pacific Grove are public property and under City control. Permission to remove trees may be obtained only from the City.

This permit expires if the building or work authorized herein is not commenced within 60 days from date of approval, or if work is suspended for a period of 20 days or abandoned after expiration, this permit must be renewed before the work may be commenced again.

Application Approved

Building Inspector
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Address: 240 Sinex  APN: 006-525-009
Owner: Allan Aaseh  Applicant: same

HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE (HRC) RECOMMENDATION:

At the December 19, 2018, HRC meeting, the Committee prepared the following Preliminary Determination of Ineligibility and forwarded the recommendation to the Community Development Director:

☑ Determined to be ineligible as an “Historical Resource,” due to the following criteria:
  ☑ 1. The property has undergone significant alterations to the primary or most visible façade, as evidenced through original plans, photographs or Sanborn maps.
    - ___________________ (description of known alteration)
    - ___________________ (type of documentation)

☐ 2a. The property does not exhibit the architectural characteristics of the styles described in Section 7.3 of the General Plan or Section IV of the Historic Context Statement;
  or
☐ 2b. The property does not exhibit unique architectural, site or locational characteristics.

☐ 3. The property is not associated with important persons, events or architecture.

☐ Determination of ineligibility cannot be made.

HRC Comments:

Claudia Sawyer, HRC Chair  Date

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR (CDD) DETERMINATION:

Based on the recommendation above, the CDD Director, or their designee:

☐ Made a determination of ineligibility, which will remain in effect for 10 years from the date of approval.

☐ Found that a determination of ineligibility cannot be made, and a Phase 1 Historic Assessment (DPR 523 Form) is required.

Mark Brodeur, CEDD Director  Date
**CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE**
Community Development Department – Planning Division
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Tel: 831.648.3190 • Fax: 831.648.3184 • www.cityofpacificgrove.org/cedd

**Permit Application**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address:</th>
<th>APN:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>240 SILEX</td>
<td>006-525-029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Will the project create, add, or replace impervious surface?**
- [ ] Yes
- [X] No

**Will the project impact any tree(s) on site?**
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Applicant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALLAN AASEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>236 7763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:AASEN@CONSTRUCTION.COM">AASEN@CONSTRUCTION.COM</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>915 PUTNAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Owner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Permit Request:**

- [ ] CRD: Counter Determination
- [ ] AP: Architectural Permit
- [ ] AAP: Administrative AP
- [ ] ADC: Arch Design Change
- [ ] ASP: Admin Sign Permit
- [ ] SP: Sign Permit
- [ ] UP: Use Permit
- [ ] AUP: Administrative UP
- [ ] ADU: Acc. Dwelling Unit
- [ ] LLA: Lot Line Adjustment
- [ ] IHS: Initial Historic Screening
- [ ] HPP: Historic Preservation
- [ ] A: Appeal
- [ ] TPD: Tree Permit W/ Dev't
- [ ] EIR: Environmental Impact
- [ ] VAR: Variance
- [ ] MMP: Mitigation Monitoring
- [ ] Stormwater Permit
- [ ] Other: _______________
- [ ] Other: _______________

**CEQA Determination:**

- [X] Exempt
- [ ] Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration
- [ ] Environmental Impact Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Authority:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Permits:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Planning Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Building Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Code Violation Permit #: ________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overlay Zones:**

- [ ] Butterfly Zone
- [ ] Coastal Zone
- [ ] Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS)
- [ ] Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHCA)

**Property Information**

- Lot: 9
- Block: 153
- GP: MD (174.4x46.4)
- Tract: Addition 5
- ZC: R-1
- Lot Size: 4161.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Resources Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeologically Sensitive Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Use Only:**

- Received by: AC
- Assigned to: 

**RECEIVED**

- Received: NOV 29 2018
- Paid: $432.00 + 90.00 + 20.88 = $542.88

**CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE**

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**Page 1 of 2**
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INDEMNIFICATION CONDITION

In consideration for City review and approval of application in this matter, the Owner/Applicant shall indemnify, defend, protect and hold harmless the City, its elected and appointed officials, officers, agents, and employees (collectively "Indemnitees"), using counsel approved in writing by the City, from and against, any and all liabilities, claims, actions, causes of action, proceedings, suits, damages, judgments, liens, levies, costs and expenses of whatever nature, including reasonable attorneys’ fees and disbursements which may accrue against Indemnitees by reason of the City’s processing, approval or denial of the request and application in this matter. Indemnification shall include, but shall not be limited to any action, or proceeding brought to attack, set aside, void, annul, limit, or inhibit the approval of the application referenced above, and shall expressly include causes of action under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The obligation to indemnify shall include, but not be limited to, all costs relating to preparing administrative records, investigations, responses to discovery, retention of experts, and other costs, including attorney’s fees or obligations related to this matter, including actions brought by the Owner/Applicant and also extend to any expense incurred in establishing the City’s right to indemnification. City expenses shall be paid by Owner/Applicant upon City request notwithstanding final disposition of the matter has not yet occurred. If the City is later determined to not be entitled to indemnification, the City shall repay amounts so advanced.

This indemnification condition is the Owner/Applicant’s inducement to the City to process and approve the application, which approval would otherwise be withheld by City due to its concern for liability or expense that may result from performance of the City’s duties. Should any dispute arise regarding interpretation of this condition, the prevailing party shall recover all reasonable costs incurred, including court costs, attorney fees and related expenses. Recovery of expenses shall be as additional costs awarded to the prevailing party, and shall not require initiation of a separate legal proceeding.

This indemnification condition shall not require the Owner/Applicant to indemnify the City or other Indemnitees: (a) to the extent that an obligation is actually paid by an insurer pursuant to an insurance policy; (b) in connection with any remuneration paid to the City, if it shall be finally adjudged that such remuneration was in violation of law; or (c) on account of the City’s misconduct if such misconduct shall be finally adjudged to have been knowingly fraudulent, deliberately dishonest or willful.

Any permit or other approval given by the City to the Owner/Applicant Guarantor shall be valid only so long as this indemnification condition is given full force and effect. If this indemnification condition is revoked, the permit or other approval of the City shall then become null and void.

Owner/Applicant represents it (and any subsidiary) is (a) duly formed and organized, (b) validly existing and in good standing under state law, and (c) has all necessary power to execute and deliver this document and perform its obligations. Owner/Applicant also represents it is authorized to enter into this agreement by all requisite partnership, corporate or other action, and its terms are a valid and legally binding obligation. Neither execution nor delivery of this document nor performance of its obligations will violate any law or provision of any agreement, articles of incorporation, by-laws or other organizational or governing documents relating to Owner/Applicant, nor conflict with any court order relating to Owner/Applicant.

Applicant Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Owner Signature (Required): ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Page 2 of 2
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### Planning Permit Fee Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Select</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Permit – Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Architectural Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – no new square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – new square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Historic Screening</td>
<td></td>
<td>$432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Sign Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Permit and Amendments – Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance and Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Variance and Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Permit with Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td>25% of base permit fee or $1,000 whichever is greater plus noticing costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Update Fee</th>
<th>5% of Permit Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Exemption Fee</td>
<td>$266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Buffer Zone</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone</td>
<td>25% of Permit Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Special Biological Significance</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area</td>
<td>15% of Permit Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Mailings</td>
<td>$0.48 * (# of Mailings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Herald Ad</td>
<td>$334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County filing fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File maintenance fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Fees:**
City of Pacific Grove
Community Development Department
300 Forest Ave., Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Report of Initial Historic Screening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>240 Sinex</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>006-525-004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>12/5/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Pacific Grove CDD Office Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessors Maps</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Historic Files</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978 Historic Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1928 Block Files</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment files by APN</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Alpha by owner</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1966-1972 Building Permit File</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Permit #</th>
<th>2562</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>12/5/1946</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SFD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Stolte Inc.</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>Stolte Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit #</td>
<td>4284</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>8/7/1984</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>2nd story addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Alan and Karen Aasen</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit #</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit #</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
Heritage Society Barn Materials:

Assessors files | N/A | Property Files by Address | No
Name (and Topic) files | N/A | Board and Batten Index | Yes
Photo Collection Index | N/A | Voter Registration 1894 | N/A
Mo. Co. Census 1900 | N/A | Polk Directory | N/A
Howard Research Books | N/A | Grove Acres Map 1926 | N/A
Block and Lot Files | N/A | 1900 Census | N/A

Pacific Grove Library Data

Polk Directories 1926 to 1988 | N/A | Historic Index Card File | N/A
Newspaper Microfilm | N/A | Mo. Co Directory 1875 | N/A
Greater Register of Mo. Co 1875 | N/A | Tuttle Photo Collection | N/A
Library Photo Collection | N/A

Comments:

Steve Honegger, Heritage Society of Pacific Grove
# Application for Building Permit

**City of Pacific Grove**

**Assessor's No.:**

**Lot:**

**Block:**

**Contractor:**

**License #:**

**Address:**

**Eng./Arch.:**

**License #:**

**Address:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECEIPT NO.</th>
<th>STORIES</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SITE DIMENSIONS &amp; AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SET BACKS IN FEET</th>
<th>COVERAGE DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRONT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allowed**

**Existing**

**New**

**TOTAL**

---

**Type of Improvement:**

- [ ] Build
- [ ] Remodel
- [ ] Add to
- [ ] Repair
- [ ] Alter

**Inspection Dates:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setback Foundation Fencing</td>
<td>10-12-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Fencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Service Panel</td>
<td>4-1-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough Electric</td>
<td>3-18-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Fault Circuit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician - No Rough Wiring Until This Space Signed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vents & Fire Stops:**

- Electric Service Panel
- Rough Electric
- Ground Fault Circuit
- Electrician - No Rough Wiring Until This Space Signed

---

**Pour No Concrete Until Above Has Been Signed:**

- Concrete, Forms & Reinforcement
- Concrete, Block & Paving
- Fireplace & Chimney
- Framing - Floor
- Rough Plumbing
- Gas Piping
- Rough Heating
- Rough Electrical

**Inspection Dates:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete, Forms &amp; Reinforcement</td>
<td>8-10-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete, Block &amp; Paving</td>
<td>10-12-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing - Wall &amp; Partition</td>
<td>3-70-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing - Roof</td>
<td>3-10-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheathing - Roof</td>
<td>3-10-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing - Fixtures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Heater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Appliances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Fixtures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Appliances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Pressure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Pressure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Meter Authorized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Meter Authorized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pour No Floor Until Above Has Been Signed:**

- Concrete, Forms & Reinforcement
- Concrete, Block & Paving
- Foundation
- Framing - Wall & Partition
- Framing - Roof
- Sheathing - Roof

**Inspection Dates:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete, Forms &amp; Reinforcement</td>
<td>8-10-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete, Block &amp; Paving</td>
<td>11-10-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing - Wall &amp; Partition</td>
<td>3-70-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing - Roof</td>
<td>3-10-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheathing - Roof</td>
<td>3-10-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing - Fixtures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Heater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Pressure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Meter Authorized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Meter Authorized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OK To Occupy:**

**Final Inspection:**

**Date:** 5-10-87

---

**Valuation:**

- Fees
- PERMIT
- PLAN CHK.
- SMIP.
- TOTAL

---
# CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

## BUILDING PERMIT

Issued pursuant to the Building and Zoning Ordinance of the Municipal Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 440</td>
<td>4th Add</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Improvement</th>
<th>Out buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>4 4/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Rooms</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 4/6</td>
<td>33 1/2&quot; x 33 1/6&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set Back—Front Street</th>
<th>Side Street</th>
<th>Side Yds.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>5'-1</td>
<td>3'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floors</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Chimneys</th>
<th>Toilets</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gable</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chancel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Permit is granted upon the condition that the undersigned owner or builder agrees to comply with all State and Local Laws and Ordinances covering the location, construction and use of buildings. This permit may be revoked upon violation of any of said provisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Builder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Fee of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5000.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: Dec 5, 19 |

Permit No: 2542 |

Building Inspector: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sketch of Lot</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Real Estate</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Personal Prop.</th>
<th>Exemption</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st Nat Bank
At this point you may be wondering where the existing Old Bath House Restaurant came from. In 1949, the city built a municipal bath house on Lovers Point on the former site of the large auditorium, which can be seen in the center of the photo on page 6. At the same time, the little snack bar was built close to where the original bath houses were located. The snack bar remains unchanged today, but the bath house has changed considerably since 1949. On Saturday, July 9, 1949, the new $60,000 municipal bath house was formally opened by Mayor Chapman along with the architect Robert Jones and the contractor Fred Stolte. The building featured a fountain-lunch counter restaurant operated by Charles Bremer and his partner Maynard Monette on the top deck of the bath house. A
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III. GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION

The following section reviews themes significant to the developmental history of Pacific Grove and defines major property types that are representative of these themes. The section concludes with general guidelines for evaluating properties for the national, state, and local register.

A. Summary of Significant Themes

The Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement utilizes themes and periods of development as its primary organizing principle. “Themes” are ways to organize and understand information about events, activities, people, communities, and patterns of change that have influenced historic and cultural development of an area. The National Park Service revised its framework for historic themes in 1994, replacing a more chrono-centric approach with themes intended to capture “the full diversity of American history and prehistory.” This historic context statement discusses the following themes relative to the growth and evolution of the built environment in Pacific Grove:

- Residential Development
- Commercial Development
- Civic Growth
- Transportation & Infrastructure
- Ethnic & Cultural Diversity
- Social, Religious, or Cultural Institutions, Movements & Trends
- Recreation, Leisure & Tourism
- Development & Booster Organizations
- Environmentalism

These themes contribute in varying degrees to the Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement, and are manifested in different ways throughout the city’s history. These themes are discussed more specifically as they relate to each of Pacific Grove’s six periods of development.

RELATING THEMES WITH PERIODS OF DEVELOPMENT

The periods of development in this context statement combine specific timeframes with themes that encompass related events, patterns of settlement and construction, activities of people important to the area, and the socioeconomic changes. Each of the periods of development is also associated with specific property types that originated within or characterize the period. The periods of development also represent the potential periods of significance for properties associated with the respective contexts. A period of significance is the time span during which a property (or property type) attained its historic significance.
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Map showing distribution of properties constructed during each period of development
(Page & Turnbull)
The periods of development utilized for the Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement have been developed by Page & Turnbull in consultation with the Historic Context Statement Subcommittee, as well as staff from the City of Pacific Grove Community Development Department. These periods are as follows:

- **Native American & Mission Periods (to 1820)**
  The dominant themes of this period are the pre-historic settlement of the Pacific Grove area; the Spanish colonization of the area and subsequent formation of the Monterey and Carmel missions; and the tensions that developed between the Native American and European cultures.

- **Mexican & Early American Periods (1821 - 1872)**
  The primary themes of this period are the redistribution of land in Northern California and the subsequent decline of the mission at Carmel; the establishment of a Chinese fishing village at Point Alones; and land acquisition by entrepreneur David Jacks.

- **Early Development of Pacific Grove (1873 - 1902)**
  The dominant themes of this period are the early development of the city as the Pacific Grove Retreat and the Retreat’s subsequent transition from a summer encampment to a city (creation of water, sewage, and transportation infrastructure and emergence of residential, commercial, and civic development patterns). The impact that development companies such as the Pacific Grove Retreat Association and the Pacific Improvement Company had on the built environment was important during this period, as was the influence of the Chautauqua and other social and religious organizations on the culture and character of the city. Other themes that emerged during this period included the development of recreational facilities and promotion of the area as a tourist attraction and the contributions of the Chinese fishing village to local culture.

- **Pacific Grove Comes of Age (1903 - 1926)**
  The primary theme of this period is the maturation of the city, as evidenced by construction of new civic facilities, the arrival of large-scale commercial development along Lighthouse Avenue, and the use of new architectural styles and building materials. Other notable developments included the redevelopment of the beach area at Lovers Point into a fully-developed tourist destination, the destruction of the Chinese fishing village and subsequent redevelopment of China Point, as well as the end of the Chautauqua gatherings. The creation of Del Monte Properties as a successor firm to the Pacific Improvement Company and its influence on the sale of lots and development of subdivisions would also become an important force during this era. Finally, the growing influence of the private automobile is a theme that can be seen in commercial, light industrial, and residential development patterns.
City of Homes (1927 - 1945)
The dominant themes of this period are recreation and tourism, the Great Depression, and World War II. Specifically, this period saw new public ownership and management of the city’s key recreational facilities, the rise of auto camps as a significant part of the city’s tourist infrastructure, the protection of natural resources via acquisition of the city’s coastline and the passing of the “butterfly ordinance,” and the improvement of recreational facilities as part of Depression-era work programs. The influence of Monterey’s Cannery Row operations on Pacific Grove would also prove to be a major factor.

Suburban Expansion (1946 - 1965)
The preeminent theme of this period is the post-war growth of the city, reflecting the corresponding dominance of the automobile. This included expansion of civic infrastructure to accommodate population growth; construction of single-family residences in new subdivisions that departed from the original grid layout of streets; the build-out of older subdivisions where development had been sparse; construction of multi-family residences; infill and redevelopment of the central business district and Lovers Point; and the continued impact of automobiles, including clearance of older buildings for parking lots. The proliferation of hotels and motels also demonstrated changes in the city’s tourist industry.

B. Summary of Property Types

Each period of development has one or more associated property types that help illustrate the period’s significant themes. Property types that are discussed in this document are defined as follows:

- **Residential properties** include single-family dwellings, duplexes, flats, and apartments. Single-family dwellings are by far the most common property type in the city, while multi-unit buildings are comparatively rare. In Pacific Grove, single-family residences can be further classified into several sub-types: tent cottages, cottages, bungalows, grander residences, and tract houses. Boarding houses, hotels, motels, and auto courts are also considered to be a residential property type for the purposes of this study.

- **Commercial properties** are those with commercial spaces on all floors; buildings with retail space on the ground floor and office space above; or mixed use buildings that feature retail space on the ground floor and dwelling space above.

- **Industrial properties** include any building where things are made, stored or repaired. In addition to factories and warehouses (which have always been scarce in Pacific Grove), industrial properties may also include buildings such as stables, auto-repair shops and garages, water works and electric substations.
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Institutional properties may include libraries, courthouses, post offices, schools, churches, hospitals, social halls and union halls. Recreational facilities, such as youth centers and the complex at Asilomar would also fall into this category. These buildings are typically larger and more ornate than other property types, are associated with a particular group or organization, and were designed to serve a public or civic function.

Cultural landscapes may include landscape elements or collections of landscape elements, because the physical history of a place like Pacific Grove can be told through more than just its buildings. A cultural landscape could be an entire designed landscape such as a park or cemetery, or could be composed of individual elements such as site features (e.g., fences, walls, etc.), public terraces, street furnishings (e.g., lights and benches), and circulation patterns.

Archeological resources, if discovered, are likely to be significant, but analysis of these resources is outside the scope of this document.

Each section of this context statement identifies associated property types, provides a description of their character and distribution, and outlines the requirements for resource registration.

C. Evaluation Criteria

The following discussion of significance and integrity generally guides the property types analysis found in later chapters of this document, and should be used to support future evaluation of historic resources in Pacific Grove. It is important to note that each property is unique; therefore significance and integrity evaluation must be conducted on a case-by-case basis. These guidelines should be implemented as an overlay to the particular facts and circumstances of each individual resource.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES & CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The National Register of Historic Places is the nation’s most comprehensive inventory of historic resources. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service and includes buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level. According to National Register Bulletin Number 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, resources over fifty years of age are typically eligible for listing in the National Register if they meet any one of the four criteria of significance (A through D) and if they sufficiently retain historic integrity. However, resources under fifty years of age can be determined eligible if it can be demonstrated that they are of “exceptional importance,” or if they are contributors to a potential historic district. These criteria are defined in depth in National Register Bulletin Number 15. The California Register of Historical Resources.
Resources follows nearly identical guidelines to those used by the National Register, but identifies the Criteria for Evaluation numerically.

The four basic criteria under which a structure, site, building, district, or object can be considered eligible for listing in the National or California registers are:

- **Criterion A/1 (Event):** Properties associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

- **Criterion B/2 (Person):** Properties associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

- **Criterion C/3 (Design/Construction):** Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction; and

- **Criterion D/4 (Information Potential):** Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.¹¹

A resource can be considered significant to American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture on a national, state, or local level. Perhaps the most critical feature of applying the criteria for evaluation is establishing the relationship between a property and its historic context, which is defined as “those patterns or trends in history by which a specific occurrence, property, or site is understood and its meaning (and ultimately its significance) within history or prehistory is made clear.”¹²

**CRITERIA CONSIDERATIONS**

Certain types of properties are usually not considered for listing in National Register. However, these properties can be eligible for listing if they meet special requirements, or Criteria Considerations. If working with one of these excluded property types, an evaluator must determine that a property meets the Criteria Considerations in addition to one of the four evaluation criteria described above in order to justify its inclusion in the National Register. These considerations are defined as follows:

- **Criteria Consideration A:** Religious Properties: A religious property is eligible if it derives its primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance.

- **Criteria Consideration B:** Moved Properties: A property removed from its original or historically significant location can be eligible if it is significant primarily for
architectural value or it is the surviving property most importantly associated with a historic person or event.

Criteria Consideration C: Birthplaces & Graves: A birthplace or grave of a historical figure is eligible if the person is of outstanding importance and if there is no other appropriate site or building directly associated with his or her productive life.

Criteria Consideration D: Cemeteries: A cemetery is eligible if it derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events.

Criteria Consideration E: Reconstructed Properties: A reconstructed property is eligible when it is accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan and when no other building or structure with the same associations has survived. All three of these requirements must be met.

Criteria Consideration F: Commemorative Properties: A property primarily commemorative in intent can be eligible if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own historical significance.

Criteria Consideration G: Properties that Have Achieved Significance within the Past Fifty Years: A property achieving significance within the past fifty years is eligible if it is of exceptional importance.13

The California Register does not have the same strict Criteria Considerations as the National Register, and is more flexible about moved properties and properties less than fifty years of age.

HISTORIC RESOURCES INVENTORY (HRI)

The eligibility criteria for local listing in the City of Pacific Grove’s Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) are similar to the National Register and California Register criteria described above. Specifically, as described in the City of Pacific Grove’s Historic Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code §23.76.025), the evaluation criteria for inclusion in the Historic Resources Inventory are as follows:

a. Whether the structure has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the city of Pacific Grove, the state of California, or the United States;

b. Whether it is the site of a significant historic event;

c. Whether it is strongly identified with a person who, or an organization which, significantly contributed to the culture, history or development of the city of Pacific Grove;

d. Whether it is a particularly good example of a period or style;
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**e.** Whether it is one of the few remaining examples in the city of Pacific Grove possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen;

**f.** Whether it is a notable work of an architect or master builder whose individual work has significantly influenced the development of the city of Pacific Grove;

**g.** Whether it embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship that represent a significant architectural innovation;

**h.** Whether it has a unique location or singular physical characteristics representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or of the city of Pacific Grove;

**i.** Whether it retains the integrity of the original design;

**j.** Whether it contributes to the architectural aesthetics and continuity of the street;

**k.** Whether it is located within a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic properties which visually contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically. [Ord. 01-25 § 1, 2001; Ord. 97-23 § 1, 1997].

**COMPARISON WITH NATIONAL & STATE CRITERIA**

Although phrasing differs, the designation criteria established by City of Pacific Grove’s HRI for the Historic Resources Inventory are similar in spirit to the National Register and California Register criteria described above. In all cases, historic resources may be significant for their association with events, social and cultural trends, important people, architecture, and/or master architects. Thus, the evaluations presented throughout this document for eligibility in any of the three registers will use a consistent approach.

**CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 133**

California Assembly Bill 133 (AB 133), passed in 1994, allows religious institutions to exempt themselves from local historic preservation laws. A religious institution may object to the application of a local ordinance to its property if the institution publicly claims that designation will suffer substantial economic hardship or will impede the use of the property in the furtherance of its religious mission. Evaluators should be aware of this exemption when considering religious properties for inclusion in the HRI. However, please note that AB 133 does not apply to state law, and therefore religious institutions may still be required to prepare Environmental Impact Reports under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**INTEGRITY**

In addition to qualifying for listing under at least one of the National Register/California Register/local criteria, a property must be shown to have sufficient historic integrity. The concept of integrity is essential to identifying the important physical characteristics of historic resources and in evaluating adverse changes to them. Integrity is defined as “the authenticity of an historic resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance.” The same seven variables or aspects that define integrity—location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association—are used to evaluate a resource’s eligibility.
for listing in the National Register and/or the California Register. According to the National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, these seven characteristics are defined as follows:

- **Location** is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred. The original location of a property, complemented by its setting, is required to express the property’s integrity of location.

- **Design** is the combination of elements that create the form, plans, space, structure and style of the property. Features which must be in place to express a property’s integrity of design are its form, massing, construction method, architectural style, and architectural details (including fenestration pattern).

- **Setting** addresses the physical environment of the historic property inclusive of the landscape and spatial relationships of the building(s). Features which must be in place to express a property’s integrity of setting are its location, relationship to the street, and intact surroundings (e.g., neighborhood or rural).

- **Materials** refer to the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern of configuration to form the historic property. Features which must be in place to express a property’s integrity of materials are its construction method and architectural details.

- **Workmanship** is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history. Features which must be in place to express a property’s integrity of workmanship are its construction method and architectural details.

- **Feeling** is the property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. Features which must be in place to express a property’s integrity of feeling are its overall design quality, which may include form, massing, architectural style, architectural details, and surroundings.

- **Association** is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property. Features which must be in place to express a property’s integrity of association are its use and its overall design quality.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) discusses another definition of integrity relative to proposed development projects, noting that projects that cause a substantial adverse change to the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment. According to Section 15064.5(b)(1) of the Public Resources Code, “Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource
would be materially impaired.” In order to avoid significant adverse effects, evaluators should look closely to see whether a project “Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources, or…a local historical register.”

EVALUATING INTEGRITY IN PACIFIC GROVE

For evaluation purposes, a building ultimately either possesses integrity or does not. While it is understood that nearly all properties undergo change over time—and thus minor alterations or changes are not uncommon—a building must possess enough of its original features to demonstrate why it is significant. Evaluators of potential historic resources should look closely at characteristics such as massing, roof forms, fenestration patterns, cladding materials, and neighborhood surroundings when evaluating a property’s integrity.

In order to convey its historical significance, a property that has sufficient integrity for listing in the national, state, or local historical register will generally retain a majority of its character-defining features. However, the necessary aspects of integrity also depend on the reason the property is significant. High priority is typically placed on integrity of design, materials, and workmanship for properties significant under Criterion C/3, while for properties significant under Criterion A/1 or B/2, these aspects are only necessary to the extent that they help the property convey integrity of feeling and/or association. Similarly, integrity of location and setting are crucial for properties significant under Criterion A/1, but are typically less important for properties significant under Criterion B/2 or C/3. For properties significant under any of these criteria, it is possible for some materials to be replaced without drastically affecting integrity of design, as long as these alterations are subordinate to the overall character of the building. For example, minor alterations such as window replacement may be acceptable in residential districts, but not in an individual property designed by a master architect.

Evaluations of integrity should also include some basis of comparison. In other words, the evaluator should understand the relative levels of integrity associated with each property type. For instance, increased age and rarity of the property type may also lower the threshold required for sufficient integrity. Conversely, some properties may rate exceptionally highly in all aspects of integrity; such properties should be given high priority in preservation planning efforts, and are more likely to be eligible for listing in the National Register. Generally, a property with exceptional integrity will have undergone few or no alterations since its original construction, and will not have been moved from its original location.

Finally, it should be stressed that historic integrity and condition are not the same. Buildings with evident signs of deterioration can still retain eligibility for historic listing as long as it can be demonstrated that they retain enough character-defining features to convey their significance.
(e) The committee shall meet no less frequently than once a month.

(f) Powers and duties of the committee shall be as follows:

(1) Determination of additions and deletions from the historic resources inventory, per PGMC 23.76.030;

(2) Architectural and historic permits for structures listed on the historic resources inventory per PGMC 23.70.070;

(3) Other duties as set out in this chapter or as directed by the city council.

(g) An affirmative vote of a majority of the total members of the historic resources committee shall be required for any action by the committee. [Ord. 17-023 § 2, 2017; Ord. 02-30 § 13, 2002; Ord. 01-25 § 1, 2001; Ord. 97-23 § 1, 1997].

23.76.025 Evaluation criteria.
The following criteria shall be utilized to assess a historic property's inclusion in the National and/or California Register and local city historic resources inventory as required in this chapter:

(a) Whether the structure has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the city of Pacific Grove, the state of California, or the United States;

(b) Whether it is the site of a significant historic event;

(c) Whether it is strongly identified with a person who, or an organization which, significantly contributed to the culture, history or development of the city of Pacific Grove;

(d) Whether it is a particularly good example of a period or style;

(e) Whether it is one of the few remaining examples in the city of Pacific Grove possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen;

(f) Whether it is a notable work of an architect or master builder whose individual work has significantly influenced the development of the city of Pacific Grove;

(g) Whether it embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship that represent a significant architectural innovation;

(h) Whether it has singular physical characteristics uniquely representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or of the city of Pacific Grove;

(i) Whether a resource with historical or cultural significance retains historic integrity. [Ord. 17-023 § 2, 2017; Ord. 01-25 § 1, 2001; Ord. 97-23 § 1, 1997].

23.76.030 Historic resources inventory historic determination – Additions and deletions.

https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/PacificGrove/#!/PacificGrove23/PacificGrove2376.html#23.76.025
The Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement (HCS), approved by the City Council on October 19, 2011, identifies development patterns and significant property types within the city. It is intended to be used as a tool to better understand and evaluate the city’s historic resources.

The HCS is organized as follows:

- **Section I. Introduction** provides basic project information and outlines research methodology.
- **Section II. Previous Surveys, Studies and Reports** summarizes previous historic resource survey work in Pacific Grove.
- **Section III. Guidelines for Evaluation** provides an overview of the various national, state, and local registration requirements; a summary of significant themes; a definition of each of the major property types found in the city; and guidelines for evaluating the significance and integrity of these properties.
- **Section IV. Historic Context** includes a narrative of the area’s developmental history. This history is broken into six periods that are defined by events, themes, and development trends. Property types associated with each of the six periods are identified and analyzed. The information in this section does not provide any determinations of eligibility, but rather can be used as a reference point when questions arise regarding a property’s significance and integrity.

Under separate cover is a document entitled “Pacific Grove Preservation Program Considerations,” which includes a discussion of potential research topics, survey efforts, designation priorities, and other preservation strategies that the City could undertake, if desired. These recommendations are intended to help prioritize future historic preservation related efforts, and are suggested as “next steps” for the City to consider.

The City of Pacific Grove has already taken several critical steps to protect its historic resources, including the adoption of a Historic Preservation Ordinance (PGMC §23.76), the creation of a Historic Resources Inventory (HRI), the establishment of a Historic Resources Committee (HRC), and the inclusion of historic preservation goals in the City’s General Plan (See Section II of the Historic Context Statement for a complete overview of Pacific Grove’s existing historic preservation program). The Pacific Grove HCS is designed to work with these existing plans and policies to improve the evaluation of the city’s potential historic resources.

The Pacific Grove HCS does not replace the City’s current Historic Assessment (HA) process, which is required in order to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Instead, the Pacific Grove HCS provides useful information to aid in the preparation of Phase I HAIs by qualified consultants, potentially reducing the time and cost involved. Using the HCS as a foundation for Phase I HA will help to strengthen and accredit the HRI, which currently includes approximately 1,300 buildings. The HCS will also be very helpful to the HRC when reviewing Initial Historic Screenings, and should be used as a reference point when questions arise concerning the significance or integrity of individual properties. On the following page is a flow chart illustrating how the HCS might be used to help evaluate the potential historic significance of a building.
HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT: PROPERTY EVALUATION CASE STUDY

The Pacific Grove HCS can help decision-makers, city staff, property owners, real estate agents, architects, and members of the community understand whether or not a particular property qualifies as a significant historic resource. The HCS does not evaluate individual properties, but rather provides the tools with which to make decisions about significance and integrity on a case-by-case basis.

The Pacific Grove HCS does not replace the City’s current Historic Assessment process, which is required in order to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Instead, the HCS will provide useful information to aid in the preparation of Phase I Historic Assessments by qualified consultants, potentially reducing the time and cost involved. The HCS will also be very helpful to the Historic Resources Committee, and should be used as a reference point when questions arise concerning the significance or integrity of individual properties.

Take the following example of a Tudor Revival-style residence constructed in 1925:

1. During which period of development was this property constructed?
2. What are the significant themes from this period?
3. What property types are associated with this period of development?
4. Does the subject property have the character-defining features of an architectural style?
5. Is the property significant (events, trends, people, or architecture)?
6. Does the property retain integrity?
7. Is the subject property a qualified historic resource?

The flow chart at the left helps illustrate how one might use the Pacific Grove HCS to help evaluate its significance.

Whether or not the subject property is found to be a qualified historic resource, the information in the Pacific Grove HCS will support and inform the decision.
**Frequently Asked Questions**

**What is a Historic Context Statement (HCS)?**
An HCS is a specialized historic study. It focuses on the physical development of a city—how and why it developed, what types of properties characterized that development, and whether or not they may be historically significant. An HCS identifies significant themes, patterns and property types, so that interested parties can recognize the forces that shaped the built environment over time. This provides a framework that helps for the identification, evaluation, and treatment of historic resources.

**What is not included in an HCS?**
A context statement is a summary or synthesis of a city’s physical history. It is not intended to be a comprehensive community history or chronology, nor does it evaluate the significance or eligibility of individual properties.

**Who uses the HCS?**
The HCS may be used by anyone! It is intended to help decision-making bodies, City staff, architects, building owners, residents, and other interested members of the community recognize and plan for historic resources in Pacific Grove.

**Can the HCS tell me when my property was built?**
Generally speaking, the HCS does not provide specific construction dates. However, it can help you focus on the period when your property was constructed. By reading about the property types and architectural styles that are associated with each period of development, you should be able to make an educated guess about when your property was built.

**Where can I learn more about the history of my property?**
For those interested in learning more about Pacific Grove’s history, we suggest visiting the Pacific Grove Heritage Society, Pacific Grove Public Library, Pacific Grove Museum of Natural History, Monterey Public Library (California Room), and California Historical Society. Primary sources you may want to reference include Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, newspaper articles, city directories, census data, and historic photographs. Secondary sources include books and publications, GIS maps, previous historical reports and survey documentation, and internet sources. Local historian Donald Howard provides exceptionally detailed accounts of Pacific Grove’s early development in his book, *The Old Pacific Grove Retreat 1875 – 1940*, which should be considered a primary reference for research on Pacific Grove.

**What are Sanborn maps, discussed often in the HCS?**
The Sanborn Map Company was founded in 1867 by Daniel Alfred Sanborn, a surveyor from Massachusetts. These richly detailed maps—showing building footprints, construction materials, and land uses—were originally created to help insurance companies estimate fire insurance liability. Sanborn Maps were produced for thousands of urbanized areas across the country, and were updated regularly until the 1950s. Today, the maps are publicly available in a variety of physical and digital formats, and are an essential tool for all historians.

**Why does the historical information end in the 1960s?**
Generally speaking, properties must be at least 50 years old before they can be listed in a historic register, and thus the HCS concentrates on the city’s history until the late 1960s. However, a few events and persons from the recent past were briefly mentioned to extend the life of the document, and ensure that it remains useful in the future.

**A photo of my property appears in the HCS. Does this mean it is historically significant?**
Not necessarily. The photos in the HCS are intended to support the text descriptions, or to provide examples of property types. However, just because a photo of a building appears in the HCS does not automatically mean that the property is historically significant.
Will the HCS place restrictions on my property?
No. The HCS in an informational document that integrates with existing plans and policies. It is designed to help building owners, planners, and other interested parties evaluate the potential historic significance of a property, but does not directly result in official designations, development restrictions, or other limitations. The California Environmental Quality Act and the Pacific Grove Historic Preservation Ordinance (PG Municipal Code Chapter 23.76) are the regulatory documents that guide the treatment of historic resources in Pacific Grove.

Will the HCS affect my property tax?
No. The HCS is an informational document and will not be used for tax assessment purposes. It is also worth noting that concern about negative economic effects is often raised when discussing historic preservation. However, many studies have shown a direct correlation between the creation of historic preservation programs and policies and a long-term increase in property values.

Does the HCS replace the current Historic Assessment Process?
No. The City’s current Historic Assessment process is required in order to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The HCS will provide useful information to aid in the preparation of Phase 1 Historic Assessments by qualified consultants, potentially reducing the time and cost involved. The HCS will also be very helpful to the City’s Historic Resources Committee, and should be used as a reference point when questions arise concerning the significance or integrity of individual properties.

Where can I find the HCS?
Electronic copies are available at:
www.ci.pg.ca.us/cdd

Reference copies are available at:
Pacific Grove Library
550 Central Avenue

and

Heritage Society Barn
605 Laurel Avenue

Hard copies may be purchased at:
Pacific Grove Community Development Department
City Hall, 2nd Floor, 300 Forest Avenue

For more information on the Historic Context Statement and accompanying Preservation Program Considerations, please contact a planner in the Pacific Grove Community Development Department, at (831)648-3190.
INTRODUCTION

Criterion "B" of the National Register Criteria for Evaluation states that properties may be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places if they "are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past." Persons significant in our past are those whose activities have been important to the communities in which they are located, to the history of their state, or to the nation as a whole. The National Register generally defines "the past" as that period earlier than fifty years ago, but more recent properties may qualify for listing if they possess exceptional significance.

Three steps are involved in determining whether or not a historic property meets Criterion B through association with an important person. Each of these steps must be addressed in the registration form in order to meet National Register documentation standards.

1. Determine the importance of individuals associated with the property being evaluated by gathering information on their lives and on the broader historical context within which they may have made a significant contribution.

2. Determine the length and nature of a significant individual's relationship to the property under study and to other historic resources; then decide why the property is an important representation of that person's accomplishments.

3. Assess the historic integrity of the resource; that is, determine if the property retains enough authentic historic character to convey its significant associations or qualities.

The following guidelines are intended to assist anyone preparing National Register documentation to follow the steps enumerated above. They fall roughly into three categories, with some overlap. Guidelines 1—5 deal primarily with evaluating the significance of a person under National Register criteria. Those numbered 6—9 emphasize the evaluation of a property's association with that individual. Numbers 10 and 11 are general standards that must be applied to all properties after assessing the significance of the person and the resource.

Examples follow the discussion of each guideline, representing types of arguments and documentation that the National Register finds acceptable or not acceptable to justify significance under Criterion B. These examples, excerpted from nominations submitted to the National Register, quote only the essence of each argument and important contextual information, not all of the information that may have been provided in the original nomination. Comments follow each example to clarify the way in which it illustrates the guideline under which it is cited.

The use of actual nominations has resulted in certain biases appearing in the examples. The vast majority of individuals discussed in the examples are male Caucasians, and most are businessmen or politicians. This reflects the fact that women, minorities, and historical themes other than commerce and politics/government have not been well-represented in nominations submitted to the National Register. There are also few properties associated with scoundrels, or others whose influence has been negative, but historically important nevertheless. We hope that reviewing this bulletin will encourage State and Federal Historic Preservation Officers to nominate properties that represent a wider variety of individuals and historical themes.

As of August 1988, there were 8366 properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places for significance under Criterion B. This number represents approximately 16 percent of the total number of listings in the National Register. Of the properties listed for associations with important persons, over half possess local significance. The homes of individuals comprise the vast majority of the properties listed under Criterion B, with the next four most common functional types being workplaces, agricultural resources, educational institutions, and religious facilities.

Most properties nominated for associations with significant persons also are nominated for other reasons, as indicated by the fact that almost two-thirds of the properties nominated under Criterion B are significant in the area of architecture as well as for the area in which the individual(s) achieved recognition. The other most common areas of significance for these properties are politics/government, commerce, social history, exploration/settlement, and industry.*