
APPENDIX E

DR. ANTHONY KIRK REBUTTAL TO PAGE & TURNBULL PRELIMINARY
OPINION (DATED NOVEMBER 4, 2019)

Anthony Kirk, Ph.D.
420 Alberto Way, No. 13
Los Gatos, CA 95032
408-827-4959

4 November 2019

Brandon Swanson
Interim RMA Chief of Planning
Monterey County Resource Management Agency
1441 Schilling Place
Salinas, CA 93921

Dear Mr. Swanson:

I have carefully reviewed the Memorandum prepared by the firm Page & Turnbull, which is dated 29 October 2019. The “preliminary opinion” developed by the firm is that the “Mid Valley Shopping Center” “appears to possess sufficient significance and integrity to be eligible for listing in the California Register [of Historical Resources].” The authors refer to my letter to Russel W. Stanley, dated 18 September 2019, as a “memorandum.” It is not a memorandum! It is an evaluation of the architectural and historical significance of the Carmel Valley Shopping Center. As you know, if a consultant finds a property not be significant, he or she addresses the matter in a letter rather than by completing DPR forms.

Page and Turnbull states that my “memorandum” concerns the Mid Valley Shopping Center. While that name is used informally, the actual name of the center, which appears on many if not most of the drawing by Olof Dahlstrand (including figure 1 of the company’s Memorandum), as well as in contemporary newspaper articles, is Carmel Valley Shopping Center. It was not completed in 1966, as stated by Page and Turnbull. It was largely finished in the following year, 1967, with significant work on Block 2 completed in the course of two projects, one in 1977, the other in 1982. The shopping center does not include “a former theater,” as stated in the Page and Turnbull Memorandum. There is absolutely nothing left of the former theater, the Valley Cinema, that took up nearly half the space in Block 3. The theater itself now comprises two floors of Mid Valley Storage, while the original passageway that led to the theater, which was lined with movie posters and stretched some forty feet from the entrance, is now occupied by the firm Skinovation.

The Carmel Valley Shopping Center complex is said by Page & Turnbull to reflect “a thorough and cohesive approach to the design of a suburban shopping.” I have no idea what this means. It appears to be nothing more than bafflegab. The buildings and site are said to “retain a good degree of integrity” relative to the original design. Properties either retain integrity or they do not retain integrity. They do not “retain a good degree of integrity.” Until a building or a complex has been carefully evaluated—not subjected to a “preliminary opinion”—it is impossible to say whether or not it retains integrity. In my

opinion, as you know, the complex is neither architecturally nor historically significant. Because I did not find it to be significant, I did not evaluate it for integrity.

The photographs of the original drawings produced by Olof Dahlstrand in the Page & Turnbull Memorandum are of interest, but they in no way illustrate the significant alterations I detail in my letter to Russel Stanley: (1) the radical changes to the historic fabric of the two shops to the east of Safeway in Block 1; (2) the transformation of Valley Cinema, a major tenant in Block 3, which became Mid Valley Storage and Skinovation; and (3) the significant exterior modification to the south side of the former Crocker-Citizens National Bank, which originally occupied all of Block 4.

The Page & Turnbull Memorandum appears to have been hastily thrown together, with little thought and no meaningful analysis. It is lacking in factual evidence and is nothing more than a plea for more work. It is not an useful evaluation of the Carmel Valley Shopping Center.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Anthony Kirk". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Anthony Kirk, Ph.D.