

**Redwood City**

Report Prepared by: **Charles Jany** (*responses in italics*)

Date of commission/board review: **2009-2010 Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC)**

**Minimum Requirements for Certification**

**I. Enforce Appropriate State or Local Legislation for the Designation and Protection of Historic Properties.**

**A. Preservation Laws**

What amendments or revisions, if any, are you considering to the certified ordinance? *There have been no amendments to the Ordinance itself, however the recently adopted **Downtown Precise Plan (DPP)** has put in place specific historic preservation standards and guidelines for all historic and potential historic resources located in the City center (follow links below) in compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards, and CEQA (per sec. 15064.5 (b) et seq.). An EIR was adopted for the DPP. This major undertaking required numerous Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC) meetings with Staff and consultants, resulting in formal HRAC recommendations to the Planning Commission which were then adopted within the context of the Downtown Precise Plan prior to forwarding to the City Council for final approval, (attachment A).*

Historic resource regulations: <http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/precise/FINAL-DTPP/DTPP-Downloads/5%20Historic%20Regulations.pdf>

Historic appendix text: <http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/precise/FINAL-DTPP/DTPP-Downloads/17%20Historic%20Appendix%20Text.pdf>

Historic appendix tables part 1: <http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/precise/FINAL-DTPP/DTPP-Downloads/18%20Historic%20Appendix%20Tables%20Pt%201.pdf>

Historic appendix tables part 2: <http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/precise/FINAL-DTPP/DTPP-Downloads/19%20Historic%20Appendix%20Tables%20Pt%202.pdf>

***Below is the link to the DPP EIR:***

Draft EIR historic section: [http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/precise/FINAL-DTPP/DTPP-Downloads/EIR/pp\\_deir\\_7\\_Culturalandhistoricresources.pdf](http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/precise/FINAL-DTPP/DTPP-Downloads/EIR/pp_deir_7_Culturalandhistoricresources.pdf)

Revisions for the Final EIR: [http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/precise/DraftFinalEIRDec-2010/Revisions\\_2.pdf](http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/precise/DraftFinalEIRDec-2010/Revisions_2.pdf)

Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

- Provide an electronic link to your ordinance or appropriate section(s) of the municipal code. *The Redwood City Historic Preservation Ordinance is located in **Chapter 40** of Redwood City Municipal Code (follow link below): **No changes***  
[http://library2.municode.com/default-test/home.htm?infobase=16574&doc\\_action=whatsnew](http://library2.municode.com/default-test/home.htm?infobase=16574&doc_action=whatsnew)

**B. New Local Landmark Designations (Comprehensive list of properties/districts designated under local ordinance)**

- What properties/districts have been locally designated (or de-designated) this past year? For districts, provide a list of resource contributors and non-contributors.  
*No landmark or historic district designations have occurred this year; however detailed historic preservation standards and guidelines were adopted for all historic and potentially historic properties located within the Downtown Precise Plan area. The evaluation work for these properties constitute the bulk of the new properties included in the Redwood City Historic Inventory. See attached list of properties listed on this inventory. Complete DPRs (some less significant properties have BSO's and/or Primary Records are included under separate cover (Attachment B).*

Historic Resources Inventory					
Table of Contents					
	Street #	Street Name	Notes		
1.	235	Alden			Updated April 1, 2011 by Troy Evangelho - Planning Specialist
2.	238	Alden			
3.	413	Alden			
4.	702	Allerton			Electronic copy is located at "Planning Shared Drive:\Historical\DPRs\DPRs Final PDF format"
5.	717	Allerton			
6.	1027	Allerton			
7.	179	Arch			
8.	201	Arch			
9.	1200	Arguello			
10.	1219	Arguello			
11.	1227	Arguello			
12.	415	Arlington			
13.	532	Arlington			
14.	423	Beech			

## Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

15.	175	Birch			
16.	839	Blandford			
17.	146	Bonita			
18.	702	Brewster			
19.	710	Brewster			
20.	726 - 728	Brewster			
21.	734	Brewster			
22.	1201	Brewster			
23.	1504	Brewster			
24.	1535	Brewster			
25.	2000	Broadway			
26.	2020	Broadway			
27.	2022	Broadway			
28.	2200	Broadway			
29.	2215	Broadway	1994 Evaluation		
30.	2215	Broadway	2009 Evaluation		
31.	2301	Broadway			
32.	2317	Broadway			
33.	2603	Broadway			
34.	2620	Broadway			
35.	2650	Broadway			
36.	2726	Broadway			
37.	2734	Broadway			
38.	640	Cassia			
39.	730	Cassia			
40.	508	Chestnut			
41.	519	Chestnut			
42.	79	Claremont			
43.	na	Cordilleras Indian Mounds			
44.	28	Diller			
45.	226	Edgewood			
46.	610	Edgewood			
47.	650	Edgewood			
48.	802	Edgewood			

## Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

49.	649	El Camino Real			
50.	753	El Camino Real			
51.	1100	El Camino Real			
52.	1322	El Camino Real			
53.	2600	El Camino Real			
54.	743	Elm			
55.	90	Finger			
56.	127	Finger			
57.	127	Franklin			
58.	303	Fuller			
59.	321	Fuller			
60.	627	Hamilton			
61.	801	Hamilton			
62.	402	Heller			
63.	420	Heller			
64.	446	Heller			
65.	707	Heller			
66.	819	Hopkins			
67.	828	Hopkins			
68.	1533	Hopkins			
69.	1816	Hopkins	2006 Evaluation		
70.	1816	Hopkins	1994 Evaluation		
71.	2004	Hopkins			
72.	2236	Hopkins			
73.	2312	Hopkins			
74.	410	Howland			
75.	45	Hudson			
76.	620	Jefferson			
77.	855	Jefferson			
78.	1217	Jefferson			
79.	242	Madison			
80.	1455	Madison			
81.	726	Main			
82.	800	Main			
83.	831	Main			

## Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

84.	839	Main			
85.	847	Main			
86.	901	Main			
87.	917	Main			
88.	929	Main	2007 Evaluation		
89.	929	Main	1992 Evaluation		
90.	935	Main	2007 Evaluation		
91.	935	Main	1992 Evaluation		
92.	1018	Main			
93.	1020	Main			
94.	1101	Main			
95.	1401	Main			
96.	1402	Main			
97.	1414	Main			
98.	1502	Main			
99.	450	Maple			
100.	620	Maple			
101.	628	Maple			
102.	611	Middlefield			
103.	727	Middlefield	2007 Evaluation		
104.	727	Middlefield	1995 Evaluation		
105.	810	Middlefield			
106.	1044	Middlefield			
107.	1204	Middlefield			
108.	1405	Middlefield			
109.	1417	Middlefield			
110.	1503	Middlefield			
111.	1520	Middlefield			
112.	1924	Middlefield			
113.	910	Nobhill			
114.	302	Orchard			
115.	53 - 55	Perry			
116.	541	Quartz			

## Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

117.	na	Redwood Embarcadero Creek			
118.	235	Samson			
119.	311	Samson			
120.	335	Samson			
121.	427	Samson			
122.	114	Stambaugh			
123.	116	Stambaugh			
124.	142	Stambaugh			
125.	397	Stambaugh			
126.	403	Stambaugh			
127.	406	Stambaugh			
128.	418	Stambaugh			
129.	424	Stambaugh			
130.	427	Stambaugh			
131.	439	Stambaugh			
132.	504	Stambaugh			
133.	601	Stambaugh	Located in front of parcel		
134.	601	Stambaugh	Located in rear of parcel		
135.	221	Standish			
136.	228	Standish			
137.	530	Warren			
138.	702	Warren			
139.	720	Warren			
140.	728	Warren			
141.	1016	Warren			
142.	1028	Warren			
143.	197	Wellesley			
144.	1800	Whipple			
145.	2414	Whipple			
146.	103	Wilson			
147.	700	Winslow			
148.	25	Woodhue			
149.	30	Woodhue			

Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

150.	316	Woodside			
	508	Adams	Potential Resource		
	524	Adams	Potential Resource		
	193	Arch	Potential Resource		
	415	Arch	Potential Resource		
	421	Arch	Potential Resource		
	701	Arguello	Potential Resource		
	840	Brewster	Potential Resource		
	1040	Brewster	Potential Resource		
	1784	Broadway	Potential Resource		
	1794	Broadway	Potential Resource		
	1612	El Camino Real	Potential Resource		
	160	Harrison	Potential Resource		
	164	Harrison	Potential Resource		
	180	Harrison	Potential Resource		
	202	Harrison	Potential Resource		
	130	Jackson	Potential Resource		
	1269	Jefferson	Potential Resource		
	1303	Jefferson	Potential Resource		
	1304	Jefferson	Potential Resource		
	121	Lincoln	Potential Resource		
	133	Lincoln	Potential Resource		
	138	Lincoln	Potential Resource		
	1102	Main	Potential Resource		
	450	Maple	Potential Resource		
	522	Maple	Potential Resource		
	526	Maple	Potential Resource		
	636	Maple	Potential Resource		
	640	Maple	Potential Resource		
	722	Maple	Potential Resource		
	734	Maple	Potential Resource		

## Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

746	Maple	Potential Resource			
750	Maple	Potential Resource			
122	Vera	Potential Resource			

- Reminder, pursuant to California Government Code § 27288.2, “the county recorder shall record a certified resolution establishing an historical resources designation issued by the State Historical Resources Commission or a local agency, or unit thereof.” Have you done this? *Two previously designated (local) historic resources (734 Brewster Avenue Middlefield Road and 1028 Warren Street) were awarded individual Mills Act Contracts and have had certified resolutions recorded on their title.*

Property Name/Address	Date Designated/Removed	Date Recorded by County Recorder
See above	NA	NA

### C. Historic Preservation Element/Plan

- Have you made any updates to your historic preservation plan or historic preservation element in your community’s general plan? If you have, provide a copy or electronic link (*Attachment C*) *follow link below*):
- If you address historic preservation in your general plan, is it in a separate historic preservation element or is it included in another element? *Historic Preservation is part of the “Built Environment” element of the new 2010 General Plan, below is an outline of the Table of Contents outlining the elements of the General Plan to help locate this item :*
- [The Built Environment Element:](#)
  - [Introduction to The Built Environment](#)
  - [Urban Form and Land Use](#)
  - [Circulation](#)
  - [Economic Development](#)
  - [\*\*Historic Resources\*\*](#) (follow the link)
  - [Infrastructure](#)

[Housing Element](#)

## Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)

[Building Community Element](#)

[Public Safety Element](#)

[Natural Resources Element](#)

- Provide an electronic link to the historic preservation section(s) of the General Plan (*follow this link*)
- When will your next General Plan update occur? 2020

### **D. Review Responsibilities**

*General statement: Public inquiries are received over the counter, via phone or e-mail. Staff consults with the Chairman of the Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC) who se members are in charge of addressing historic preservation issues, per Chapter 40 of the Municipal Code (see link) to determine whether this item warrants being placed on the HRAC agenda for full committee review.*

### **C.1 Design Review/Certificates of Appropriateness**

- *For properties located in the Downtown the City has put in place a design review process with is compliant with the Redwood City historic Preservation Ordinance but more detailed, please refer to “Appendices” section of Downtown Precise Plan **A1.2.3 “Historic Project Review Process”** (9<sup>th</sup> plate, page 165, Zoom in 150%)*  
<http://www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/precise/FINAL-DTPP/DTPP-Downloads/17%20Historic%20Appendix%20Text.pdf>
- *For properties outside of the Downtown Precise plan, the following process applies (same as last year)*

#### Levels of Design Review Summary:

*A) Minor review level (Tier 1): As explained above, this design review process involves historic resources/ potential resources, The "application" is placed on the HRAC meeting agenda for a determination of compliance to the SIS. The general purpose of this design review process is to protect and preserve the subject resource and addresses the following:*

*1) Whether the application contains sufficient information (i.e. Is it complete and adequate?) to review the subject proposal, and then,*

*2) Whether the proposed work complies with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards and, if applicable, to provide options and design alternatives that would preserve the historic character-defining features of the historic resource, in compliance with the purposes of the Redwood City Historic Preservation Ordinance and Historic Element of the General Plan.*

## Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

*B) Major review level (Tier 2) The “application” still causes a significant impact after HRAC review. This level of review (analysis of potential CEQA impact via Initial Study -- Neg. Dec. or EIR) involves Planning Commission review to consider the HRAC recommendation. Otherwise, the proposal is processed at the Planning and Building staff level.*

*C) City Council action (Tier 3): Final action on:*

- 1) Individual landmark and historic district designations, Mills Act contracts*
- 2) Statement of Overriding Considerations*
- 3) Appeal of Planning Commission/HRAC actions*

*Design review at the minor level (identified as “Tier one” in this report) are the most frequent; typically, City staff responds to several inquiries per week):*

*a) The location and age of the resource.*

*All sites are first identified according to “year-built” data in the City’s computer database where properties older than 50 years in age are “flagged” (with written “restrictions”) based on the historic status of the property; i.e. Is the resource a historic landmark, a contributor to a designated historic district, listed on the Historic Inventory, or a potential resource?*

- The next step involves identifying the exterior appearance/architecture of the (potential) resource (i.e. is the property a Period Revival, Art Deco, a “Rancher”? “Google streetview” helps to determine, its context and condition of façade.*
- Staff also considers the **context** of the resource. Is it located in an area with a specific physical character or composition? (for example, recognizing a district with a predominant building element, pattern or “feel”, as compared to an area containing an unrelated mix of architectural styles and periods as well as building scales with major out of scale intrusions.*
- In addition, because of their relative scarcity, properties 75 years or older (Pre WWII) are subject to a higher level of staff scrutiny staff if compared to more common post-WWII residential “rancher-type” development. Building permit information may be available through microfiche City records. Applicants are also directed to proceed with research information regarding the physical characteristics of the subject property is available through the offices of the County Assessor’s records (called “Appraisal Reports”) which include the date and nature of all additions, property layout, construction materials.*
- Assuming that a potential resource (more typically a building) is identified, the next step involves determining the historic **integrity** of the potential resource (i.e. to what level is the property’s exterior altered or architecturally compromised) followed by a visual evaluation (typical research tools involve **DPR 523** forms for buildings and sites, **CHRIS** searches for potential archeological sites).*

## Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

- *Additional historical background data can be typically obtained through records at the City's **Local History Room in the Redwood City Main Library** (under management of the Redwood City Archives Committee -- volunteers due to budget cuts). The San Mateo County Museum archives are also a good source of historical information.*

*b) The Scope of the "application":*

*Depending on the nature of the proposed "work/application" and the level of historic significance of the resource, the HRAC Liaison makes a preliminary determination whether there may, or may not be an **environmental impact** on the subject resource (for example: whether the application is eligible for a "CEQA Guideline Section 15331 Class 31 Exemption", (per authority of Section 21083 of the Public Resources Code, as referenced in Section 21084 of the Public Resources Code). The determining **threshold** is whether the project is **minor** (i.e. whose impact on the subject resource can be reduced to a level of insignificance) or **major** (i.e. that the historic resource is significantly affected by a proposal which would not be in compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards).*

*Design review, insofar as the application affects an historic resource (potential or documented), is done by the Historic Resources Advisory Committee members (HRAC) using the **Secretary Of Interior's Standards (SIS)** to make an evaluation as to whether there is project compliance with the SIS (or not). Additional review tools include the "**Seven Aspects of Integrity**" as well as other applicable reference documents, such as the various "**ITS**" publications which are available from the National Park Service. More specifically, the City/HRAC consults with "**Preservation Briefs #14 "New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns"** published by the National Park Service U.S. Dept. of the Interior to provide direction, guidance and seek alternatives to steer the "application" towards compliance with the above-referenced standards and guidelines. In the event when a project is determined to be non-compliant to the SIS by the HRAC, the CEQA process would then apply.*

- *Who takes responsibility for design review or Certificates of Appropriateness? The Redwood City design review process does not require certificates of appropriateness, changes to historic resources are administered through an architectural permit, and/or a building permit as applicable. Since **Planning and Building services are in the same Department and share the same counter** and because **all properties over 50 years old are flagged on the computer**, the building department checks with Planning before processing permits affecting historic or potential historic resources; the permits are not released until that process occurs. (See above for more detail, more specifically, please review process used for **properties within and adjacent to the Downtown Precise Plan**, otherwise:
  1. *For designated historic landmarks and properties located within historic districts, the proposed "application" is placed on HRAC agenda for review if "significant" changes to exterior of resource are anticipated (significant changes typically include changes to the roof, siding and trim materials as well as additions)*
  2. *Proposal is reviewed at an HRAC meeting in light of applicable treatment of Secretary of Interior Standards, followed by a recommendation to approve with conditions, (deny, or continue -- because more information is required). This input is**

## Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)

*incorporated to the Planning permit called a “Notice of Official Action”, followed by a “tracked” building permit, as applicable.*

- Do all projects subject to design review go the commission, or are some reviewed at the staff level without commission review? *Generally speaking, because of the prevalent nature of post WWII ranchers in Redwood City, the 50 year old “milestone” is not applied for low-density residential uses (other than Eichler’s, of course). **Instead, construction pre-dating WWII is used as a standard for potential resource.** Once a historic, or potential historic resource is identified, a changes that involve “in kind” replacement of exterior materials (assuming such materials are sympathetic/compatible to the resource) are addressed at the staff level (typically, the HRAC chairperson (and most often the Vice Chairperson too) is notified and provided a chance to view the resource and confirm whether this item needs to be reviewed by the HRAC or not.*
- What is the threshold between staff-only review and full-commission review? *Minor changes which do not require HRAC review -- as determined by HRAC staff liaison – do not affect **character-defining features** of the resource and tend to typically affect **non-street visible** portions of the resource (and generally affect a small percentage of the exterior façade of the resource).*

### C.2 California Environmental Quality Act

- What is the role of the staff and commission in providing input to CEQA documents prepared for or by the local government? *The HRAC is the official Redwood City entity responsible for the review of CEQA documents when historic resources (and/or potential historic resources) are involved per CEQA guidelines section 15064.5 (b) et seq. Through this formal review process, the HRAC provides recommendations to the Planning Commission. The CEQA-related input from the HRAC is incorporated as part of the record in the form of written comments on applicable projects (these actions are reflected in the HRAC minutes). The key role of the HRAC is to determine the level of historic significance of the resource and if applicable, the level of impact to that resource. For example, this review process could include making a determination on whether a historical report or assessment is adequate and complete, or commenting as to the appropriateness of mitigation measures relating to a specific project etc...*
- What is the role of the staff and commission in reviewing CEQA documents for projects that are proposed within the jurisdiction of the local government? *As liaison to the HRAC, staff is responsible for the assembly and submittal of all necessary information to the HRAC for their review, based on the specific purview and scope of review of the HRAC. The HRAC typically makes a determination that the Environmental analysis/Report is adequate and complete. Staff then proceeds with applicable CEQA process including the implementation of a Mitigation and Monitoring plan; a detailed and comprehensive review of the project.*

### C.3 Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

- What is the role of the staff and commission in providing input to Section 106 documents prepared for or by; the local government? *Staff is typically involved in investigating and confirming the status of properties considered as potential*

**Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report**

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

*housing projects that could eventually be subsidized using Federal funds (Attachment D). The HRAC liaison also reviews the project documentation and forwards a determination on the Area of Potential Effect (APE). Eventually a determination of compliance of the project to the SIS may be required based on the context.*

- *What is the role of the staff and commission in reviewing Section 106 documents for projects that are proposed within the jurisdiction of the local government? As liaison to the HRAC, staff is responsible for the preparation and submittal of all necessary information to the HRAC, based on the specific purview and scope of review of the HRAC. Staff's role insures a detailed and comprehensive review of the project, per Section 106 process guidelines.*

**II. Establish an Adequate and Qualified Historic Preservation Review Commission by State or Local Legislation.**

**A. Commission Membership (see table below)**

- *Who are the current members; **No changes in membership since the past report (and year before as well):** Mrs. Dee Eva has stayed on as an emeritus member to the HRAC and is current Chair of the "Path of History" project task force (see enclosed program for the self-guided walking tour and photographs of the Path Of History event .*
- *Do they represent a professional discipline or do they represent a public role? Both, they are the City's official historic committee in charge of making recommendations on matters of historic preservation which involves making recommendations to the Planning Commission.*
- *What is their date of appointment and when does their appointment expire? (see below)*
- *What is their email address? (see below)*
- *Include resumes and Qualifications Review forms for all members. If your do not have two qualified professionals on your commission, why have the professional qualifications not been met and how is professional expertise being provided? If all positions are not currently filled, why is there a vacancy, and when will the position will be filled? The staff HRAC liaison (Charles Jany) meets the professional objectives required for CLG qualifications through his educational background. Notwithstanding, it is this staff's opinion that the HRAC is well experienced entity in the field of local history and general preservation concepts. The Chairman is a charter member of this committee (established in 1980) and was also instrumental in establishing the historic preservation ordinance which is currently in place. Several members are attorneys who are (or were) members of the Planning Commission, which contributes to the group's qualifications on preservation matters. Other members also bring unique preservation-related skills to this group. This is a "hand's on" working committee as evidenced by their yearly accomplishments.*

Name	Discipline	Date Appointed	Date Appt. Expires	Email Address
<i>See below</i>				

*1. Kenneth Rolandelli  
Discipline: Advocate Historian*

Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)

Chairperson

Date Appointed 10/80

Date Appt. Expires 7/11

Email Address [kenrolandelli@aol.com](mailto:kenrolandelli@aol.com)

2. James Gernand

Vice Chair

Discipline: Engineer, Architectural background

Date Appointed 7/06

Date Appt. Expires 7/11

E mail Address [jimgernand@sbcglobal.net](mailto:jimgernand@sbcglobal.net)

3. Michael Bursak

Discipline: Attorney, former planning Commission Chairperson

Date Appointed 9/97

Date Appt. Expires 7/10-- term extended until 7/11

368-4800 (bus), no e-mail available

4. Kaia Eakin

Discipline: Attorney, Administrator at University, Preservation Advocate

Date Appt. 7/09

Expires 7/11

E mail Address [kaia\\_eakin@sbcglobal.net](mailto:kaia_eakin@sbcglobal.net)

5. Rachel Holt

Discipline: Attorney, Planning Commission representative

Date Appointed 7/07

Term expires 6/30/11

E mail Address [rholtsg@yahoo](mailto:rholtsg@yahoo)

6. Barbara (Nori) Jabba

Discipline: Consultant, Preservation advocate, History and Grant Writing background

Date Appointed 7/07

Date Appt. Expires 7/10-- term extended 7/11

E mail Address [njabba@dmbinc.com](mailto:njabba@dmbinc.com)

7. Julia Pellizzer

Discipline: Preservation advocate , background in railroad rolling stock restoration

Date Appointed 1/95

Date Appt. Expires 7/11

E mail Address [Jpellizzer@yahoo](mailto:Jpellizzer@yahoo)

**Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report**

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

Emeritus

- *Dee Eva*
- *Joanne Thompson*

**B. Commission Staff**

- Who are your current commission/CLG staff? *The staff liaison to the HRAC is Charles Jany (continuous since 1987) Christopher Rogers is assistant Planner and drafts the HRAC minutes for final review and provides staff support, Kristina Mateo is the administrative/clerical support, Gary Kelly is the Graphics artist and exhibit specialist.*
- What are their disciplines, and their dates of appointment/assignment? *(see below)*
- Is the staff to your commission the same as your CLG coordinator? *Yes*
- Include resumes and Qualifications Review forms for all new staff.
- If the position(s) is not currently filled, why is there a vacancy? *NA*

<b>Name/Title</b>	<b>Discipline</b>	<b>Dept. Affiliation</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
<i>Charles Jany</i>	<i>Architecture and Urban Planning</i>	<i>Manager -- Current Planning Services</i>	<i>cjany@redwoodcity.org</i>

*(See attached Minutes and Agendas for CLG 2009-10 Attachments E & F)*

**C. Attendance Record**

- Please attach in chart form for each commissioner and staff member, the attendance records for meetings. Commissions are required to meet four times a year, at a minimum. *(Attachment G)*

**D. Training Received**

- What training has each commissioner and staff member received, including descriptions and dates of training, and training provider? Remember it is a CLG requirement is that all commissioners and staff to the commission attend at least one training program relevant to your commission each year. It is up to the CLG to determine the relevancy of the training.

6)

<b>Commissioner/Staff Name</b>	<b>Training Title &amp; Description</b>	<b>Training Provider</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b><i>HRAC and staff liaison (Charles Jany)</i></b>  <i>Health problems have hindered Committee member Pellizzer to attend multiple HRAC meetings and venues</i>	<i>Design Review for Historic Buildings, Districts, Sites and Landscapes- Maritime Museum Auditorium 5 Custom House Plaza Monterey, CA 91030.</i>	<b><i>California Preservation Foundation (CPF)</i></b>	<i>March 31, 2010</i>

Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

--	--	--	--

**III. Maintain a System for the Survey and Inventory of Properties that Furthers the Purposes of the National Historic Preservation Act**

**A. Historical Contexts**

- Have you initiated, researched, or developed any historic contexts? If you have, list and describe in several sentences each historic context, how it is being used, and the date submitted to OHP (California CLG procedures require CLGs to submit survey results including historic contexts, to OHP.) If you have not done so, submit a copy with this report. NA
  - *A comprehensive historic survey of the Downtown area has been completed as part of the Downtown Precise Plan (see link above)*
  - *An EIR for the Kaiser expansion project has included an extensive study (Attachment hard copy of Assessment Report and Archeological monitoring Plan Attachment H)*
  - *An EIR for the Redwood City Stanford Campus (formerly the AMPLEX campus is underway)*
  - *A proposed development involving three lots in the Edgewood Park area (Finger Avenue) is prompting a study for evaluation for a potential historic district/area; the potential district boundaries are not defined at this time. (Attachment I) -- map*
  - *The City prepared a Historic Resources Report in anticipation of the rehabilitation of the Veterans Memorial Center (Attachment J)*
  - *The Historic Resources Advisory Committee is considering the "Mt. Carmel area for potential designation as a historic district /area; the potential district boundaries are not defined at this time.. Will require a reconnaissance survey*
  - *Main street Historic district expansion underway (attachment K)*

Context Name	Description	How it is Being Used	Date Submitted
Downtown Precise Plan	Precise Plan for City Center of Redwood City	Includes protection of historic resources and properties adjacent to historic resources	Approved December 2010, end of appeal period February 2010

**B New Surveys (excluding those funded by OHP)**

- Have you carried out any surveys or re-surveys? If you have, list the area surveyed, level (reconnaissance or intensive), acreage, number of properties surveyed, and the date you submitted the survey to OHP. (California CLG procedures require CLGs to submit survey results including historic contexts, to OHP.) If you have not done so, submit a copy with this report. *(See comment above)*

**Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report**

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

- Keep in mind that the evaluation of a single property is not a survey. Also, material changes to a property that is included in a survey, is not a change to the survey and should not be reported here.
- How are you using the survey data?

<b>Area</b>	<b>Context Based-yes/no</b>	<b>Level: Reconnaissance or Intensive</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b># of Properties Surveyed</b>	<b>Date</b>
Main Street Historic District expansion (Attachment K)	yes	intensive	Approx. 1 acre	Three new properties investigated	Working with SHPO staff

**C. Changes to Inventories**

- Have you made corrections to you inventory of historic properties, or have you identified any corrections that need to be made? *(yes)*
- If you have, what are the reasons for the changes (new information, alteration [approved/not approved], demolition [approved/not approved], etc.)?
- Have you changed the status codes of any properties in your inventory? Submit the changes with this report. *NA*

<b>Property Name/Address</b>	<b>Additions/Deletions to Inventory</b>	<b>Changes to Status Codes</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Date of Change</b>
Attachment B)		no	no	NA

**IV. Provide for Adequate Public Participation in the Local Historic Preservation Program**

**A. Public Education**

- What public outreach, training, or publications programs have you undertaken? Please provide copy of (or a link to) all publications or other products not previously provided to OHP.

<b>Item or Event</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Date</b>
<i>National Preservation Month 2009 (Attachment L)</i>	<i>Tours and educational outreach to approximately 800 seventh graders + staff</i>	<i>May 2010</i>
<i>HRAC liaison provided historic walking tours (Attachment M)</i>	<i>One hour educational tour PACT program (education to citizens about government, includes historic walking tour terminating in San Mateo County Historical Museum) new City employee orientation about importance of history in Redwood City.)</i>	<i>May, 2010</i>
<i>Historic Walking Tour (HRAC Chairperson)</i>	<i>National Preservation Month activities 2009 Downtown tours of historic districts, Historic Union Cemetery tour</i>	<i>May 2010</i>

## Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

What is the current status of preservation in your community? What are the most critical preservation planning issues?

*Interest and support for Historic Preservation continues to grow in our community, as evidenced by the numerous programs and activities which have filled this year's calendar. History remains an attractive and fascinating topic for many of Redwood City's citizens, staff, decision makers and visitors. The Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC) serves as the City's most effective advocacy group for the preservation of our Community's resources. The HRAC members continue to volunteer hundreds of hours of hard work towards the enhancement of Redwood City's unique historic resources, and under the guidance and organization of their Chairperson, the HRAC accomplishes enormous tasks with relatively little resources. With the continued support of the City Council, Planning Commission, staff, and volunteers, the HRAC will continue to spearhead new concepts that support community history and pride. The main challenge can be summarized as achieving multiple long term goals -- in the short term --, with limited staff time and funds.*

What is the single accomplishment of your local government this year that has done the most to further preservation in your community?

*A) Adopt a new General Plan along with a new Downtown Precise Plan which extends further protection to documented and potential historic resources in Redwood City.*

*B) The overwhelming success of the **National Preservation Month Program** in Redwood City entirely sponsored by the HRAC, which involves the following (see attachment 8):*

- 1. The coordination (with Redwood City School District offices) by HRAC of the bus drop-off and pick up downtown of **731** public school 7<sup>th</sup> grade children (plus teachers) -- **grant funds for bus drop off and pick up obtained through the Redwood City Cultural Commission (Parks Dept.)***
- 2. Escorting each class through a downtown tour involving three separate National Register- listed properties (Lathrop House, Old Courthouse/History Museum, Fox Theater)*
- 3. Touring each property hosted by trained docents (whose time is donated by corresponding entity; (Redwood City Heritage Association, San Mateo County Museum Association, Fox Theater property owners)*
- 4. Free lunch program in Historic Courthouse Plaza (food donated through private community funds)*

*Since this National Preservation Month an on-going yearly event (for 15 years) I have added this year's accomplishment:*

**C) Implementation of the Path of History Walking Tour Program:**

- Dedication ceremony with Wells Fargo stage Coach supported by generous donations from **Wells Fargo Bank, The Civic Cultural Commission and the Peter and Paula Ucelli Trust** (Attachment N)*
- Kiosk restoration with historic information panels*
- Sculptural art piece supporting four historic plaques*
- Brochure publication (Attachment N)*

## Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

What incentives are you providing for historic preservation in your community, e.g., loan or grant programs, property tax reduction, zoning variances, etc.? What programs are you offering, what is the public utilizing, and how successful are the programs in promoting historic preservation? Please provide a brief overview narrative.

Name or Type of Incentive Program	How many properties have benefited?
<i>Self guided walking tour Path of History Program</i>	<i>Downtown employees, visitors and residents</i>
<i>Mills Act Contract Program</i>	<i>15 properties so far</i>
<i>National Preservation Month Tours 2009</i>	<i>720 kids + teachers</i>

What recognition are you providing for successful preservation projects or programs?

- *City Council adoption of Resolution promoting historic events, National Preservation Month*
- *Local TV advertising National Preservation Tours*
- *Various newspaper press releases related to above-events promoting local history*
- *Public Dedication ceremony of “Path of History” -- program map at public kiosk /display and historic Plaque program HRAC task force (Dee Eva Chairperson) **\$10,000 grant from Wells Fargo Bank -- Downtown Redwood City branch, \$4,000 grant from Peter and Paula Uccelli Foundation, \$1,000 grant from RWC Archives Committee, \$5,000 grant from RWC Civic Cultural Commission (Parks Dept)** (attachment N)*
- *Redwood City Beautification Awards for “best historic restorations” (commercial and residential)*
- *Historic Plaques donated to owners of Historic landmarks*
- *Promotion of Mills Act Contracts (new contracts forthcoming)*

How did you meet or not meet the goals identified in your annual report for last year?

*To apply the current HRAC “template” process used in 2008 to 2009, as applicable i.e. Implement the National Preservation Month Program as in previous years. completed Update the Redwood City Historic Inventory. completed Adopt the Main Street Historic District #2. Underway Update the Historic Element of the General Plan. Completed. Adopt additional Mills Acts. Processing application. Develop and implement the “Path of History” Program. Completed information Kiosk and plaque centerpiece, final plaque design and construction underway.*

What are our local historic preservation goals for 2010-2011?

- *Continue current programs (national Preservation Month, Historic plaques for Landmarks, Mills Act Contracts)*
- *Implement the new historic section in 2010 General Plan*
- *Process projects in the new Downtown Precise Plan*
- *Add properties to Historic Inventory*
- *Complete the “Path of History” program*

## Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report

*(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010)*

- *Designate Historic Main street District expansion (Attachment K) and certify through SHPO as National-Register-eligible*
- *Designate Redwood City as a “Preserve America” City*

So that we may better serve you in the future, are there specific areas and/or issues with which you could use technical assistance from OHP? In what subject areas would you like to see training provided by the OHP? How you like would to see the training conducted (workshops, online, technical assistance bulletins, etc.)?

*I personally appreciate all the prompt assistance and technical support received from OHP offices. In light of the State budget woes, this is phenomenal. The historians that I converse with are very knowledgeable and always willing to point me in the right direction (Lucinda, Marie, Michelle, Jay, to name a few) Please continue to provide free CLG training opportunities in the Bay Area throughout the year.*

Would you be willing to host a training working workshop in cooperation with OHP? *Yes, it would be ideal for me if these (free) workshops could also provide AICP credits.*

### **XII Attachments**

- A) *Downtown Precise Plan – Historic*
- B) *Historic Inventory*
- C) *General Plan – Historic*
- D) *Historic Preservation Loan Program*
- E) *HRAC minutes*
- F) *HRAC agendas*
- G) *Attendance*
- H) *Kaiser Historic report*
- I) *Edgewood Park analysis Map*
- J) *Veterans Memorial Center Historic analysis*
- K) *Main Street district proposed expansion map*
- L) *National Preservation Month*
- M) *PACT walking tour and Citizen education – historic*
- N) *Path of History Program*