



**CITY OF EUREKA**  
**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT**  
Rob Holmlund, AICP, Director  
Community Development Division  
Riley Topolewski, Senior Planner  
531 K Street • Eureka, California 95501-1146  
Ph (707) 268-1971 • Fx (707) 441-4202  
[rtopolewski@ci.eureka.ca.gov](mailto:rtopolewski@ci.eureka.ca.gov) • [www.ci.eureka.ca.gov](http://www.ci.eureka.ca.gov)

## **PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE**

**Notice Is Hereby Given** that the City of Eureka Historic Preservation Commission will hold a public hearing on **Wednesday, November 7, 2018, at 4:00 p.m.**, or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard, in the Council Chamber, Eureka City Hall, 531 “K” Street, Eureka, California, to consider the following application:

**Project Title:** Fritz window and door replacement

**Project Applicant:** Gary Fritz

**Case No:** HPO-18-0008

**Location:** 1736 13th Street

**APNs:** 006-041-008

**Project Number:** HPO-18-0008

**Zoning and General Plan Designation:** RS-6000/LDR (Low Density Residential)

**Description:** The applicant is requesting approval to replace both exterior doors with new, metal doors. The applicant is also requesting approval, after the fact, for the replacement of four wooden windows with new, vinyl windows, and the alteration of window framing.

**Date of Project Application:** September 21, 2018

**Staff Contact Person:** Riley Topolewski, Senior Planner; City of Eureka, Development Services Department, Community Development Division; 531 “K” Street, Eureka, CA 95501-1165; phone: (707) 268-1971, fax: (707) 441-4202, email: [rtopolewski@ci.eureka.ca.gov](mailto:rtopolewski@ci.eureka.ca.gov)

All interested persons are invited to comment on the project either in person at the scheduled public hearing, or in writing. Written comments on the project may be submitted at the hearing or prior to the hearing by mailing or delivering them to the Community Development Division, Third Floor, 531 K Street, Eureka. Accommodations for handicapped access to City meetings must be requested of the City Clerk, 441-4175, five working days in advance of the meeting. Appeals to the City Council of the action of the Acting Director on the project may be made within 10 calendar days of the action by filing a written Notice of Appeal, along with the filing fees as set by the City Council, with the City Clerk. The City’s final action is appealable to the California Coastal Commission. If you challenge the nature of the proposed action in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues that you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice or written correspondence delivered to the public entity conducting the hearing at or prior to the public hearing. The project file is available for review at the Development Services Division, Third Floor, City Hall. If you have questions regarding the project or this notice, please contact the department at (707) 441-4160; fax: (707) 441-4202; e-mail: [planning@ci.eureka.ca.gov](mailto:planning@ci.eureka.ca.gov)



# CITY OF EUREKA

## DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

**Rob Holmlund, AICP, Director**

Riley Topolewski, Senior Planner

531 K Street • Eureka, California 95501-1146

Ph (707) 441-4160 • Fx (707) 441-4202 [www.ci.eureka.ca.gov](http://www.ci.eureka.ca.gov)

## CITY OF EUREKA HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

### STAFF REPORT

November 7, 2018

**Project Title:** Fritz Window and Door Replacement

**Project Applicant:** Gary Fritz

**Case No:** HPO-18-0008

**Project Location:** 1736 13th Street

**APN:** 006-041-008

**Project Zoning and Land Use:** RS-6000 (Single Family Residential)/LDR (Low Density Residential)

**Project Description:** The applicant is requesting approval to replace both exterior doors with new, metal doors. The applicant is also requesting approval, after the fact, for the replacement of seven wooden windows with four new, vinyl windows, which includes the alteration of window framing.

**Contact Person:** Riley Topolewski, Senior Planner; phone: (707) 268-1970; fax: (707) 441-4202; email: [rtopolewski@ci.eureka.ca.gov](mailto:rtopolewski@ci.eureka.ca.gov)

**Staff Recommendation:** Adopt a resolution.

**Motion:** *See suggested options on page 10.*

### **Background:**

The property is included on the Local Register of Historic Places (LRHP) and is currently owned by Gary Fritz. According to the “Green Book”, the residence at 1736 13<sup>th</sup> Street was constructed in 1901 as a single-story frame Italianate house.

According to the applicant, in the 1980s, vinyl windows were installed by a previous owner on the west and south sides of the house. Additionally, one window on the east-side porch, was replaced with vinyl at that time. More recently, the applicant has replaced the seven remaining wood windows on the east and south sides of the structure with four, vinyl windows.

The applicant is also proposing to replace both exterior wooden doors with metal doors. The existing doors are not original to the house, having been built and replaced by the current owner/applicant a number of years ago.

A citizen noted the window replacement on an historic structure, and sent an e-mail to the City. Code Enforcement confirmed the windows had been replaced, and sent a violation letter to the owner/applicant. The applicant visited with City Staff, who relayed to him the property is listed on the LRHP, wooden window replacement required approval by the Historic Preservation Commission, and that it was possible and even likely that the replacement of the wood windows with vinyl would not be approved. Staff provided an application, which the applicant submitted immediately. During the conversations, the applicant also shared he did not realize the property was on the Local Register of Historic Places. Although he was the property owner at the time the LRHP was created, and he received a notice, he believed that he only had to respond if he wanted to be included on the LRHP; therefore he did not respond.

The applicant submitted the photographs shown in Figures 6 and 7, but the changes to the window openings were not entirely evident from the close-up photos. Staff visited the site and took the photographs shown in Figures 2 and 4, which more clearly show the modification to the shape and size of the windows, the combining of the double vertical windows, and the change in how the windows open (horizontal slider instead of vertical single- or double-hung).

**Images:**



*Figure 1: Street View of 1736 13<sup>th</sup> Street with window replacement in progress*



*Figure 2: After window replacement*



*Figure 3: Street View of 1736 13<sup>th</sup> Street (north side) showing window replacement in progress*



Figure 4: After window replacement



Figure 5: Doors to be replaced at 1736 13<sup>th</sup> Street, with proposed style of replacement



Figure 6: New Vinyl Windows on north side of 1736 13<sup>th</sup> Street



Figure 7: New Vinyl Windows on east side of 1736 13<sup>th</sup> Street

**REQUIRED FINDINGS:** Title 15, Chapter 157, of the Eureka Municipal Code, Section 157.07(C), specifies that for properties listed on the Local Register of Historic Places that a proposed alteration must be considered in light of its effect on the existing historical character of the affected structure as it relates to the streetscape. Also as provided in Chapter 157, the Historic Preservation Commission has adopted the ***Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*** as the guidelines for alterations to historic properties and in carrying out their historic preservation responsibilities.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards were developed to promote consistent preservation practices. The intent of the Standards is to assist the long-term preservation of a property's significance through the preservation of historic materials and features. The Standards are neither technical nor prescriptive, but are intended to promote responsible preservation practices that help protect cultural resources. In the Standards, there are four ways that a historic property may be treated; they include Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction.

Preservation focuses on the maintenance and repair of existing historic materials and retention of a property's form as it has evolved over time. Rehabilitation acknowledges the need to alter or add to a historic property to meet continuing or changing uses while retaining the property's historic character as it has evolved over time. Restoration depicts a property at a particular period of time in its history, while removing evidence of other periods. Finally, Reconstruction re-creates vanished or non-surviving portions of a property for interpretive purposes.

The most appropriate standard to use for reviewing this project is Rehabilitation. Rehabilitation emphasizes the retention and repair of historic materials, but also acknowledges that time moves forward and properties change, and that additions may be made so long as the essential historic character on the parcel remains. Contemporary or non-historic materials may be used in the construction where the same materials would be impractical. Rehabilitation focuses more on how people continue to use and adapt properties according to changing needs than on historical interpretation.

Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features that convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values. There are 10 standards to consider when determining if Rehabilitation is the appropriate method of preserving a historic resource. They are:

1. *A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.*

The historic residential use of the property will remain unchanged. Replacing the windows and doors will not affect the spatial relationship of the property to adjacent residential properties; however, the distinctive features and fenestrations of the structure are altered through the modifications to the windows. Spatial relationships of the windows to the wall, and each window to the other windows on the structure are altered. Although the existing wooden doors are not original, replacing the wood with metal could further alter the distinctive features of the structure.

2. *The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*

Replacing the existing wood frame windows with vinyl, and changing the window

openings and number of windows alters the historic character of the property. The applicant has indicated that replacing the existing windows with wood was prohibitively expensive. Additionally, because the windows on the west and south side of the structure, as well as the window on the porch were changed to vinyl by a previous owner, the applicant intended these vinyl replacement windows to match the rest of the windows. Although the existing wooden doors are not original, replacing the wood with metal could further alter the historic character of the structure.

- 3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.*

No conjectural features or elements from other historic properties have been or will be added to the property.

- 4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.*

There have been no changes to the property that have acquired significance in their own right.

- 5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*

Some distinctive features of the structure remain and have been preserved, including the siding style and trim. By utilizing vinyl windows however, the distinctive materials that characterize the property, as well as the wood window craftsmanship are not preserved. The existing wooden doors are not original, so replacing the wood with metal would not conflict with this standard.

- 6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*

The applicant has indicated that the wood windows were rotten, he replaced the windows with vinyl, and he did not retain the wood windows. While deterioration of wood windows may, in some instances, necessitate replacement with a new window, the new window should match the previous window size, shape, location, and preferably materials. Although in some instances, replacement of wood windows with vinyl has previously been approved by the Commission, those replacements did not substantially alter the size, shape, and opening of the windows. While it is possible replacement of wood with vinyl in the same window openings for this structure could have been approved, the changes to the fenestration by combining

double windows into a single window, and changing the size and shape does not match the old, and does not conform to the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

7. *Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.*

No chemical or physical treatments have or will occur.

8. *Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.*

All work has and will occur within the existing footprint of the structure, and no ground disturbing activities are proposed. The parcel is located in an urban area and is outside known archeological areas.

9. *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*

The newly installed windows do match the existing vinyl windows in style, scale, and proportion. The new doors proposed by the applicant are metal, and would replace non-historic wooden doors. The applicant has also stated that if metal doors were not an option, oak doors with a stained finish could be used to match the existing look of the current doors.

10. *New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

No new additions or adjacent construction are proposed.

Based on the discussion for each standard above, the alteration of the window openings, combined with the replacement of the wood windows with vinyl, Staff believes the project as proposed does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

The Historic Preservation Commission should review the proposed project to determine whether it is appropriate for the parcel. If the Committee concurs with Staff's analysis above, and concludes the proposed project does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, the Commission could deny the application. Denial would mean the applicant would have to restore the original window openings, and purchase and reinstall wood windows, and would not be able to replace the exterior doors.

However, instead of denial, the Commission could consider and then impose conditions that could then allow the Commission to find the project would conform to the Secretary of the

Interior Standards. The conditions would require the applicant to take some action, such as:

1. Restore the seven window openings, and install wood windows.  
Unknown costs, but could be substantial. The applicant has already expended money, and time modifying the window openings, purchasing and installing the vinyl windows, and replacing the siding. The costs of the vinyl windows would be lost. Additional money and time would be required to restore the original openings, and to find, purchase, and install wood windows. The result of this scenario would be the same as project denial.
2. Restore the seven window openings, and install vinyl windows.  
Unknown costs, but could be substantial. The applicant has already expended money, and time modifying the window openings, purchasing and installing the vinyl windows, and replacing the siding. The costs of the vinyl windows would be lost, and additional money and time would be required to restore the original openings, and to find, purchase, and install new vinyl windows.
3. Allow a grace period for window restoration.  
Prior to imposition of any fines as discussed in Scenario 5, below, the Commission could instead require the applicant apply potential fines toward purchasing and replacing the windows. The Commission could implement a grace period during which no fines would be imposed, provided the applicant restores the windows by a certain date. Failure to replace the windows would result in the imposition of the administrative citation and fine process described in Scenario 5 below, at the end of the grace period.

If the Commission chooses to impose conditions of their own, or use any of the conditions above, it is recommended that the Commission adopt findings and conditions of approval to specify the action that must be taken, and identify the design, architectural style, exterior colors, and exterior appearance should be used for the proposed project.

If the Commission imposes conditions in order to be able to approve the project, or if the Commission denies the vinyl window replacement, the applicant could:

4. Appeal the denial to City Council.  
There is a \$780 appeal fee. The applicant has stated it's unlikely that he could afford to pay the appeal fee.
5. Ignore the denial or conditions of approval.  
Although Staff does not recommend this option, it is a possible scenario with consequences. The applicant could chose to ignore the denial or the conditions of approval, and not appeal the Commission's action. The next step could then involve the issuance of an administrative citation and daily fine. The daily fine would be \$50.00 per day, which totals \$18,250 per year. The fines would continue to accrue, as well as penalties and interest, until the Commission's conditions were met, or if denied, the windows were replaced. If the applicant did not pay the accrued fines, penalties, and interest, the next step would be to lien the property for the amount of the accumulated fines. The lien would eventually be satisfied when the property is sold in the future. The

violation would then become the responsibility of the next owner, and the fines could continue to be assessed to the new owner. Under this scenario, the now-existing vinyl windows would remain.

**Environmental:** This project is subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). A project that complies with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties qualifies for a Class 31 exemption from the preparation of environmental documents. If this project, or a portion thereof, is determined to be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, then the project or portion qualifies for a Class 31 exemption from CEQA.

Projects which a public agency rejects or disapproves are exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15270(b). If the project, or a portion thereof, is denied, then the project or portion is exempt from CEQA.

**Motion Options:**

**Denial of doors and windows**

*“I move the Historic Preservation Commission adopt a resolution denying the door replacement and window alterations.”*

**Approval of doors only**

*“I move the Historic Preservation Commission adopt a resolution denying the window alterations but approving the door replacement.”*

**Conditions of Approval for windows**

*“I move the Historic Preservation Commission adopt a resolution approving the replacement of the doors, and conditionally approving the alterations to the windows.”*

**Conditions of Approval for doors and windows**

*“I move the Historic Preservation Commission adopt a resolution conditionally approving the replacement of the doors, and alterations to the windows.”*

**Support Material:**

Attachment 1	Vicinity Map .....	page
Attachment 2	Parcel Map.....	page
Attachment 3	Resolution Denial windows and doors .....	page
Attachment 4	Resolution Denial windows, approval doors .....	page
Attachment 5	Resolution Conditional windows, approval doors .....	page
Attachment 6	Resolution Conditional windows and doors.....	page

**RESOLUTION NO. 2018-**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF EUREKA DENYING THE REPLACEMENT OF THE EXTERIOR  
DOORS AND ALTERATION OF THE WINDOWS AT 1736 13<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

WHEREAS, the subject property at 1736 13<sup>th</sup> Street is included on the Local Register of Historic Places (LRHP); and

WHEREAS, according to the “Green Book”, the residence was constructed in 1901 as a single-story frame Italianate house; and

WHEREAS, the applicant is proposing to replace both exterior doors with new, metal doors; and

WHEREAS, the applicant is requesting approval, after the fact, for the replacement of seven wooden windows with four new, vinyl windows, and the alteration of window framing; and

WHEREAS, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards were developed to promote consistent preservation practices, and the intent of the Standards is to assist the long-term preservation of a property's significance through the preservation of historic materials and features.

WHEREAS, the most appropriate standard to use for reviewing this project is Rehabilitation; and

WHEREAS, rehabilitation emphasizes the retention and repair of historic materials, but also acknowledges that time moves forward and properties change, and that additions may be made so long as the essential historic character on the parcel remains; and

WHEREAS, contemporary or non-historic materials may be used in the construction where the same materials would be impractical; and

WHEREAS, the project is subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS, projects which a public agency rejects or disapproves are exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15270(b).

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Eureka, that the project, is denied, and the decision to deny] the subject application was made after careful, reasoned and equitable consideration of the evidence in the record, including, but not limited to: written and oral testimony submitted at the public hearing; the staff report; site investigation(s);project file; and, the evidence submitted with the permit application. The findings of fact listed below “bridge the analytical gap” between the raw evidence in the record and the Historic Preservation Commission’s decision.

1. The historic residential use of the property will remain unchanged.

2. Replacing the windows and doors will not affect the spatial relationship of the property to adjacent residential properties.
3. The distinctive features, fenestrations, and historic character of the structure are altered through the modifications to the windows.
4. Spatial relationships of the windows to the wall, and each window to the other windows on the structure are altered.
5. The existing wooden doors are not original to the structure.
6. Replacing the wood doors with metal doors could further alter the distinctive features of the structure.
7. No conjectural features or elements from other historic properties have been or will be added to the property.
8. There have been no changes to the property that have acquired significance in their own right.
9. No chemical or physical treatments have or will occur.
10. All work has and will occur within the existing footprint of the structure, and no ground disturbing activities are proposed.
11. No new additions or adjacent construction are proposed.
12. The project is exempt from CEQA.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Eureka in the County of Humboldt, State of California, on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:           COMMISSIONER  
 NOES:           COMMISSIONER  
 ABSENT:        COMMISSIONER  
 ABSTAIN:       COMMISSIONER

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Ted Loring, Chair, Historic Preservation Commission

*Attest:*

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Rob Holmlund, Executive Secretary

**RESOLUTION NO. 2018-**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF EUREKA APPROVING THE REPLACEMENT OF THE EXTERIOR  
DOORS AND DENYING THE ALTERATION OF THE WINDOWS AT 1736 13<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

WHEREAS, the subject property at 1736 13<sup>th</sup> Street is included on the Local Register of Historic Places (LRHP); and

WHEREAS, according to the "Green Book", the residence was constructed in 1901 as a single-story frame Italianate house; and

WHEREAS, the applicant is proposing to replace both exterior doors with new, metal doors; and

WHEREAS, the applicant is requesting approval, after the fact, for the replacement of seven wooden windows with four new, vinyl windows, and the alteration of window framing; and

WHEREAS, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards were developed to promote consistent preservation practices, and the intent of the Standards is to assist the long-term preservation of a property's significance through the preservation of historic materials and features.

WHEREAS, the most appropriate standard to use for reviewing this project is Rehabilitation; and

WHEREAS, rehabilitation emphasizes the retention and repair of historic materials, but also acknowledges that time moves forward and properties change, and that additions may be made so long as the essential historic character on the parcel remains; and

WHEREAS, contemporary or non-historic materials may be used in the construction where the same materials would be impractical; and

WHEREAS, the project is subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS, a project which a public agency rejects or disapproves is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15270(b); and

WHEREAS, a project that complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties qualifies for a Class 31 exemption from the preparation of environmental documents.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Eureka, that the replacement of the exterior doors is approved, and the alterations to the windows are denied, and the decision to partially approve the subject application was made after careful, reasoned and equitable consideration of the evidence in the record, including, but not limited to: written and oral testimony submitted at the public hearing; the staff report; site investigation(s); project file; and, the evidence submitted with the permit application. The

findings of fact listed below “bridge the analytical gap” between the raw evidence in the record and the Historic Preservation Commission’s decision.

1. The historic residential use of the property will remain unchanged.
2. Replacing the windows and doors will not affect the spatial relationship of the property to adjacent residential properties.
3. The distinctive features, fenestrations, and historic character of the structure are altered through the modifications to the windows.
4. Spatial relationships of the windows to the wall, and each window to the other windows on the structure are altered.
5. The existing wooden doors are not original to the structure.
6. No conjectural features or elements from other historic properties have been or will be added to the property.
7. There have been no changes to the property that have acquired significance in their own right.
8. No chemical or physical treatments have or will occur.
9. All work has and will occur within the existing footprint of the structure, and no ground disturbing activities are proposed.
10. No new additions or adjacent construction are proposed.
11. The modification of the windows is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15270(b).
12. The replacement of the doors is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the project qualifies for a Class 31 exemption from CEQA.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Eureka in the County of Humboldt, State of California, on the 7th day of November, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONER  
NOES: COMMISSIONER  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONER  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONER

---

Ted Loring, Chair, Historic Preservation Commission

*Attest:*

---

Rob Holmlund, Executive Secretary

**RESOLUTION NO. 2018-**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF EUREKA APPROVING THE REPLACEMENT OF THE EXTERIOR  
DOORS AND CONDITIONALLY APPROVING THE ALTERATION OF THE WINDOWS  
AT 1736 13<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

WHEREAS, the subject property at 1736 13<sup>th</sup> Street is included on the Local Register of Historic Places (LRHP); and

WHEREAS, according to the “Green Book”, the residence was constructed in 1901 as a single-story frame Italianate house; and

WHEREAS, the applicant is proposing to replace both exterior doors with new, metal doors; and

WHEREAS, the applicant is requesting approval, after the fact, for the replacement of seven wooden windows with four new, vinyl windows, and the alteration of window framing; and

WHEREAS, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards were developed to promote consistent preservation practices, and the intent of the Standards is to assist the long-term preservation of a property's significance through the preservation of historic materials and features.

WHEREAS, the most appropriate standard to use for reviewing this project is Rehabilitation; and

WHEREAS, rehabilitation emphasizes the retention and repair of historic materials, but also acknowledges that time moves forward and properties change, and that additions may be made so long as the essential historic character on the parcel remains; and

WHEREAS, contemporary or non-historic materials may be used in the construction where the same materials would be impractical; and

WHEREAS, the project is subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS, a project that complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties qualifies for a Class 31 exemption from the preparation of environmental documents.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Eureka, that the replacement of the exterior doors is approved, and the alterations to the windows are conditionally approved, and the decision to approve the subject application was made after careful, reasoned and equitable consideration of the evidence in the record, including, but not limited to: written and oral testimony submitted at the public hearing; the staff report; site investigation(s); project file; and, the evidence submitted with the permit application. The findings of fact listed below “bridge the analytical gap” between the raw evidence in the record and the Historic Preservation Commission's decision.

1. The historic residential use of the property will remain unchanged.
2. Replacing the windows and doors will not affect the spatial relationship of the property to adjacent residential properties.
3. The distinctive features, fenestrations, and historic character of the structure are altered through the modifications to the windows but with conditions imposed, are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
4. Spatial relationships of the windows to the wall, and each window to the other windows on the structure are altered but with conditions imposed, are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. .
5. The existing wooden doors are not original to the structure.
6. No conjectural features or elements from other historic properties have been or will be added to the property.
7. There have been no changes to the property that have acquired significance in their own right.
8. No chemical or physical treatments have or will occur.
9. All work has and will occur within the existing footprint of the structure, and no ground disturbing activities are proposed.
10. No new additions or adjacent construction are proposed.
11. The replacement of the doors and alteration of the windows as conditioned is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the project qualifies for a Class 31 exemption from CEQA.

**FURTHER** approval of the project is conditioned on the following terms and requirements. The violation of any term or requirement of this conditional approval may result in the revocation of the permit.

1. [Condition(s) to be determined by Historic Preservation Commission during meeting]
2. The applicant shall undertake the project as described herein and as approved by the Historic Preservation Commission. Any deviation in proposed design, architectural style, or exterior appearance from those currently proposed and approved shall have prior approval.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Eureka in the County of Humboldt, State of California, on the 7th day of November, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:	COMMISSIONER
NOES:	COMMISSIONER
ABSENT:	COMMISSIONER
ABSTAIN:	COMMISSIONER

---

Ted Loring, Chair, Historic Preservation Commission

*Attest:*

---

Rob Holmlund, Executive Secretary

**RESOLUTION NO. 2018-**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF EUREKA CONDITIONALLY APPROVING THE REPLACEMENT OF  
THE EXTERIOR DOORS AND ALTERATION OF THE WINDOWS AT 1736 13<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

WHEREAS, the subject property at 1736 13<sup>th</sup> Street is included on the Local Register of Historic Places (LRHP); and

WHEREAS, according to the “Green Book”, the residence was constructed in 1901 as a single-story frame Italianate house; and

WHEREAS, the applicant is proposing to replace both exterior doors with new, metal doors; and

WHEREAS, the applicant is requesting approval, after the fact, for the replacement of seven wooden windows with four new, vinyl windows, and the alteration of window framing; and

WHEREAS, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards were developed to promote consistent preservation practices, and the intent of the Standards is to assist the long-term preservation of a property's significance through the preservation of historic materials and features.

WHEREAS, the most appropriate standard to use for reviewing this project is Rehabilitation; and

WHEREAS, rehabilitation emphasizes the retention and repair of historic materials, but also acknowledges that time moves forward and properties change, and that additions may be made so long as the essential historic character on the parcel remains; and

WHEREAS, contemporary or non-historic materials may be used in the construction where the same materials would be impractical; and

WHEREAS, the project is subject to environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS, a project that complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties qualifies for a Class 31 exemption from the preparation of environmental documents.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Eureka, that the replacement of the exterior doors and the alterations to the windows are conditionally approved, and the decision to approve the subject application was made after careful, reasoned and equitable consideration of the evidence in the record, including, but not limited to: written and oral testimony submitted at the public hearing; the staff report; site investigation(s); project file; and, the evidence submitted with the permit application. The findings of fact listed below “bridge the analytical gap” between the raw evidence in the record and the Historic Preservation Commission's decision.

1. The historic residential use of the property will remain unchanged.
2. Replacing the windows and doors will not affect the spatial relationship of the property to adjacent residential properties.
3. The distinctive features, fenestrations, and historic character of the structure are altered through the modifications to the windows but with conditions imposed, are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
4. Spatial relationships of the windows to the wall, and each window to the other windows on the structure are altered but with conditions imposed, are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
5. The existing wooden doors are not original to the structure.
6. No conjectural features or elements from other historic properties have been or will be added to the property.
7. There have been no changes to the property that have acquired significance in their own right.
8. No chemical or physical treatments have or will occur.
9. All work has and will occur within the existing footprint of the structure, and no ground disturbing activities are proposed.
10. No new additions or adjacent construction are proposed.
11. With conditions imposed, the replacement of the doors and alteration of the windows is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the project qualifies for a Class 31 exemption from CEQA.

**FURTHER** approval of the project is conditioned on the following terms and requirements. The violation of any term or requirement of this conditional approval may result in the revocation of the permit.

1. [Condition(s) to be determined by Historic Preservation Commission during meeting]
2. The applicant shall undertake the project as described herein and as approved by the Historic Preservation Commission. Any deviation in proposed design, architectural style, or exterior appearance from those currently proposed and approved shall have prior approval.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Eureka in the County of Humboldt, State of California, on the 7th day of November, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONER  
 NOES: COMMISSIONER  
 ABSENT: COMMISSIONER  
 ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONER

---

Ted Loring, Chair, Historic Preservation Commission

*Attest:*

Rob Holmlund, Executive Secretary