

CITY OF CHULA VISTA
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Commission Meeting

December 4, 2013

4:45 p.m.

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

<p style="text-align: right;">2</p> <p>1 A P P E A R A N C E S</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 Commissioner Stillman, Chair</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 Commissioner Danielson</p> <p>6 Commissioner Fink, Co-Chair</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 Commissioner Fodioli</p> <p>9 Commissioner Shanehare</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 Commissioner O'Neal</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">4</p> <p>1 experts in historic preservation related fields. All</p> <p>2 HPC members have been appointed by the Mayor and serve</p> <p>3 the City without pay.</p> <p>4 The HPC serves as the authority on historic</p> <p>5 preservation matters and advises council and other</p> <p>6 City boards and commissions on historic preservation</p> <p>7 matters as needed. The action of the HPC on most</p> <p>8 matters is final, unless an appeal is filed. Appeals</p> <p>9 must be filed within ten business days after the date</p> <p>10 of the decision. The HPC members have reviewed all of</p> <p>11 the written information, which has been provided in</p> <p>12 advance.</p> <p>13 Members of the public may address the HPC on</p> <p>14 any matter that is on the agenda, or on items under</p> <p>15 consideration, or excuse me, on items under the</p> <p>16 Commission's jurisdiction not on the agenda by</p> <p>17 completing the speakers slip form and submitting it to</p> <p>18 the HPC secretary.</p> <p>19 In attendance at HPC meetings are the City</p> <p>20 of Chula Vista staff members who provide the HPC with</p> <p>21 analysis and recommendations for the requests being</p> <p>22 presented. We appreciate your attendance and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">3</p> <p>1 P R O C E E D I N G S</p> <p>2 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: We'll call the regular</p> <p>3 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission, the</p> <p>4 City Chula Vista to order at 4:05. Rosemarie, would</p> <p>5 you please call roll.</p> <p>6 SECRETARY: Commissioner Danielson.</p> <p>7 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON: Present.</p> <p>8 SECRETARY: Commission Fink.</p> <p>9 COMMISSIONER FINK: Here.</p> <p>10 SECRETARY: Commissioner Fodioli.</p> <p>11 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: Here.</p> <p>12 SECRETARY: Commissioner O'Neal. Commission</p> <p>13 Shanehare.</p> <p>14 COMMISSIONER SHANEHARE: Here.</p> <p>15 SECRETARY: And Chair Stillman.</p> <p>16 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Here. For the benefit</p> <p>17 of the audience and the applicants I'd like to make a</p> <p>18 few introductory remarks. The Historic Preservation</p> <p>19 Commission, otherwise known as the HPC, is comprised</p> <p>20 of seven members, seven citizens. Each HPC member has</p> <p>21 an interest, competence and knowledge in historic</p> <p>22 preservation. And four of the members are considered</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">5</p> <p>1 participation in this meeting. Let's call for the</p> <p>2 consent calendar, please, Secretary Rosemary.</p> <p>3 SECRETARY: There's nothing on it.</p> <p>4 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Well, there's one.</p> <p>5 Declaration excuse. Oh, none, okay. I just like to</p> <p>6 follow procedure. Do we have any members of the</p> <p>7 public who wish to speak to any item under the</p> <p>8 jurisdiction of the this Commission but not on the</p> <p>9 agenda? I see none. We'll move onto the action item.</p> <p>10 Staff will be presenting the consideration of historic</p> <p>11 eligibility of the Sears building.</p> <p>12 COMMISSIONER FINK: Good afternoon Honorable</p> <p>13 Commissioners. For your consideration this afternoon</p> <p>14 is the Sears historical eligibility. To give you a</p> <p>15 little bit of background, you may recall that the City</p> <p>16 conducted a survey starting in 2011, and we had the</p> <p>17 survey public review and comment period from September</p> <p>18 19th to October 3rd. Where prior to that all owners</p> <p>19 that were determined to be eligible historical</p> <p>20 resources were contacted via a service that their</p> <p>21 property was determined eligible, and that they were</p> <p>22 welcome to come to the Historic Preservation</p>

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

6	<p>1 Commission meeting on September 19th or October 3rd. 2 As well as we had a website set up, a link and our 3 email information on our website available for public 4 comment and any other additional information that 5 owners would like to provide us. They did have that 6 opportunity for that two-week period of time. 7 And then in June 2013 Sears came forward 8 with an expert technical analysis. And in your staff 9 report you'll see we did have some prior contact with 10 Sears asking what the implications were of the 11 eligibility determination and that type of thing. But 12 had never received any formal documentation from them 13 until June 2013. At such time they provided an expert 14 technical analysis that was conducted by Heritage 15 Architecture. And then in September 2013 conducted 16 their reevaluation based on the information that was 17 provided in Heritage Architecture's expert technical 18 analysis. And we'll call that an ETA for the rest of 19 our presentation. 20 So in the 2012 survey the first thing that 21 we did is establish a local historic context. And 22 there were three periods of significance that were</p>	8
7	<p>1 identified through that process. The first being the 2 community building period, which was from 1870 to 3 1910. The second being the City development economy 4 period, 1911 to 1939. And the City maturation period 5 from 1940 to 1970. Sears falls within that City 6 maturation period of the historic context. And Sears 7 was actually recommended to ASM through the public 8 input process. We had an extensive public input 9 process that's separate from the public comment 10 process. It was part of phase one where we held 11 public workshops, sent out information, had a public 12 input forum available on our website where people 13 could provide staff and/or the consultant with 14 information on resources that may not have fallen into 15 our scope, based on assessor records, or by a 16 windshield survey. So we actually obtained quite a 17 bit of recommendations from the public and Sears was 18 one of them to be looked at further in the phase two 19 part of the survey. 20 So ASM did look at sears in phase two of the 21 historical resources survey, and they did determine 22 that Sears was an eligible historical resource. And</p>	9
6	<p>1 they found that to be the case for criteria one for it 2 being a significant event, specifically for the 3 commercial development aspect of the resource, and in 4 criteria three for architecture, the modern style. 5 One of few here in the City. And I'm going to turn it 6 over to Shannon with ASM, and she will go over the 7 analysis of the presentation. 8 SHANNON: Hello Commissioners. Heritage 9 Architecture is going to be presenting their findings 10 in depth in a moment. But we just wanted to give you 11 a brief overview that they recommended the building 12 not eligible in their ETA. They felt strongly that 13 the character defining features of the building had 14 been altered to the point that it had lost all over 15 integrity. Those are bulleted here for you in the 16 slide, those specific defining features. They also 17 noted the closure of 5th Avenue as part of a change to 18 the setting. They felt the building was not one of 19 the last or best examples in Chula Vista, and that it 20 was not an 'exceptionally important work of the master 21 architects, Stiles and Robert Clements. 22 We took the report that they provided with</p>	8
7	<p>1 all the additional information and reevaluated the 2 building. As you may recall, the scope of the 3 information that we were able to research for each of 4 the buildings that we evaluated during the 5 recognizance phase one and phase two surveys was not 6 to the degree that an individual ETA can provide. So 7 we certainly reviewed all the information they 8 provided. And, again, continue to stand by a 9 recommendation that it is eligible under criteria one 10 for its important association with the commercial 11 development of Chula Vista during the City maturation 12 period. 13 We also stand behind our recommendation that 14 it is eligible as a significant modern building in 15 Chula Vista. Modernism is arguably the most important 16 architectural stuff of the 20th Century. Chula Vista 17 has very few examples of this style. In fact, less 18 than .05 percent, I believe, are found in the City. 19 And so that means any modern architecture in Chula 20 Vista is a rare example. So we only recommended 6 21 buildings total of the 12,000 that looked at eligible 22 as commercial for modern style.</p>	9

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

10	<p>1 We also found that the information that</p> <p>2 Heritage Architecture was able to provide on the</p> <p>3 architects, which hadn't been able to research,</p> <p>4 actually really compelling, and that this is the only</p> <p>5 example of these master architects in Chula Vista.</p> <p>6 And so we would also recommend it additionally under</p> <p>7 criteria three for its association as a unique local</p> <p>8 work of master architects.</p> <p>9 Lastly, we feel that the building continues</p> <p>10 to retain submission integrity. And I think that's</p> <p>11 the real issue here, does the building have enough</p> <p>12 integrity to continue to convey its associations? And</p> <p>13 while it has lost some integrity of materials and</p> <p>14 design and craftsmanship because some of the elements</p> <p>15 that have been removed, it retains enough of its</p> <p>16 integrity that we feel it continues to convey</p> <p>17 historical significance. Especially when you consider</p> <p>18 this in light of the few examples of this type in</p> <p>19 Chula Vista, in which the National Register, which has</p> <p>20 provided the guidance on evaluating integrity, allows</p> <p>21 for more loss of integrity when your example is a rare</p> <p>22 example. And that's the case here.</p>	12
11	<p>1 One of the litmus tests that generally the</p> <p>2 Register and many of us employ is if you were someone</p> <p>3 who had been associated with the building during its</p> <p>4 period of significance, so since you attended the</p> <p>5 opening of Sears in 1966, if you were standing in</p> <p>6 front of it today, would you continue to recognize it?</p> <p>7 And I think we would all agree that the answer is yes.</p> <p>8 And that generally is sort of the litmus test of</p> <p>9 whether or not a property retains integrity. So back</p> <p>10 to you, right.</p> <p>11 COMMISSIONER FINK: So with that said, so</p> <p>12 taking ASM's reevaluation into consideration, as well</p> <p>13 as the information provided by Heritage Architecture,</p> <p>14 staff would recommend that they Commission take no</p> <p>15 action and does not change the eligibly status for the</p> <p>16 Sears building.</p> <p>17 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Thank you very much</p> <p>18 staff. Let me just go around the Commissioners and see</p> <p>19 if they have any questions or comments of our staff.</p> <p>20 And we'll start with Commissioner Danielson.</p> <p>21 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON: Thank you very</p> <p>22 much</p> <p>for all the information that you presented to us. I</p>	13
10	<p>1 mean it was very thorough, and I enjoyed reading about</p> <p>2 it and learning more about the commercial history of</p> <p>3 Chula Vista. I did a little research regarding Sears</p> <p>4 and designated properties. And I learned that you</p> <p>5 have had other buildings that you've had designated.</p> <p>6 And the one that I found most interesting was the one</p> <p>7 in Santa Monica. And I was just curious if you are</p> <p>8 designated, do you have any plans to enhance the</p> <p>9 building that would maybe create it back to a more,</p> <p>10 what's the word I want, to have the integrity of the</p> <p>11 building look more like the Clements architecture that</p> <p>12 he was famous for?</p> <p>13 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Ms. Danielson, we were</p> <p>14 just going to ask staff if you have any questions on</p> <p>15 their report.</p> <p>16 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON: Oh, I'm sorry.</p> <p>17 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: We'll have an</p> <p>18 opportunity to engage with the applicant in just a</p> <p>19 second. But it was a good question.</p> <p>20 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON: Okay, thank you.</p> <p>21 Sorry.</p> <p>22 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: And designation is not</p>	12
11	<p>1 being considered. We're simply discussing the</p> <p>2 question of was the original ASM eligibility status</p> <p>3 correct?</p> <p>4 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON: Oh, okay. Well, I</p> <p>5 don't have any comment regarding that at this time.</p> <p>6 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Thank you. Commissioner</p> <p>7 Shanehare.</p> <p>8 COMMISSIONER SHANEHARE: Is this on?</p> <p>9 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: You've got to punch it.</p> <p>10 COMMISSIONER SHANEHARE: Is this on now?</p> <p>11 Thanks. I agree with the Sears people and not with</p> <p>12 the staff report. I think the building is not</p> <p>13 historically significant and it was wrong to put it on</p> <p>14 the survey list. Chula Vista Center should be on the</p> <p>15 list. And I think I, in fact, recommended that Macy's</p> <p>16 and the main structure of the Chula Vista Center be</p> <p>17 added. For some reason they cut it in two, they chose</p> <p>18 to put Sears on, which is not important historically,</p> <p>19 and to ignore Macy's. So I see no reason why we have</p> <p>20 to bother with Sears. Now, the Sears parking lot is</p> <p>21 another question. We'll get into that maybe later.</p> <p>22 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Thank you very much,</p>	13

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

14	<p>1 Commissioner Shanehare. Commissioner Fodiodi. 2 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: I've been reading the 3 report pretty quickly. 4 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Can you speak into your 5 microphone. 6 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: And I want to thank 7 Beth and Shannon for being thorough with their 8 examination. And I'd like to hear what the other 9 party has to say. 10 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Thank you very much, 11 Commissioner Fodiodi. Vice Chair Fink. 12 COMMISSIONER FINK: No comments right now, 13 no. 14 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Thank you. And 15 Commissioner O'Neal? 16 COMMISSIONER O'NEAL: I'm trying to 17 understand how you got to the fact that it still 18 retains enough of its original. I mean the footprint 19 by in large is the same, but I don't see a whole lot 20 of the fathat still exists in 1966 when I was there to 21 see it open. So it's what I said, it's always 22 disconcerting when a building that was constructed</p>	16
15	<p>1 while I was high school is considered possibly 2 historical. So I'm just trying to get a better sense 3 of it. Yes, you stood in front of it today you know 4 it's a Sears, because there's a bloody great sign that 5 says Sears on it. But the context is very much 6 different, particularly with the closing of 5th and 7 higher deck down. The fahas pretty dramatically 8 changed, except possibly on the eastern side. So I'm 9 just trying to get to what is it there that you think 10 really is the original. 11 COMMISSIONER SHANEHARE: Well, I'm not 12 disagreeing that there have been some loss in 13 materials. But I think that enough of what was 14 originally there remains. It still as its original 15 form, its scale, its massing, two-story form with no 16 windows on the upper floor. Yes, those plate glass 17 windows have been lost, or perhaps only boarded over. 18 I don't think anyone's been able to investigate that 19 to see if they're still there or not. That's 20 certainly something that could be restored. 21 Integrity is a very subjective issue. And 22 part of the reason for that is that it allows for some</p>	17
	<p>1 loss of integrity so that buildings can be restored 2 and brought back to their original state. And I think 3 this is a perfect example of one of those kind of 4 cases where we definitely have some loss of integrity. 5 But I think that there's enough of those materials. 6 There's certainly still the canopies. There have been 7 some, again, some intrusions to the canopies. But the 8 mirror wall panels remain. I could go on. But I 9 think the crux of my opinion is that there is enough 10 that remains, and with restoration even it could be 11 brought back, that that's part of the purpose when you 12 step back and think about preservation in general that 13 we do this, is so that there can be these buildings 14 that are retained, and when there is loss of fabric it 15 can be restored. So that's why there is some 16 allowance for some loss of integrity and buildings can 17 still be eligible. 18 COMMISSIONER O'NEAL: So if then I put 19 forward the Broadway building, the out parcel in that 20 one that is the four stories, which is probably closer 21 intact the way it looked, what would your feeling be 22 on that, or staff?</p>	
	<p>1 SHANNON: I wanted to clarify that we did 2 not include Macy's, simply because we didn't think it 3 was old enough and we didn't have the right 4 information. And I think that it should be 5 reevaluated, and I do think it's very likely eligible. 6 But that is just a gut. But I have not gone to 7 further research or done an actual survey of it. 8 COMMISSIONER O'NEAL: All right, that's all 9 I have for staff right now. 10 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Thank you Commissioners. 11 I have four speakers' slips here. And I understand 12 Sears and Heritage Architecture is present today. I 13 understand I also have a presentation. So we'd be 14 happy to hear exactly what you have to say. 15 MR. MARSHALL: I appreciate that. Do you 16 mind turning this on? 17 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: It doesn't seem like 18 it's on. 19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Somebody up here does 20 that. 21 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Oh. Let's see, 22 microphones.</p>	

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

18	<p>1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, I don't think you do 2 it. The City Clerk does. 3 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Okay. 4 MR. MARSHALL: There we go. All right, very 5 good. Well, I'm pleased to be here in front of the 6 Commissioners. My name is David Marshall, I'm the 7 lead principal, the President of Heritage Architecture 8 and Planning. We're located in downtown San Diego. I 9 actually held a seat similar to yours for the City of 10 San Diego. For six years I was on the City's 11 Historical Resources Board, so I understand the 12 process and I appreciate your volunteer efforts. 13 I'm usually out speaking in front of people 14 in support of designation, because that's kind of what 15 we do as an architecture firm, is we restore historic 16 buildings. But at the same time I recall when I was 17 on the San Diego Board that it was a balance between 18 making sure, well, first of all you want to make sure 19 you want to make sure you got it right. But second of 20 all you want to make sure that you were being 21 conservative enough so you weren't letting something 22 slip through. But at the same time it was important</p>	20
19	<p>1 to have the threshold of what it means to be historic 2 at a certain level. Because if you start lowering 3 that threshold you start diluting what is really truly 4 historic. And that was something that I didn't want 5 to do either. Because people's understanding and 6 appreciate of historic buildings could be lessened if 7 you lessen that threshold. 8 So I'm here to present and we have our 9 PowerPoint up. Just to focus on primarily the 10 integrity issue. And I know ASM, I know Shannon, and 11 we've worked with City staff before. In fact, in 2002 12 we worked with Chula Vista staff to help put together 13 the Chula Vista Historic Planning Program, which 14 eventually became your Board. So we feel it's very 15 important to have this process. But it is true also 16 that people could look at the same information and 17 have different opinions. And that's understandable. 18 It is a subjective item. But I will explain to you as 19 best as I can how we came to the conclusion. 20 Because when Sears first approached us we 21 told them from the very start that we may not give you 22 the answer you want. We're going to do the research,</p>	21

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

22	<p>1 Macy's, which was originally Marston's, but it became 2 Broadway I think within the first year, Broadway was 3 built three and half years earlier. And actually is, 4 we think, a better architectural example. So we don't 5 think that argument is strong. And we also feel that 6 the integrity issue is also important in consideration 7 of criteria three.</p> <p>8 And I just want to point out that when I was 9 on the City's board, the way we looked at association 10 with an architect or a builder is did the building 11 still retain enough integrity to represent their work? 12 An analogy I've used before is it's like a Martin 13 Scorsese movie. If another director took over and 14 changed out, recast the part, and changed the music, 15 and reedited the movie, is it still a Martin Scorsese 16 movie? Is it representative of his work? And we feel 17 that the degree of remodels has removed this building, 18 or reduced its integrity to a significant degree.</p> <p>19 Orientation wise, I think you're all 20 familiar with the Center. And the red area is showing 21 the footprint of Sears and the Auto Center. Just a 22 little bit about the building history. Stiles and</p>	24
23	<p>1 a significant degree of building materials from the 2 original period to be considered maintaining its 3 significance. Also under criteria one they talk about 4 location setting, feeling and association are the most 5 important of those criteria.</p> <p>6 Under criteria three architecture and master 7 architect. Again, they refer to significant degree of 8 building materials should be intact. And also they're 9 talking about high degree of design material and 10 craftsmanship are the most important related to 11 criteria three.</p> <p>12 This is National Register Bulletin 15, which 13 talks about how to apply the criteria, especially for 14 integrity. And, again, must retain essential physical 15 features. Design, workmanship, materials are more 16 important that setting feeling and association when 17 you're referring to architecture. One thing it talks 18 about is it's not enough to convey the massing of the 19 building, which we think Sears still does. It has to 20 relate to the features that once characterized the 21 style. And it's those features that have been 22 primarily the lost portions of the building.</p>	25
23	<p>1 Clements Architects, and the address. A few dates, 2 the two yellow dates are the key dates. The first one 3 is the grand opening of the Center in '62. And the 4 last date is the grand opening of Sears three and half 5 years later. So, again, it's part of that overall 6 period of history, but it's not the first.</p> <p>7 These are just a list of some of the 8 exterior alterations that occurred. Basically from 9 '79 through 2003. These are all exterior issues. The 10 main one is the 1980s, the postmodern remodel where 11 the canopies were added, and the columns were 12 thickened. And I'm sure it had a pretty exuberant 13 paint color at that time. It was done by the same 14 firm that did Horton Plaza, Jurdy Associates. And it 15 was Chula Vista's attempt to kind of I guess take 16 advantage of the postmodern style that was popular at 17 the time. Unfortunately, it did a lot to change the 18 look of the Sears building.</p> <p>19 Obviously integrity is an important issue. 20 You're all familiar, I think, with the seven aspects 21 of integrity. I'll talk about those later. Under 22 criteria one they talk about the building must retain</p>	<p>1 And then there was a mention earlier that 2 some of the elements could be restored and brought 3 back. And I have no disagreement with that. In fact, 4 that's what my architectural firm does. But for the 5 purposes for evaluating integrity, you're not supposed 6 to consider what the building could be, you're looking 7 at what the building is right now. And we don't know 8 that anyone will ever restore those features. So 9 that's really your mission is to look at what the 10 current condition is.</p> <p>11 And, again, the talk about the visual 12 quality. If there's something that's covered over, if 13 it's not visible it's not under consideration. We 14 assume that all the stone that used to be on the 15 exterior of the building is gone, but it may be under 16 layers of plaster. But regardless, it's not really 17 something that is supposed to be considered at this 18 point, because it's not visible.</p> <p>19 Loss of integrity of design, I'll just 20 quickly go through this. You've already heard the 21 display windows are gone, signage is gone, entries, 22 columns have been clad, there's new entry features,</p>

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

26	<p>1 the garden center has been completely renovated, lot 2 of postmodern features have been added. Those are all 3 related to design. Setting, the determination of 5th 4 Avenue is a big issue. As well as it used to be a 5 standalone building, and it's now been glommed onto 6 with the rest of the Center, I think as you know. The 7 storefront, well, materials, a lot of the original 8 materials, including the engraved push plates and 9 things like that that are shown drawings, and the 10 stone cladding, those are all gone. And then the 11 issue of feeling, we feel that the fact that not only 12 5th Avenue being closed, but it being attached to the 13 rest of the Center has really given it a different 14 feeling. We think association is still there, but we 15 think feeling has been sacrificed. 16 I know you've seen these in our report, and 17 hopefully you got a color copy of it. But I want to 18 point out that everything you see orange is what is 19 either missing or obscured from the original building. 20 And we were able to get the original drawing, which 21 was very helpful for this analysis. Most of the areas 22 you see are either stone that used to be very</p>	28
27	<p>1 prominent right at the ground level, which has been 2 removed, as well as signage. Again, storefront, 3 stone, signage, things like that. But you can see the 4 degree, in some of these elevations it's more than 5 half of what's visible. Especially down where the 6 public sees it most, at ground level. 7 The original competition of the Center 8 you can see here in this aerial photo. Where Sears is 9 is the dirt area you see, it hasn't been built yet. 10 And it was across the street. This is after Sears had 11 been constructed, obviously in red there. And it 12 shows how it was separated from the rest of the 13 Center. And in the next image you will see what it is 14 today. So we think that's why they setting and the 15 feeling of Sears no longer being an independent piece 16 has been sacrificed, or at least lessened 17 Just some images of some of the key elements that we 18 think have changed. You can see those entry pieces, 19 the postmodern that are quite prominent. In fact, 20 they may be the most prominent feature. They're not 21 original, they're from the 80s. There's a close up 22 view of one of them. The upper paneling you see on</p>	29
	<p>1 the right-hand side, the aluminum or metal perforated 2 panel is an original features. It's one of the few 3 areas with some of the original decorative elements on 4 it. You could see the fins down below on the canopy, 5 those were added in the 80s. They liked triangles in 6 the 80s, I guess. This is showing, it's the close up, 7 the plaster area on the lower part of the photo, that 8 used to be all a display window. That's all been 9 stuccoed over. 10 This is the eastside. You can see the 11 signage is gone and you could see the little plant- 12 ons, as well as the thicker columns you see there. 13 They took what were very slender, modern, very light 14 construction, kind of these floating horizontals, now 15 have these really beefy columns that more than triple 16 the size, the diameter of the original columns. 17 This is where they have the vaults. The 18 vaults are a nice element. But they used to be a 19 floating feature, like a wing. And you can see what 20 the heavy column really does to that whole feeling. 21 Is it reversible? Yes. But that's really, you're not 22 supposed to be thinking about what could be reversed,</p>	

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

30	<p>1 mentions here in the National Register Bulletin. When 2 you're trying to identify a rare example you look at 3 what other examples could be used that are similar. 4 And also you need to consider that when you're 5 evaluating whether something is truly rare or 6 significant. 7 So here we have the Broadway building, and 8 I'll call it Macy's from this point forward, around in 9 yellow. You could see it's part of the original 10 Center. It's three and a half years old. It was on 11 the end of that long central spine. So it was what 12 you saw when you were standing in the main mall 13 circulation space. And it's still there. Now, when 14 we did a little research into not only Macy's, but the 15 whole Chula Vista Shopping Center it was completed in 16 '62, the architect was Charles Lechman and Associates, 17 a very significant architectural firm out of Los 18 Angeles. That's Mr. Lechman on the cover of Time 19 Magazine. Now, there aren't too many architects that 20 have been on the cover of Time Magazine. Also, his 21 family owned, I guess, Pepsodent toothpaste, and they 22 were famous for some other reasons. But he was a very</p>	32	<p>1 concrete block, but you see that floating entry 2 canopy, there was at least three of those. One of 3 them is quite a bit larger than that. They used 4 bronze trim in detailing, and there's even a cove 5 terrazzo wall base next to those faux stone panels. 6 The only impacts I saw to this building as far as 7 integrity were there were some one-story retail 8 structures that were built up on the outside of it. 9 Which to me looked like they could be removed in the 10 future. But the original building is still there. 11 And it's very prominent to the Center. In fact, it's 12 in the middle of the Center as it stands today. 13 We wanted to do an apples to apples 14 comparison, because these buildings are three and a 15 half years apart, they used similar materials. This 16 is the example of how they used concrete masonry 17 block. Macy's on the left and Sears on the right. 18 Sears isn't known for its use of cutting edge 19 architecture or design. They were very much kind of 20 the working man's type department store. And when the 21 Broadway or Marston's before that was built there was 22 definitely a lot more attention to detail and kind of</p>
31	<p>1 significant individual, and his association with the 2 Chula Vista Shopping Center, and in particular Macy's 3 we think is important. You could see two other 4 buildings that he was involved in, LAX and Madison 5 Square Garden, The Forum in Los Angeles, it's a long 6 list. This is a very significant architect. 7 This is Macy's as it stands today. In fact, 8 this is from yesterday. Everything you see in this 9 photo, except for the signage and the cell phone 10 antennas is original historic fabric. The lower 11 panels have been painted, they used to be kind of a 12 brown color of a faux stone. But that's all original 13 fabric. And the pattern block you see behind it, it's 14 dirty, but it's never been painted. A nice power wash 15 would get it back to its original look. So that was 16 nice to see. 17 I want to point out the level of detail that 18 this architect put on the building, which is we think 19 above and beyond what Sears building is. If you're 20 looking for a good example of this type of 21 architecture. I love modernism, and I think this is a 22 great example. Not only can you see the patterned</p>	33	<p>1 a high style modernism. You may agree that both of 2 the buildings are historic, and we would understand 3 that view. But we think that if you're going to 4 compare the two, we have the list of characteristics 5 on the left there. By the way, those aren't our 6 opinion, all of those are factual statements about one 7 is older than the other. Both have what we would 8 consider master architects associated with them. But 9 when you talk about integrity being intact, you talk 10 about more ornate moderate, exuberant modern style, 11 and the use of high end materials, as well as being 12 the anchor of the original center, that's all in favor 13 of the Broadway and Macy's building. So there we are 14 with the comparison. And however you find Sears, you 15 need to be considering Macy's. And it sounds like it 16 may be included in a future study. 17 So just concluding here, of the seven 18 aspects of integrity here, the ones you see in yellow 19 are the ones we felt the Sears building no longer 20 complied with or no longer had enough of to consider. 21 Obviously the location is the same, that's not 22 impacted. And the association with the shopping</p>

Capital Reporting Company
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

34	<p>1 center is still there, although it's second phase 2 association. But when you talk about design setting 3 with the road being gone, it being attached to with 4 the rest of the mall, the materials, the workmanship 5 to the materials, and also the feeling of the building 6 no longer being an isolated standalone building, we 7 feel that all of those have been reduced to a level of 8 making the building not historic. 9 The last sentence there a quote. And, 10 again, it's talking about it's not eligible if it 11 retains some basic features conveying massing, which 12 Sears does, but has lost the majority of features that 13 once characterized its style. We think of all the 14 things you need to remember, that's the key phrase. 15 It's not about massing, it's not about whether the 16 Sears name is still on it, it's about whether the 17 features that characterize its style and the work of 18 the master architect are still there. And we felt 19 that there wasn't enough there, unfortunately. In the 20 70s maybe, but today no. 21 And then lastly we're asking that, we know 22 staff has said they're not asking for a vote, but we</p>	36
35	<p>1 would like there to be a determination by this Board 2 that Sears is not a historic resource, potentially 3 historic or otherwise, and that the survey be updated 4 to reflect that. I would also like the survey to be 5 updated to reflect the rest of the shopping center and 6 the Macy's, which we now know more about. That's the 7 conclusion of our presentation. And we're here to 8 answer any questions. Thank you. 9 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Thank you, Mr. Marshall. 10 I got that right didn't I, Marshall? 11 MR. MARSHALL: Yes. 12 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: I got that right. If 13 you want to stay there. Are we going to entertain any 14 questions? I think maybe we'll start with 15 Commissioner Danielson again. She had a question. 16 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON: Well, I'm just 17 curious, when you pick a comparison property, Macy's 18 building owner hasn't come forward for designation, 19 have they? 20 MR. MARSHALL: No. But neither has Sears. 21 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: And we're not 22 considering designation.</p>	37

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

38	<p>1 buildings in the gas line corridor. But it had been 2 really bastardized. But during the Hard Rock Hotel it 3 was agreed to incorporate that in the project and 4 restore it back to the way it looked. And we were the 5 architects on the that project. And after it was 6 restored, using historic images and otherwise, it was 7 brought back to the Board and designated an added to 8 the gas line corridor as a contributor to the historic 9 district. So it's possible to do that.</p> <p>10 And I just wanted to highlight the idea that 11 something can be restored isn't enough to designate it 12 in its current condition. It means that after that 13 work is done it's eligible, but not before that work 14 is done. So that was why I was using that as an 15 illustration. Again, I don't expect Sears to be 16 restoring it to the way it looked in 1966, but it's 17 feasible.</p> <p>18 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: And Commissioner 19 Danielson, this is not a project. There is no 20 discussion of designation. We are simply reviewing --</p> <p>21 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON: I understand.</p> <p>22 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: I just wanted --</p>	40	
39	<p>1 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON: But I just wanted 2 to be clear on what he was saying.</p> <p>3 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: That's good. I just 4 want to be sure that we have clarity that the 5 objective of tonight's meeting is to determine whether 6 Chula Vista's survey designating this as eligible is 7 correct.</p> <p>8 LYNETTE: Chair Stillman, if I may just 9 clarify the difference between a survey and 10 designation also. So eligibility versus designation. 11 A survey process does not require owner consent. So 12 it's just the City's ability to account for what 13 potential historical resources we have. And then from 14 that point the property owner would be informed and 15 they could give us more information if we didn't have 16 all the information, that type of thing, that then 17 would afford them the ability to make the decision, I 18 want to come forward for designation or not. So we do 19 have eligible historical resources that the property 20 owners may never come in for designation. So it's 21 just our way to know what we have. And we really find 22 it a useful tool for both preservation purposes. And</p>	<p>1 also on the other end for when somebody wants to come 2 in for a project, if they were identified as not being 3 historic, not being eligible, it saves them the time 4 and effort to have to go through that process once 5 they come in for a project. So it is important that 6 we continue to try to identify those resources that 7 are historic, as well as those that are not. And then 8 designation, of course, is owner driven completely.</p> <p>9 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON: Right, I 10 understand.</p> <p>11 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Thank you, Lynette. 12 Commissioner Danielson, do you have any other?</p> <p>13 COMMISSIONER DANIELSON: No, that was it. I 14 just was making sure I understood.</p> <p>15 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Thank you. Commissioner 16 Shanehare.</p> <p>17 COMMISSIONER SHANEHARE: No, I have no 18 questions. I think it was a good report. Thank you 19 very much for presenting that. I think we should 20 correct this mistake.</p> <p>21 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Commissioner Fodiodi. 22 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: I'd like to ask you a</p>	41

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

42	<p>1 survey. Our only mission was to look at Sears in 2 context and address that issue. And that's why we 3 thought that Macy's was a fair issue or a fair topic 4 for discussion. 5 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: But that kind of went 6 against your premises. Because the street dissected 7 the properties. And it has a different feeling now by 8 having this connection as well, by having the two rows 9 of the mall building and circling Macy's building. So 10 I still don't understand why Macy's building was 11 included, because it's not part of the survey, it was 12 not part of the survey. But that was your choice. 13 It's like you're trying to tell us that Macy's is a 14 better example. 15 MR. MARSHALL: Well, that was one of my 16 points. But it's just for comparison purposes is the 17 reason we did it. 18 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: But it's a four-story 19 block. 20 MR. MARSHALL: It's what? 21 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: It's a four-story 22 block by several hundred feet in size, just a block</p>	44	<p>1 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: Oh, it's not part of 2 the complex of Sears? 3 MR. MARSHALL: It is. It wasn't identified 4 individually, it was just called Sears. So we don't 5 know if the Auto Center was included or not. 6 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: When we look at the 7 elevations, and you did your job by making them brown 8 or orange, can you tell me if you have the square 9 footage of the wall elevation? You have like the 10 renovated part of how many square feet versus the 11 overall elevation and square footage. The way I see 12 it the above elevation, the upper elevation, what 13 would you guess it is, percentage of renovation? 14 MR. MARSHALL: In this particular view? 15 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: Yes, the upper. 16 MR. MARSHALL: It's probably about 60 17 percent. 18 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: What? 19 MR. MARSHALL: The upper two levels are 20 about 60 percent probably, 60 to 70 percent. 21 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: No, I'm talking about 22 the one that was renovated.</p>
43	<p>1 house. And Sears is an elegant long building with some 2 straight lines, very modern type of architecture for 3 the century. It's a totally different building. And 4 I still don't understand it's like comparing apples to 5 oranges. I mean there's a certain feel to Sears when 6 you walk around the entire circumference of the 7 building. If you look at the elevation you still see 8 the integrity of the original architectural style. 9 Can we look at the slides that show the elevation of 10 the building? 11 MR. MARSHALL: Am I able to go backwards on 12 this, or you can do that? 13 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: The front elevation, 14 the side elevation, that was the original. Right 15 here. No, let's go back right here. So if I 16 understand right 17 -- 18 MR. MARSHALL: That's the Auto Center. 19 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: Well, yeah, isn't the 20 Auto Center part of your -- 21 MR. MARSHALL: It wasn't identified 22 separately, it was built at the same time.</p>	45	<p>1 MR. MARSHALL: Well, if you want to back up 2 one slide I think it shows the -- 3 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: Okay. The bottom 4 part is renovated, right, the orange? 5 MR. MARSHALL: Yes. 6 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: Okay. What is the 7 percentage of that? 8 MR. MARSHALL: That's in orange? 9 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: Yes. 10 MR. MARSHALL: It varies. I would say on 11 average it's probably maybe in the 40 percent range, 12 maybe 35, maybe 45. 13 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: Right. And you know 14 as an architect that the threshold for saving a 15 structure is about 50 percent. Let's say if you were 16 in the City of San Diego, a new building on the coast, 17 the coastal development permit says the threshold is 18 about 50 percent of walls to remain. So you're saying 19 that just because you have about 35 percent that has 20 been damaged, destroyed, that we should not consider 21 the rest? 35 percent is a very small, it's not even 22 close to 50 percent.</p>

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

46	<p>1 MR. MARSHALL: Well, the 50 percent issue, I 2 don't know what that relate to. But there's nothing 3 in the Historic Code that includes a percentage. We 4 were looking at not so much the percentage. The other 5 thing you need to keep into account is the ones that 6 are right down at street level that are the most 7 visible. And some of these it's 100 percent of what 8 people see at the ground level that's been altered. 9 What we were looking at is this building used to have 10 three primary materials, stucco, stone, well, actually 11 four, glass, and then metal panel. Stone was probably 12 the second most prominent material. There is no stone 13 at all on the building anymore. And then glass, we 14 think exterior glazing it's lost probably close to 50 15 percent, maybe more. So we weren't looking at overall 16 percentages, we were looking at not from a renovation 17 building standpoint, but from a historic building 18 standpoint, has it lost those detail elements and 19 those materials that were characteristic of its style 20 at the time. And we felt that it had. And, again, 21 it's subjective. 22 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: So when you walk</p>	48	<p>1 is right behind. Because contractors always want to 2 do it on the cheap side, so they would cover rather 3 than remove. It would cost a lot of money to remove 4 all this stonework, a lot of money. 5 And in fact, I did a building recently that 6 I renovated, it had been built in 1968, on Poinsettia 7 and Volte Avenue [ph] And I had it covered with 8 plywood, the glass was covered with plywood. We know 9 that it can be renovated quite easily. 10 MR. MARSHALL: Sure. 11 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: And let's look at the 12 other elevations. Well, what percentage is that lower 13 elevation, 15 percent in remodel? 14 MR. MARSHALL: It's probably in that range, 15 yes. 16 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: And the upper 17 elevation maybe 20 percent? 18 MR. MARSHALL: Yes. I mean the reason we 19 wanted to colorize it is so you could all make that 20 judgment yourself. I mean we wanted it to be obvious, 21 because it's hard to describe things. But if you show 22 it graphically people can understand it.</p>
47	<p>1 around the site, and if you take a backdrop you're in 2 the middle of the parking lot, you're not looking at 3 the bottom elevation that has been modified, you're 4 looking at the massing of the building. And that 5 includes the upper part that is intact. And the 6 bottom you have cars all over the place, the bottom is 7 not significant in the parking lot. You know that? I 8 tried to take photographs of the building, I had to go 9 in front of the cars to get the bottom part. And if 10 you're in the parking lot you have the car, all the 11 roofs of the car that just block your view of the 12 entire structure. So I don't agree with what you're 13 saying. And if you walk around the parking lot you 14 see the huge size of that parking lot in those days it 15 was an adventure to come to Sears. It definitely was, 16 you walked a long distance. And you had that nice 17 elegant long building, which is still there. I don't 18 think it's been destroyed at all. 19 And you're talking about those fat columns. 20 Well, you can remove fat columns. And if you scratch 21 the stucco you can probably still see the original 22 stonework. And you take out the paneling, the glass</p>	49	<p>1 COMMISSIONER FODIODI: And the canopies are 2 still there. Nothing's been missing, just a tiny 3 little angle of format on edge of the fascia. That's 4 not much. I think that's all I have to say. 5 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Thank you Commissioner 6 Fodiodi. Vice Chair Fink, have you some comments? 7 COMMISSIONER FINK: Yes. This kind of goes 8 along with what Mr. Fodiodi was saying. It's been 9 stated that the building has lost a significant degree 10 of design, setting, materials, workmanship and 11 feeling. And my question to you first is what is a 12 significant degree? And then I'm going to pose it 13 also to Ms. Davis. 14 MR. MARSHALL: My significant degree is 15 going to be different than yours. It's probably going 16 to be different than other people. So you know it 17 when you see it. It's not definable. But you're 18 taking into account not only percentage of area, but 19 what it is, how important a particular feature is, and 20 how important it's characteristic is. You're also 21 taking into account whether it's a primary elevation 22 or a secondary elevation. Sears is unique in that it</p>

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

50	<p>1 was kind of an island, and so it had really four 2 primary elevations. So, I mean there's a lot of 3 aspects. We agreed, there was as good comment 4 earlier, I heard that would it be recognizable to 5 someone who was there in '66? Certainly, the name 6 Sears on it is one of the big indications. But the 7 generally massing is there as well. And unless they 8 have really good memories and they haven't seen it in 9 those years they may not remember it had stone on it. 10 So that's not really what we're saying. 11 We're just saying it all goes back to in 12 order to designate something historic you have to make 13 sure that it's a good surviving example of particular 14 style or period, or representative or a master 15 architect or both. We felt that this had been altered 16 to a degree that it no longer reflected the 17 architect's intent. It could certainly be restored to 18 be that, but in its present state it was not there. 19 So when we think that it can no longer be associated 20 and it's lost its integrity, we consider that 21 significant. There's not a percentage, it varies from 22 building to building. And in this building it varies</p>	52	<p>1 still be eligible. So if this building were in a 2 different community where there were multiple examples 3 of modern architecture that were better examples, I 4 don't think that I would have recommended it eligible. 5 But having spent a lot of time in Chula Vista, having 6 done our windshield survey of the entire community 7 west of the 805, there aren't that many great examples 8 of modernism in actuality. And because it is such a 9 significant movement, that's why we really took a 10 close look at the ones that we identified in the 11 survey. 12 Macy's has been brought up several times. I 13 do think that's a great a example, and I'm sorry that 14 we missed it. But when we were doing all of our pre- 15 survey work we just didn't have the right date for 16 that building, and that's the reason it was not 17 included as part of the comparable properties that we 18 looked at. Because we did considered comparable 19 properties when we recommended this building, and the 20 other five buildings that we recommended within the 21 City of the 12,000 that we looked at that were 22 eligible as modern commercial buildings. Because</p>
51	<p>1 from elevation to elevation. But it came to a point 2 where independently we just felt looking at the 3 material that what it was that made the building 4 unique, especially the details of it, had been 5 sacrificed too far. 6 COMMISSIONER FINK: And Ms. Davis? 7 MS. DAVIS: I can't disagree with much of 8 what David said. I mean it's a difficult call to make 9 when you're making the determination of how much 10 integrity has been lost and has too much been lost? 11 From my opinion enough of it is retained in this 12 building that it has not lost too much integrity to 13 convey its historical associations. Another factor to 14 consider, a couple of factors that we considered is 15 that one of the reasons we've recommended this 16 building as eligible is under criteria A. In which 17 case design, workmanship and materials are not as 18 significant aspects of integrity as the other four 19 elements. And that's something we established in the 20 context and the criteria. 21 Secondly, because this is a rare example, 22 you could have more loss of integrity and have it</p>	53	<p>1 there were other modern examples, they just were not 2 good examples, mostly because they had been so altered 3 and lost so much integrity. This is one of the better 4 examples that remains. 5 COMMISSIONER FINK: And I believe you said 6 there were only six examples in the City of the modern 7 architecture. 8 MS. DAVIS: Yes. And if we throw Macy's 9 we've got seven. 10 COMMISSIONER FINK: Okay, that's all I have. 11 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Thank you Vice Chair 12 Fink. Commissioner O'Neal. 13 COMMISSIONER O'NEAL: I'm one of those who 14 believes that this probably should not be eligible. I 15 think its original character is degraded. I was on 16 the Design Review Committee when we looked at the 17 Jurdy Partnership's changes. And I know that there 18 was a lot of angst within the City and staff, because 19 the Broadway was an outparcel and we couldn't compel 20 them to match this design. And we were not 21 particularly happy with what thought. And keep in 22 mind that Sears, was it Home Mart, Sears owned the</p>

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

54	<p>1 property and they did the expansion across 5th Avenue 2 and everything else. That was Sears at the time. And 3 Broadway really didn't want a part of it, do what you 4 want. But I think in the end they put the little 5 kiosks around the outside as some palliative measure. 6 But this is commerce. And I think we run a 7 real risk of -- this is one of these things where form 8 follows function. And when there was a time that you 9 wanted, and you could full circle the building, you 10 had a lot of plate glass windows, they window dressed 11 and they showed the wares inside and we'd look at that 12 as even a part of the streetscape. And that's really 13 the important part of the building. I disagree that 14 it's the upper half that matters, or we'd be talking 15 about the mechanical screening as a virtue. 16 So my feeling is that quite frankly if we're 17 going to do anything, we should have plaque to the 18 Japanese farmers who lost that property to the Navy 19 and the Navy housing. They're the ones who got 20 royally screwed on that deal. But if we're going to 21 do anything, I think you best handle that with a 22 plaque where you show this building when it was a</p>	56	<p>1 when we look at the Price Club building down on 2 Broadway? And it's important because it was the first 3 Price Club and the first big box in Chula Vista. Are 4 we going to classify that? Because the footprint's 5 there, and the exterior is relatively intact, they 6 don't change it. So I think we have to think through 7 how we're going to do these things. Or Plaza Panetta 8 that just went through a multi-million dollar change 9 doesn't happen, because we declare it and we can't 10 fool around with it, or it makes it more difficult to 11 fool around with. The glazing is missing. If it were 12 residence we would say that the glazing, the glass are 13 the eyes of the home. It's important. In a retail 14 the loss of that I think changes dramatically. The 15 pedestrian level, which is the level that is 16 appropriate when you're judging a commercial building, 17 a retail building. So I would support or even make a 18 motion that we not consider this Sears building 19 eligible for -- 20 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: You'll have that 21 opportunity in a few minutes. 22 COMMISSIONER FINK: All right.</p>
55	<p>1 standalone and it was separate. Because it was a 2 complete separate operation. So I would support not 3 considering this eligible in terms that it would 4 impose any restrictions on their ability to change 5 with the changing times of the retail operation. 6 Otherwise you're going to make this thing irrelevant 7 and the commerce will move along to someplace else, as 8 we shop differently and do things differently. That's 9 my own opinion. 10 But I think the number of buildings we have 11 of any architectural style that are commercial, they 12 got built during boom times and they got built in the 13 architectural style that was popular at that time. 14 And you can follow that as it goes. Chula Vista was 15 mostly agricultural, so we weren't a hub. Bringing 16 Marston's in was a big deal. I mean one of the 17 granddaughters was in my high school class. Though 18 that was no big thing, nobody paid any attention to 19 it. Just another kid in the class. But it was a 20 milestone, because we were sort of on the map. It was 21 like getting your first McDonald's. 22 But what are we going to do 15 years hence</p>	57	<p>1 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Thank you very much for 2 your thoughts. I have a couple of thoughts. I don't 3 think that these fachanges are permanent. I think 4 that they're reversible and I think that's an 5 important thing to consider when we're talking about 6 this building. I tend to think that Mr. Fodiodi is 7 right, that it's covered up. That's my first thought. 8 I think it's an elegant building in form and shape, 9 and there's no determination that these alterations 10 are not to a great extent reversible. 11 I think also that we need to remember that 12 even in terms of commerce the idea of adaptive reuse 13 and an iconic building, I believe that that commercial 14 area has since been rezoned in the urban core update 15 to be a mixed use. It's not my job and that's not 16 under discussion. But since my colleagues have all 17 ventured into topics that are not directly under 18 discussion, I'd like to take the opportunity to put 19 out there that there is a lot of currency with an idea 20 of adaptive reuse. Mr. Marshall, you've been 21 downtown. And I was personal property appraiser when 22 Joseph Cotton was doing the real estate. So I've been</p>

Capital Reporting Company
 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting City of Chula Vista 12-04-2013

58	<p>1 here a long time and watched all that also. 2 But our issue tonight is, again, I think a 3 lot of good points have been raised, but is to 4 consider what Heritage has put forward, what I'm 5 thankful for our very knowledgeable Commissioners have 6 pointed out, including Mr. O'Neal. And give this some 7 consideration as to whether this should remain on the 8 eligible status. Eligible is just that look through. 9 Those who came forward for designation they dug 10 further and brought more evidence than our consultants 11 were able to do. If this ever becomes a project of 12 some type, then some of my questions about the 13 reversibility and all will be answered. And that will 14 happen down the road, if ever, whatever Sears decides 15 to do down the road. Eligible is simply eligible. So 16 that's my say. Unless staff has any further comments, 17 then I will entertain any motions that commissioners 18 wish to make. 19 COMMISSIONER SHANEHARE: We can make a 20 motion to have this removed from historic eligibility? 21 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Well, you could, yes. I 22 believe, yes, you can.</p>	60
59	<p>1 COMMISSIONER SHANEHARE: Then I make that 2 motion. 3 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Thank you very much. We 4 have a motion on the floor. Do I have any seconds. 5 COMMISSIONER O'NEAL: I'll second that. But 6 I'd also like to make an observation. 7 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: Okay. 8 COMMISSIONER O'NEAL: If you don't mind. 9 CHAIRMAN STILLMAN: No. Well, you go right 10 ahead. 11 COMMISSIONER O'NEAL: As a contractor who 12 many times has had to finesse an architect's two- 13 dimensional drawings into something buildable in three 14 dimensions, I would suggest to you that the stucco 15 over the masonry, whether the masonry still exists or 16 not, is pretty heavily attached to that masonry. And 17 in order to remove that stucco and the mechanical 18 fasteners you're going to find that the masonry is 19 pretty significantly compromised. So whether it's 20 reversible maybe, yes. We don't know what's back 21 there. I mean I have found full tile fireplaces 22 behind rock facades in Mission Hills, and then I've</p>	61

