
APPENDIX K

Painter Preservation Alternatives Memorandum
(Dated September 22, 2021)



Painter Preservation
HISTORIC PRESERVATION & URBAN DESIGN

September 22, 2021

Teri Wissler Adam
Vice President/Senior Principal
301 Lighthouse Avenue
Monterey, CA 93940

RE Alternatives to proposed changes to the Mid Valley Shopping Center

The following fulfills Optional Task #2 in my Scope of Work, authorized in July 2021, which involves developing proposed alternatives to the redevelopment of the Mid Valley Shopping Center as proposed (drawings dated 11-2019, project description dated 9-22-2020) to be studied in the Environmental Impact Report for the project. Diana Painter, Principal Architectural Historian for Painter Preservation, was hired by EMC on behalf of Monterey County in August 2020 to develop an Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) for the Mid Valley Shopping Center to determine whether the resource (1965-1968), was historically and/or architecturally significant and retained integrity, baseline considerations under CEQA to ascertain whether a proposed project would adversely impact a historic resource. Painter Preservation completed this evaluation, documented in a report dated December 21, 2020. That report found the Mid Valley Shopping Center significant for its design and as the first shopping center in the Carmel Valley to exhibit a cohesive, comprehensive modern architectural expression (Criterion 3), and significant for its association with architect Olof Dahlstrand, a highly respect architect in Carmel and the greater Bay Area (also Criterion 3). The report also found that the shopping center retained integrity.

Painter Preservation then evaluated proposed changes to the shopping center with respect to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. If it can be demonstrated that a proposal meets the standards, it can be generally said that the proposed changes do not cause an adverse impact under CEQA. Painter Preservation completed this analysis on January 12, 2021. We found that the project did not meet the Standards, specifically Standards #2, #5 and #9, which address design, materials, features, finishes, construction techniques, and spatial relationships. The project as proposed affected the aspects of integrity that best characterize this suburban rustic, yet modern, shopping center, which are design, materials, workmanship, and feeling (aesthetics).

As part of developing the HRE and completing the above analysis, Painter Preservation developed a list of character-defining features that characterize the important qualities of the center, roughly in order of priority (HRE, p. 85 of 94). This provides the basis for developing an alternative that does not impact the existing historic shopping center. The qualities that are important to retain in the center (paraphrased), include the roof forms and materials; the framing design; the concrete work, that is, its quality of design and material expression; the repetition of columns and pilasters; the simplicity of the landscape and hardscape features; and the monument sign.

The design alternatives provided in this memorandum achieve the following goals:

- 1) remove the impactful recent changes to the shopping center that affect its historic qualities;
- 2) protect the character-defining qualities of the shopping center; and
- 3) inform the development of alternatives that are compatible with the historic qualities of the center.

Alternatives that can fulfill these goals can include following.

- 1) Remove the existing white paint and hardiplank that obscures the color, material quality and design of the existing concrete and concrete aggregate and intaglio patterning of the columns and surfaces.
- 2) Protect those features outlined in the list of character-defining features prepared as part of the HRE and the Secretary of Interior's Standards analysis.
- 3) Ensure compatibility with the historic features, achieved through the following (correlate these suggestions with the goals above, 1-3):
 - a. Do not change the design and material quality of the building roofs through adding 'pop-up' signage and removing roof cladding. Do not substitute metal roofs for shingle roofs.
 - b. Do not paint and otherwise obscure the design and material qualities of the concrete, rustic timbers, and their joinery. Do not add hardiplank imitating rustic wood that obscures 'real' materials in the center.
 - c. Do not remove the covered walkway, which not only protects pedestrians from sun and rain but also defines the public spaces and outdoor eating area, preventing them from looking like an extension of the parking lot and further, creates a visual corridor connecting the two anchors of the shopping center, the Safeway and the former theater. Do not remove existing overhangs, for the same reason.
 - d. Do not paint the natural materials of the center, which are in good condition and are part of its aesthetic. In particular, do not paint the shopping center in pastel shades that counter its aesthetic and natural qualities.
 - e. Do not create colorful plastic play features that do not relate to the existing simple landscape design. Drought tolerant landscape materials are a good idea, but removal of existing landscape that screens service areas from the surrounding neighborhood is in general not a good idea.
- 4) Reversing changes to the center that were made in the past are not required as part of this project but may be advantageous. They include 1) removing the mini-storage facility from the theater and replacing it with uses that generate pedestrian traffic; 2) restoring the front façade and public space at the theater; and 3) restoring the original appearance of the pharmacy (now a Goodwill).

This analysis provides direction to the project architect for redesigning the proposed project in order to preserve its historic integrity and make it an attractive feature of the neighborhood. The project can be redesigned to both protect the resource and achieve the project's goals.

Sincerely,



Diana J. Painter, PhD