



## CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

300 FOREST AVENUE  
PACIFIC GROVE, CALIFORNIA 93950  
TELEPHONE (831) 648-3190 • FAX (831) 648-3184

### MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

#### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

DATE & TIME: TUESDAY, AUGUST 12, 2008 – **6:00 P.M.**

LOCATION: CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 300 FOREST AVENUE

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting commenced at 6:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

Architectural Review Board (ARB) members present:

Jeff Becom

Darlene Billstrom

Ken Hinshaw

Doug Howe, Chair

Wilda Northrop

Maryanne Larson Spradling, Vice Chair

Staff in attendance:

Sarah Hardgrave, Senior Planner

Tricia Wotan, Associate Planner

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Minutes from July 22, 2008, Site Review and Regular Hearing were reviewed by the Board.

→ **On a motion by Billstrom/Spradling, the Board voted 6-0 to approve the July 22, 2008, ARB site review and regular hearing minutes.**

**4. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

None.

**5. COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

**6. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

None.

**7. CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS**

None.

**8. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS**

Board Member Billstrom reported that, on behalf of the Historic Resources Committee, she presented the recently revised Historic Preservation Ordinance to the Planning Commission and feedback was provided from both the Commission and the public.

**9. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

- ❖ **Project Address 950 Balboa Avenue:** Subcommittee approval has been granted for window details;
- ❖ **Project Address 383 Junipero Avenue:** Subcommittee approval has been granted for window details.

**10. ADMINISTRATIVE ARCHITECTURAL APPROVALS**

None.

**11. ITEMS WITHDRAWN OR TABLED**

None.

**12. REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE**

None.

**13. CONSENT AGENDA**

Both items originally denoted on the Consent Agenda, project addresses 1007 Balboa Avenue and 502 Evergreen Avenue, were moved to the Regular Agenda for discussion.

**→ On a motion by Becom/Hinshaw, the Board voted 6-0 to move Regular Agenda Item 14 d. Project Address 505 Seventeen Mile Drive to the Consent Agenda.**

**a. Project Address: 505 Seventeen Mile Drive**

Architectural Approval Application No. 3763-08 for proposed remodel and addition to an existing single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Hunter Eldridge, architect, for James Garcia

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

**→ On a motion by Becom/Hinshaw, the Board voted 6-0 to grant concept approval to the Consent Agenda as noted above.**

**14. REGULAR AGENDA**

**a. Project Address: 1007 Balboa Avenue**

Architectural Approval Application No. 3803-08 for proposed bay window on an existing single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Tim Scharer for Marsha Malis

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Tim Scharer, contractor, and Marsha Malis, owner, spoke to and answered questions from the Board. No further public comment was received.

→ **On a motion by Howe/Hinshaw, the Board voted 6-0 to grant final approval subject to subcommittee review (by Howe/Becom) of the window casing and trim detail to match existing materials and form, including the window sill and head. Architectural approval is based on the standard findings and conditions for approval of an architectural approval application.**

**b. Project Address: 502 Evergreen Road**

Architectural Approval Application No. 3636-07 for proposed design changes to window and door schedules for a single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Michael Boudreau for Jansen family

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Michael Boudreau, architect, presented the design changes to and answered questions from the Board. No further public comment was received.

→ **On a motion by Billstrom/Hinshaw, the Board voted 4-2 (with Northrop and Howe voting no) to grant final architectural approval. Architectural approval is based on the standard findings and conditions for approval of an architectural approval application.**

**c. Project Address: 401 Eardley Avenue**

Architectural Approval Application No. 3783-08 for proposed exterior alterations to an existing single-family residence. This project was continued from the July 22, 2008, ARB hearing.

Applicant: Manuel DeMaria, contractor, for Scoto family

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Manuel DeMaria, mason, presented the project to and answered questions from the Board. No further public comment was received.

→ On a motion by Hinshaw/Billstrom, the Board voted 6-0 to **deny** the architectural application as presented on the basis that the project does not conform to the Tudor architectural style and design as noted on page 5 of the Architectural Review Guidelines and the use of materials and texture as noted in Section 4 of the Guidelines.

→ On a motion by Hinshaw/Becom, the Board voted 5-1 (with Howe voting no) to **deny** the Categorical Exemption conclusion of the Historic Assessment. The Board believes the report ignores the City's criterion for historic potential, and that the existing structure has retained historic integrity and the minor improvements over time are reversible and have not compromised the potential historic features of the dwelling.

**d. Project Address: 820-822 Cedar Street**

Architectural Approval Application No. 3800-08 for proposed window and door changes to an existing multi-family dwelling.

Applicant: Loretta Warren

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

John Warren, son of owner, presented the project to and answered questions from the Board. No further public comment was received.

→ On a motion by Hinshaw/Becom, the Board voted 5-1 (with Howe voting no) to refer the project back to the applicant for further study and to return to the ARB to a date uncertain with applied grid details and new door samples. This decision was rendered based upon inconsistency of the proposed project with the existing architectural style and design of the structure per page 5 Section 1 of the Architectural Review Guidelines, and Guideline 5 of the Window Guidelines.

Further public comment in opposition to the Board's decision was received from John Warren after the decision above was rendered.

**e. Project Address: 601 Lighthouse Avenue**

Sign Permit Application No. 08-1053 for proposed signage on an existing commercial structure.

Applicant: Chris Polster, AKC Services, for Bank of America

CEQA status: Class 11 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Chris Polster presented the project to and answered questions from the Board. No further public comment was received.

**→ On a motion by Billstrom/Hinshaw, the Board voted 6-0 to refer the project back to the applicant for further study based upon Title 20 Sign Ordinance of the Municipal Code, and the project will be heard again at the ARB hearing scheduled for September 9, 2008.**

BOARD MEMBER SPRADLING STEPPED DOWN PRIOR TO THE NEXT ITEM DUE TO OWNING PROPERTY WITHIN 500 FEET OF THE PROJECT SITE.

**f. Project Address: 1349 Pico Avenue**

Architectural Approval Application No. 3779-08 for proposed design changes to an approved addition and remodel project for an existing single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Terry Latasa, architect, for Youssef family

CEQA status: Adopted 2004 Environmental Impact Report and Mitigation Measures apply to newly proposed design changes; no subsequent EIR necessary per CEQA Article 11 Section 15162.

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Frank Jenkins, contractor, presented the design changes to and answered questions from the Board.

Public comment: Maryanne Spradling, neighbor, spoke in opposition to the current project and stated the staging area encroached onto her property. No further public comment was received.

**→ On a motion by Howe/Billstrom, the Board voted 5-0 to refer the project back to the applicant for the development and submittal of details and specifications for the following items: stone work (type and application method), fascia and eave, skylights, garage door (type and installation method), railing, design colors, and windows. All details should be included in the design plans. This project shall be heard at the September 9, 2008, ARB hearing.**

BOARD MEMBER SPRADLING RETURNED TO THE BOARD.

**g. Project Address: 1013 David Avenue (formerly 1021 David Avenue)**

Architectural Approval Application No. 3749-08 for proposed new two-story single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Robert S. Walker, architect

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Robert Walker, architect, presented the revised project plans, including a streetscape elevation of the proposed four single family dwellings at 1013 – 1019 David Avenue.

Public comment: Pastor Chuck Davis thanked the applicants for working with the Del Monte Park neighbors and responding to their concerns in the revised plans.

Board member Northrop identified concerns with the proportion of the windows and stated that narrower windows on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor bay window would be preferable from a design standpoint. Board members Becom, Spradling and Hinshaw noted the improvements from the plans previously reviewed and general support for the concept design. Board member Billstrom identified her concerns with the similar roof pitch and chimney structures on each proposed house, as well as overall concern that the designs reflect a track house development rather than distinct structures.

**On a motion by Becom, second by Howe, the Board voted 5-1 to grant concept approval, with Board member Billstrom voting no.**

**h. Project Address: 1015 David Avenue (formerly 1021 David Avenue)**

Architectural Approval Application No. 3750-08 for proposed new two-story single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Robert S. Walker, architect

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Robert Walker, architect, presented the revised project plans, and clarified that the proposed exterior siding is shingles rather than stone.

Board member Becom noted that some variation in the new structures could be added by utilizing different chimney treatments, including stone. Board member Northrop, citing Architectural Review Guidelines #33 and #36, expressed concern about the round window shape and placement over the front door.

**On a motion by Becom, second by Hinshaw, the Board voted 5-1 to grant concept approval with further study of the window over the front door and the chimney treatment, with Board member Billstrom voting no.**

**i. Project Address: 1017 David Avenue (formerly 1021 David Avenue)**

Architectural Approval Application No. 3751-08 for proposed new two-story single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Robert S. Walker, architect

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Robert Walker, architect, presented the revised project plans.

Board member Becom inquired about the placement of the second story, citing Architectural Review Guideline #19 and the diagrams for appropriate infill. The applicant explained that the second story placement was intended to protect the neighboring views and to create view corridors through the proposed dwellings. Board member Hinshaw suggested that the applicant consider different types of stone treatment in the final plans. Board member Spradling concurred that such details could help make greater distinctions between each structure. Board member Billstrom noted she preferred the roof line in this unit.

**On a motion by Howe, second by Spradling, the Board voted 4-2 to grant concept approval, with Board members Becom and Billstrom voting no.**

**j. Project Address: 1019 David Avenue (formerly 1021 David Avenue)**

Architectural Approval Application No. 3761-08 for proposed new two-story single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Robert S. Walker, architect

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Robert Walker, architect, presented the revised project plans, and clarified that the proposed exterior siding is horizontal siding rather than stucco.

Public comment: Bill Frank, neighbor at 1027 Lincoln, noted that the elevation change in the rear is minimal, and that he would prefer to see some consistency between the structures, for example with the roof lines, and not have a hodge podge of styles.

Board member Hinshaw inquired about the proposed roofing materials and suggested the applicant consider different textures as well as different colors, and to look at providing exposed rafter tails on one or two of the new units to further distinguish each building. Board member Billstrom noted the similarities between the garage doors and the fenestration of the front windows, and suggested the applicant consider a clear story window. Board member Becom concurred and noted the box window in the front was very similar to that proposed at 1015 David.

**On a motion by Becom, second by Northrop, the Board voted 5-1 to grant concept approval, with Board members Becom and Billstrom voting no.**

## 15. **REPORTS OF BOARDMEMBERS**

Board Member Billstrom reported that the Heritage Society of Pacific Grove is sponsoring Board Member Hinshaw to attend two upcoming all-day historic preservation workshops in Ventura, California.

Board member Billstrom also noted that at the next Planning Commission meeting on August 21, 2008, there will be continued review and discussion of proposed revisions to the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Board member Becom noted that he will be out of the country from mid-October to mid-November, and therefore unable to attend the meetings during that time.

## 16. **REPORTS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

None.

## 17. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

**Note:** Materials regarding meeting agendas and minutes for the Architectural Review Board are available for review at the Community Development Department, 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove.

THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES. **THE CITY MANAGER'S CONFERENCE ROOM AND CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS IN PACIFIC GROVE CITY HALL ARE ACCESSIBLE MEETING PLACES.** A LIMITED NUMBER OF DEVICES ARE AVAILABLE TO ASSIST THOSE WHO ARE HEARING IMPAIRED. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO USE ONE OF THESE DEVICES, PLEASE CONTACT THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT SECRETARY AT (831) 648-3190.

## **NOTICE TO APPLICANTS**

Applicants or their representatives must be present at the meeting for which their item, **including those items on the Consent Agenda**, is scheduled. **If unable to attend, the applicant must submit a written request for continuance prior to the meeting. The item may be denied if continuance is not requested.**

Decisions rendered by the Architectural Review Board may be appealed to the Planning Commission using a form available at the Community Development Department. The appeal form, plus an appeal fee, must be filed with the Community Development Department within 10 days (5 days in the case of a single-family dwelling in an R-1 zone as considered under the terms of subsection F. of Section 23.73.040 of the Municipal Code) of the action or decision being appealed. Notwithstanding the time limit for appeal set out in the above section, the Planning Commission and the City Council shall always have until their next regularly scheduled meeting following Architectural Review Board action to decide to review such action. No building permit pertaining to an Architectural Review Board action may be issued until the appeal period has passed.

Applicants are requested to contact the Building Department for building permit requirements. No sign approved by the Architectural Review Board shall be painted, erected, or otherwise installed until the appeal period has passed. **Any proposed exterior changes from approved plans require Architectural Review Board review and approval.** There is a fee for design changes submitted after the architectural approval application has been granted final approval.

**STANDARD FINDING FOR APPROVAL OF AN ARCHITECTURAL APPROVAL APPLICATION**

The architecture and general appearance of the building(s) will be in keeping with the neighborhood and the completed project will not be detrimental to the orderly and harmonious development of the City nor impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.

**STANDARD CONDITIONS OF ARCHITECTURAL APPLICATION APPROVALS**

This approval shall be null and void if a building permit has not been applied for within one year from the date of approval. Application for extension of this approval must be made prior to the expiration date.

All construction must occur in strict compliance with the proposal as set forth in the application(s) for permits, subject to any special conditions. Any deviation from the approved plans must be reviewed and approved by the staff and may require Architectural Review Board approval.

The terms and conditions shall be perpetual, and it is the intention of the Architectural Review Board and the permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions.

Review by the Public Works Department is required prior to issuance of the building permit. The applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from the Public Works Department before undertaking any work in the Public way and prior to issuance of the building permit.

**JUDICIAL TIME LIMITS**

This serves as written notice that Pacific Grove Municipal Code Section 1.20.010 incorporates Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure of the State of California and provides a ninety-day limitation for judicial review of any final administrative decision by the council, or any board, commissioner, or officer of the city.