

**ARCHITECTURAL AND PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, April 15, 2026 – 7:00 PM

Video Recording is Archived on the City Website

<https://www.claremontca.gov/Government/City-Council/Watch-a-Meeting>

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Neiuber called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PRESENT

COMMISSIONER: BENNETT, DEAL, NEIUBER, PERRY, SPIVACK,
TUCKER

ABSENT

COMMISSIONER: CASTILLO

ALSO PRESENT

Christopher Veirs, City Planner; Daniel Kim, Assistant Planner;
Jordan Goose, Assistant Planner; Melissa Sanabria, Administrative
Assistant

CEREMONIAL MATTERS, PRESENTATIONS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no ceremonial matters, presentations, or announcements.

PUBLIC COMMENT

This item starts at 0:01:01 in the archived video.

Commission Secretary Sanabria announced that no written, general public comments had been received.

Chair Neiuber invited public comment.

There were no requests to speak.

Chair Neiuber closed public comment.

CONSENT CALENDAR

This item starts at 0:02:58 in the archived video.

Chair Neiuber invited public comment.

There were no requests to speak.

Chair Neiuber closed public comment.

Commissioner Perry moved to approve the Consent Calendar, seconded by Commissioner Deal; and carried on by roll call vote as follows:

AYES: Commissioner – Bennett, Deal, Neiuber, Perry, Tucker

NOES: Commissioner – None

ABSTENTIONS: Commissioner – Spivack

ABSENCES: Commissioner – Castillo

Commissioner Spivack abstained from voting on the Consent Calendar due to not being present at the Architectural and Preservation Meeting on February 11, 2026.

1. Architectural and Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes of February 11, 2026
Approved and filed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

This item starts at 00:05:10 in the archived video.

2. Architectural and Site Plan Review #26-A02, Review of a New Standing Seam Metal Roof on a Two-Story Single-Family Residence Located at 2178 North San Marcos Place. Applicant - Mohamad Baroudi

Assistant Planner Kim presented a PowerPoint and addressed Commissioners' questions regarding the roof's style, its compatibility with the neighborhood, the presence of nearby mansard roofs, and the appropriateness of the materials used. City Planner Veirs clarified that mansard roofing materials are more commonly found in commercial locations than in residential ones, which is why this matter was referred to the Commission.

Additionally, Assistant Planner Kim responded to further questions from the Commissioners regarding the cost differences between shingle and standing seam metal roofing, whether the roof would extend over painted areas, and whether the material was selected for safety or fire prevention reasons.

Chair Neiuber invited public comment.

There were no requests to speak.

Public comment was closed.

Commissioner Perry had no objections to the proposed roof type; however, he found the visibility and color of the roof to be overly intense. While he agreed that the material and style were appropriate, he felt that the color palette was stark. He expressed his eagerness to hear the comments of the other Commissioners regarding the color choice.

Commissioner Deal visited the property and observed the neighborhood's diverse architectural styles. She felt that the roof design, although it had a commercial appearance, would fit in well. She appreciated the beautiful door and front porch featuring metal accents and did not oppose the project.

Commissioner Tucker supported the metal roof, noting its longer lifespan compared to shingles and its enduring appearance. She stated that the proposed material aligns with the

French mansard style, effectively mimicking the original intent, which would have used lead. Commissioner Tucker agreed with Commissioner Perry's comments regarding the intensity of the color palette and suggested that the applicant consider a softer gray instead.

Commissioner Bennett expressed support for the design, stating it would complement the neighborhood.

Commissioner Spivack noted that while the roof design is dramatic, it complements the home well and shows its architectural style effectively. She agreed that softening the color is worth considering, but she would not oppose the project, as it aligns with the good taste of the neighborhood. Commissioner Spivack also suggested adding black trim to the white dormers for a more cohesive appearance and commended the applicant for the investment in the property.

Chair Neiuber expressed that he typically opposes standing seam roofs on most homes in Claremont. He noted that he has observed standing seam roofs being used on residential properties in Hollywood, Beverly Hills, and Palm Springs. Chair Neiuber also mentioned Commissioner Perry's concerns about the sizing, emphasizing that the black color would make the roof appear even heavier, especially considering that the current shingles already give a heavy appearance.

Commissioner Perry agreed with the Commissioners' comments and that the proposed roof style is an improvement over the existing shingles. Overall, the project is an improvement to the aesthetic of the home, adding a touch of simplicity. Commissioner Perry offered that he found the project to be appropriate and would support the project. While a softer color could lessen the impact, it would be inconsistent with the rest of the home.

Commissioner Spivack moved to adopt Resolution No. 2026-04, A RESOLUTION OF THE ARCHITECTURAL AND PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE PLAN REVIEW #26-A02, REVIEW OF A NEW STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF ON A TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE LOCATED AT 2178 NORTH SAN MARCOS PLACE; and find this item is exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Seconded by Commissioner Bennett; and carried on a roll call vote as follows:

AYES: Commissioner – Bennett, Deal, Neiuber, Perry, Spivack, Tucker
NOES: Commissioner – None
ABSENCES: Commissioner – Castillo

Chair Neiuber announced this decision can be appealed within ten calendar days.

This item starts at 00:23:36 in the archived video.

3. Sign Review #15-S01AMD, Review of Proposed Amendment To CMC Campus Sign Program. Applicant - Claremont McKenna College

City Planner Veirs presented a PowerPoint presentation and addressed Commissioners' inquiries regarding parking and directional signage.

Mario Violich, Moore Rubel Yudell Architects and Planners, provided a verbal presentation and addressed Commissioners' questions regarding the project's lighting strategy, the additional signage lighting's impact on the surrounding area, and wayfinding signage.

City Planner Veirs confirmed that a 30-day lighting review would be conducted to ensure the lighting was not too bright.

Chair Neiuber invited public comment.

There were no requests to speak.

Public comment was closed.

Commissioner Deal spoke in support of the project, as the design is well done and is a good addition to the college.

Commissioner Bennett appreciated the project's design for being architecturally and artistically appealing and appropriately sized.

Commissioner Tucker found the project to be an elegant solution. She liked the steel, which reflects the colors of CMC, and noted its legibility both during the day and at night.

Commissioner Perry spoke in support of the design, particularly highlighting the pylon sign. He noted that it provides a nice contrast within the overall sign system and serves as a landmark along Claremont Boulevard, clearly identifying the Sports Bowl and the parking area. He echoed Commissioner Bennett's positive remarks and suggested the applicant watch the ground cover, especially the Mahonia during summer as it is not likely to take the heat and sun that will be present at the site. He suggested that the applicant consider replacing it with a sun-suitable plant like prostrate rosemary.

Commissioner Spivack agreed with her fellow Commissioners and noted that the signage is beautiful. However, she expressed concern that the pylon sign might be too large. Ultimately, she deferred to the expertise of the architect and the City Planner.

Chair Neiuber agreed that the project is appropriate, noting its total square footage is well below what would be allowed for the site. He emphasized the need to clearly define the single main entrance and believes the scale and massing are appropriate.

Commissioner Perry moved to adopt Resolution No. 2026-05, A RESOLUTION OF THE CLAREMONT ARCHITECTURAL AND PRESERVATION COMMISSION APPROVING SIGN REVIEW #15-S01AMD, FOR REVISIONS TO PREVIOUSLY-APPROVED SIGN PROGRAM FOR THE CLAREMONT MCKENNA COLLEGE CAMPUS. APPLICANT - CLAREMONT MCKENNA COLLEGE. Seconded by Commissioner Bennett; and carried on a roll call vote as follows:

AYES: Commissioner – Bennett, Deal, Neiuber, Perry, Spivack, Tucker
NOES: Commissioner – None
ABSENCES: Commissioner – Castillo

Chair Neiuber announced this decision can be appealed within ten calendar days.

This item starts at 00:52:40 in the archived video.

4. Register Listing #26-RL01, Review of a Proposal to Add Seventy-Nine Properties with Modern Architecture to the Register of Structures of Historical and Architectural Merit of the City of Claremont

Assistant Planner Goose presented a PowerPoint presentation and noted that voting would be split up due to the Commissioners' proximity to the subject properties within 500 feet.

City Planner Veirs provided further clarification regarding how the voting would need to proceed due to Commissioner conflicts based on a 500-foot proximity from their properties. During this discussion, Chair Neiuber shared that the eleven properties with missing historical surveys should be removed from consideration: 584 West 9th Street, 700 Alamosa Drive, 4150 Las Casas Drive, 4151 Las Casas Drive, 4154 Las Casas Drive, 1089 Oxford Avenue, 4143 Tenango Road, 796 Via Santo Tomas, 2772 Via Sinaloa, 2701 North Mountain Avenue, and 4205 Oak Hollow Road.

City Planner Veirs also summarized the objections received from 655 East Foothill Boulevard, 669 West 8th Street, 796 Via Santo Tomas, 4184 Tenango Road, 842 West Harrison, and 584 West 9th Street. He went on to explain that dropping these additional properties would be up to the Commission's recommendation, as the municipal code is very clear that listing a property is not dependent on the property owner's consent. City Planner Veirs went on to say that, other than the Foothill property, these properties may not warrant overriding the owner's preference without additional compelling information.

Chair Neiuber recommended adding the properties with objections to a list of properties that will be postponed for review, except for the Millard Sheets property on Foothill Boulevard. Commissioner Spivack shared that she spoke with the property owner of this building and detailed some of the concerns about being able to make changes to the building as needs change, which was unclear to the property owner.

The Commission and City Planner Veirs engaged in a discussion about the properties that would be continued to a later date, which properties would be voted upon for the item, and concerns expressed by property owners.

Assistant Planner Goose addressed Commissioners' inquiries regarding the notification process for the item. City Planner Veirs provided further clarification regarding how property owner information is obtained, and that notice was also sent to neighboring properties within a 300-foot radius of each property proposed for designation.

The Commission agreed to amend the recommendation to drop the 11 missing survey locations and locations where property owners expressed objections to being added to the Registry: 584 West 9th Street, 700 Alamosa Drive, 4150 Las Casas Drive, 4151 Las Casas Drive, 4154 Las Casas Drive, 1089 Oxford Avenue, 4143 Tenango Road, 796 Via Santo Tomas, 2772 Via Sinaloa, 2701 North Mountain Avenue, 4205 Oak Hollow Road, 655 East Foothill Boulevard, 669 West 8th Street, 796 Via Santo Tomas, 4184 Tenango Road, and 842 West Harrison.

City Planner Veirs and Assistant Planner Goose addressed Commissioners' inquiries regarding whether the ten-day notice is the only required step in notifying properties that a property would be up for discussion and review for addition to the Register, what other

information was included in the notice, how property owners could access that information, if there was a mechanism to determine if a property owner received the notification, if there's an option for property owners to opt out, where property owners can take information if there is something incorrect in the property's listing, if surveys can be updated to reflect updates to the properties, what due diligence occurred in updating surveys, and if Claremont Heritage can update missing information from the surveys.

City Planner Veirs further summarized the amended action that would be voted on, noting that 16 homes had been removed from consideration for the item.

Chair Neuber invited public comment.

Unidentified speaker expressed that homeowners appreciate their nomination but are unclear about what modifications can or cannot be made to their homes, as well as the implications of the designation. He recommended that the Commission postpone the item until a clearer explanation of the process can be provided to the property owners involved.

Lori Bassman asked that more information be provided and shared her concerns about how her insurance will be impacted by being added to the Registry.

Cinnamon agreed that there is a lot of confusion from property owners and shared that she received the notice from her neighbors. She requested that residents be provided with additional information and have the opportunity to appeal, defer, or self-nominate to be added to the Registry.

Laura Kotopsky expressed concerns about her rights, responsibilities, and the benefits of the designation, and found it challenging to locate the Ordinance. Additionally, Laura voiced concern about what changes can be made to the property and that other owners requested to be removed from consideration. She agreed with Commissioner Spivack that more information is needed.

Unidentified speaker shared his history in the City, and that Millard Sheets' son was a student of his mother. He echoed the sentiments of the other commenters and asked if there was a way for homeowners to see the surveys of their homes. The speaker also voiced support for Claremont Heritage, but shared that additional information would be helpful.

Jesse Emmert, a member of the Board for Claremont Heritage and the Planning Commission, spoke as a resident with a home on the Register. He noted that the homes on the proposed list were ineligible in the 1980s and that their current inclusion is an honor that offers protection, especially since some are vulnerable. He also mentioned being able to make modifications to his home that were appropriate to its architectural style and encouraged the Commission to approve the item.

Evis Mezini expressed her pride in living in her home and her desire to preserve its natural surroundings and mid-century style. She purchased the property in 2015 but felt uncertain that the survey accurately reflected her efforts in maintaining and improving it. While she sees value in the designation, she requested more time for property owners to fully understand what being on the Register entails.

Erica Beer expressed concerns about the implications of being on the Registry. She thanked Commissioner Spivack and noted that ongoing work at her home was likely not reflected in the survey. She requested that the Commission pause to ensure a better understanding for all involved.

David Shearer provided additional background information and an overview of adding buildings to the Register, explaining what that entails. He also shared that Claremont Heritage would be happy to host a community meeting to share more information.

There were no other requests to speak.

Public comment was closed.

Commissioner Tucker suggested that the item be moved to a different date to allow for further discussion.

Commissioner Perry acknowledged the solid framework established by Claremont Heritage and the City for identifying properties for the Register, but expressed concerns that communication with homeowners has not been sufficiently developed. He suggested improving notification methods and providing a printed summary for those interested in self-registering. Additionally, he advocated for Claremont Heritage to hold workshops to educate homeowners about the process. He emphasized that more work is needed before taking any action.

Commissioner Deal shared that she does not reside in a historic home and is learning about the preservation process. She attended a presentation at Claremont Heritage that discussed the loss of history in a city and how detrimental that is. As a result, she is eager to move forward and gain more knowledge about this process.

Commissioner Spivack thanked the community members who spoke during public comment and appreciated David Shearer's offer for Claremont Heritage to host a workshop. She stressed the importance of preserving valuable resources and having homes on the Register that reflect a clear design or purpose, noting that while many homes are well-maintained, some are not. Commissioner Spivack expressed concerns about the information in the surveys and urged property owners to check their addresses for updates and pictures. Additionally, she suggested that the Commission take more time to address the issue and hold a meeting to create a plan, as previous listings were considered one at a time for more thoughtful evaluation.

Commissioner Bennett emphasized the Commission's focus on architecture and preservation, which he believed all speakers shared. However, he noted a lack of understanding about the implications of being on the Register. If David Shearer, who is passionate about preservation, is asking for a pause, the Commission should take time to ensure homeowners understand the meaning of being on the Registry.

Chair Neiuber discussed Claremont's unique character and the benefits of its historic preservation efforts, which attract both people and revenue. He highlighted the common misconception that historic homes cannot be altered, explaining that he has preserved the exterior of his own historic home to maintain neighborhood harmony. Chair Neiuber shared that research by Claremont Heritage showed that historic homes command higher prices per square foot than other homes in the City. Being on the Registry also allows properties to

qualify for the Mills Act, offering tax reductions for restoration efforts. He explained that the four criteria for the Registry each have nuances. Some properties meet only one criterion, while others meet all, which does not reduce their value. This is why some surveys have more information. Chair Neiuber supported hosting informational sessions and recommended tabling the item for further discussion, emphasizing that the evaluation focuses on exteriors rather than interiors. Claremont Heritage and staff are available for guidance on appropriate modifications.

City Planner Veirs confirmed that the item could be continued for additional information to a date not specified as was identified as Alternative 1 in the staff report.

Commissioner Spivack offered her time to go through the surveys and pull ones that she had concerns about to allow for a more even presentation and ensure that the criteria are being met.

Commissioner Perry spoke in support of tabling with the thought that they need to identify the next steps for homeowners. He shared that he did not want to table the item without a clear game plan for moving forward.

City Planner Veirs voiced his appreciation for the comments received and shared his support for including more information in the notice moving forward. He noted that staff had anticipated fielding more calls from residents to allow for a one-on-one conversation, but received very few. He also suggested bringing fewer homes at a time to be added to the Registry.

Chair Neiuber supported City Planner Veirs' suggestion to limit the number of items brought at one time, suggesting fifteen, and also recommended including more information for residents or providing a link to view the historical surveys.

City Planner Veirs clarified that the surveys were attached to the staff report, which is available on the City website.

The Commission entered a discussion on how to offer residents information about the most common questions, which resulted in a Subcommittee being set up to work with Assistant Planner Goose and City Planner Veirs.

Commissioner Spivack moved to continue Register Listing #26-RL01, Review of a Proposal to Add Seventy-Nine Properties with Modern Architecture to the Register of Structures of Historical and Architectural Merit of the City of Claremont, to a non-specific date to allow time to put together an informational packet to provide additional information to residents and create a Subcommittee with Commissioners Bennett, Spivack, and Tucker. Seconded by Commissioner Tucker; and carried on a roll call vote as follows:

AYES: Commissioner – Bennett, Deal, Neiuber, Perry, Spivack, Tucker
NOES: Commissioner – None
ABSENCES: Commissioner – Castillo

Chair Neiuber announced this decision can be appealed within ten calendar days.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS – None

REPORTS

This item starts at 02:16:43 in the archived video.

An audience member requested additional public comments to encourage the Commission to consider a broader range of homes. Chair Neiuber replied that the public comment period had ended and that extra comments are only accepted from those who couldn't speak during the designated 30 minutes.

Staff

City Planner Veirs reported on items of interest from previous City Council meetings, described future items coming before the Commission, and provided a reminder regarding required statements for abstentions and recusals.

Commission/Committee

Commissioner Bennett provided updates from the art committee, upcoming art installations and murals, and asked about the graffiti removal process for the art boxes.

City Planner Veirs answered Commissioner questions regarding the Village South project and the sixty-day period of assessment for comments related to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Commissioner Spivack asked for an update on Walter's construction.

Chair Neiuber shared that he was contacted by Walter's to do a special wall showcasing the history of the people who have been there. He also provided an update on the upcoming Garner House rededication on May 14, 2026, and the Route 66 Centennial Monument sign that will be installed on Foothill Boulevard next month.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Neiuber adjourned the meeting at 9:37 PM.

Chair

ATTEST:

Administrative Assistant