

*Los Altos*

# Halsey House – ADA compliance and Alternatives Discussion



June 14, 2016

# Discussion Items

- How we got here and purpose of the feasibility study
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Parking Requirements
- Alternatives
  - Alternative A– Renovation and Adaptive Re-use
  - Alternative A (partial)– Partial renovation and demolition
  - Alternative B – New Construction (not studied)
  - Alternative C – Preservation
  - Alternative D - Demolition



**Halsey House**

# Site History

- Constructed in 1923
- Purchased by the City in 1974
- Landmarked in 1981
  - 12.44.210 - Duty to keep in good repair.
    - A. The owner, occupant or the person in actual charge of a historic resource, a historic landmark or property located within a historic district shall keep and maintain in good condition and repair all exterior portions of the improvement or structure, and all interior portions thereof whose maintenance is necessary to prevent deterioration and decay of any exterior architectural feature or natural feature.
- Closed in 2008 due to public health and safety concerns
- In 2013 a CIP project was developed to better understand the feasibility and costs associated with two alternatives – renovation for adaptive reuse, and demolition and new construction
- M. Sandoval Architects selected in 2015 to perform a feasibility study review 2 design alternatives (renovation vs. new construction)
- Additional questions raised regarding ADA compliance and additional alternatives



# ADA and Parking

Per MIG report, Redwood Grove does not have ADA compliant access. The City provides compliance for current programming by making special accommodations (allowing drop off or providing assistance), but not for passive use of the park.

- Access can be provide from Shoup Park via upgrading the connecting pathway, or;
- Access can be provided via the main entry from University Avenue.

No parking is required to be constructed per the California Building Code (CBC) or ADA. The decision to provide parking is at the discretion of the City.

- If parking is to be provided or designated at a certain location (i.e. Shoup Park). Then ADA parking and a compliant pathway must be provided from the parking area to the facility.



# Alternative A – Renovation and Reuse

- Alternative A, revises the original construction budget provided in the M. Sandoval Report by removing parking in Redwood Grove and incorporates a new accessible path connecting Shoup Park to Redwood Grove
  - Preserves the historic Halsey House. Qualifies project for historic preservation grants
  - CEQA – By following the Secretary of the Interior’s standards, the project would qualify as a categorically exempt. No EIR associated with historic preservation would be required
  - Provides 4,000 SF of programmable space for Recreation and Community Services.
  - Overall project cost - \$3.2M



# Alternative A (partial)

- Alternative A (partial) represent a partial renovation and partial demolition concept intended to reduce the overall cost of the project. 1,200 square feet is an assumed square footage an only intended to provide a range of costs in association with Alternative A. The 1,200 square feet of renovated area would preserve one “wing” of the U-shaped house as well as the courtyard.
  - Would require EIR (\$75-100k) to address loss of historical significance and potential mitigation costs.
  - Great limits available programming (use would be similar in nature to the Neutra House.
  - Cost of \$1.6M (not including EIR and mitigations)



# Alternative C - Preservation

- Alternative C, Preservation of the Halsey House would perform a renovation of the exterior “shell” of the facility and thorough repair of damaged interiors, including structural components, however, the interior space would not be completed to a finished state and the facility would not be able to be occupied.
  - Preserves the historic Halsey House. Depending on scope, could qualify project for historic preservation grants.
  - Meets the City’s requirements for historic preservation.
  - Can be considered a “phased” approach as work being performed is necessary in an ultimate renovation.
  - Does not trigger site work requirements and occupancy related work.
  - Based off similar work performed in Capitola on the Rispin Mansion
  - Estimated cost of \$700k



# Alternative D - Demolition

- Alternative D, Demolition of the Halsey House would demolish the facility.
  - No programmable space would be provided.
  - Would require an EIR (\$75-100k) to address loss of historical significance and potential mitigation costs. Council would likely be required to overrule findings that it is feasible to renovate the property.
  - Estimated cost of \$115k does not include EIR costs or challenges to overruling of the EIR findings.





# Summary

- Staff seeks direction from Council identifying an alternative to pursue. If Council considers Alternatives A, A(partial), or C (Preservation) it is recommended to proceed forward with temporary measures identified in the 2015 M. Sandoval Report by making immediate repairs to prevent further deterioration from weather and vandalism. It is estimated by staff to cost \$25k to perform the temporary measures.
- Council is also encouraged to consider the need for programming space in Redwood Grove and the priority of capital needs for other facilities citywide.



Halsey House - Interior



*Los Altos*

# Halsey House – ADA compliance and Alternatives Discussion

