



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, SEPTEMBER 9, 2008 – 6:00 P.M.

LOCATION: CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 300 FOREST AVENUE

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting commenced at 6:05pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Architectural Review Board (ARB) Members present:

Jeff Becom

Darlene Billstrom

Ken Hinshaw

Doug Howe, Chair

Maryanne Larson Spradling, Vice Chair

Wilda Northrop

Staff in attendance:

Sarah Hardgrave, Senior Planner

Patrick Kelly, Contract Planner

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes from the August 26, 2008, ARB Site Review and Regular Meeting were reviewed by the Board.

→ **On a motion by Northrop/Hinshaw, the Board voted 6-0 to approve the August 26, 2008 ARB site review and regular meeting minutes.**

4. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None.

5. COMMUNICATIONS

None.

6. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

None.

7. CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS

None.

8. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

None.

9. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

None.

10. ADMINISTRATIVE ARCHITECTURAL APPROVALS

None.

11. ITEMS WITHDRAWN OR TABLED

None.

12. REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE

None.

13. CONSENT AGENDA

Item 13b, project address 138 Fountain Avenue, was moved to the regular agenda for discussion.

a. Project Address: 226 Laurel Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3787-08 for tile roof replacement on a an existing single-family dwelling listed on the City of Pacific Grove Historic Resources Inventory.

Applicant: Richard Hobbie, property owner

CEQA Status: Class 31 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

b. Project Address: 440 Crocker Avenue

Amendment to Architectural Approval Application No. 3713-07 for proposed window design change for a previously approved remodel and addition to an existing single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Dennis Hodgin, architect, for Charles Wilkinson

CEQA Status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

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

14. REGULAR AGENDA**a. Project Address: 138 Fountain Avenue (HRI)**

ARB member Jeffrey Becom stepped down prior to this item due to residence within 500 feet.

Architectural Approval Application No. 3816-08 for proposed roof material change to an existing single-family dwelling listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory.

Applicant: Martin J. Schopp

CEQA status: Class 31 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Project applicant Martin J. Schopp clarified that the wooden gutters will be retained or replaced with the same material, and that the proposed shingle pattern on the first floor bay window roof will be replaced to match the existing wood shingle pattern. No further public comment was received.

→ **On a motion by Billstrom/Northrop, the Board voted 6-0 to grant final architectural approval. Architectural approval is based on the standard findings and conditions for approval of an architectural approval application.**

b. Project Address: 601 Lighthouse Avenue

Sign Permit Application No. 08-1053 for proposed signage on an existing commercial structure. Item continued from the August 12, 2008, ARB hearing.

Applicant: Chris Polster and Kasey Clark, 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.

Wally Redun presented the project and answered questions from the Board. No further public comment was received.

→ **On a motion by Howe/Spradling, the Board voted 6-0 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: 908 Del Monte Boulevard

Architectural Approval Application No. 3791-08 for proposed second-story addition to an existing single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Darren Davis, designer, on behalf of Shield family

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Paul Shield presented the project and answered questions from the Board.

Public comment:

Erwin Spizer, neighbor at 1008 Ripple Avenue, spoke in opposition to the project due to potential impacts to viewshed from his residence.

→ **On a motion by Northrop/Howe, the Board voted 5-1 (with Hinshaw voting no) to grant final architectural approval. Architectural approval is based on the standard findings and conditions for approval of an architectural approval application.**

d. Project Address: 1136 Balboa Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3784-08 for proposed second story addition and remodel to an existing single-family dwelling. Item continued from the August 26, 2008, ARB hearing.

Applicant: Robert Mein, architect

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Bob Mein presented the project, and Steve Jacobs and Karen Flup presented window details. They responded to questions from the Board.

Public comment:

Chris Houston, neighbor, spoke in favor of proposed changes to garage portion of project and expressed concern about addition to the east side of the house.

Eddie Hurt, Pacific Grove resident, architect, and former ARB member, spoke in favor of the project.

→ **On a motion by Howe/Billstrom, the Board voted 5-1 (with Hinshaw voting no) to grant concept architectural approval with the conditions that the roof pitch be revised to the previously proposed 4.5/12 pitch and that the garage plate height be reduced from 9'8" to 8'6", and that the garage be setback to better conform to Architectural Review Guideline #4.**

e. 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. Item continued from the August 12, 2008, ARB hearing.

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.

ARB member Maryanne Spradling stepped down prior to this item due to residence within 500 feet.

Terry Latasa presented the project and responded to questions by the Board.

Public comment:

Maryanne Spradling expressed concerns with the roof material and noted that the staging area was not part of the ARB approval and was being addressed separately by staff and the applicant.

→ **On a motion by Howe/Billstrom, the Board voted 5-0 to continue the item to the September 23, 2008 meeting and to refer the project back to the applicant to add the structural framing beam to the plans, to consider horizontal stacking for the stone elements, to revise the window trim detail, to remove the glass tinting from the deck railings, and to provide a sample of a tinted window for other portions of the structure.**

f. Project Address: 1007 Hillside Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3774-08 for a proposed new two-story single-family dwelling, and Tree Permit Application No. 2008327 for the removal of 19 trees.

Applicant: Steven Krebs, Krebs Designs, on behalf of Bart Jovellana

CEQA Status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Derek Seimens presented the project and responded to questions from the Board.

Public comment:

Debbie Ternullo, neighbor, expressed concerns about potential storm drainage issues and the need to retain runoff onsite.

Carl Mounteer, neighbor, spoke in opposition to the project and expressed concerns with building and site coverage, building setbacks, staking and flagging of the proposed structure, and impacts to his private viewshed.

→ **On a motion by Billstrom/Howe, the Board voted 5-1 (with Northrop voting no) to continue the item to the October 14, 2008 meeting and to refer the project back to the applicant to study increasing the front setback, clarifying tree removal on the site plan, revising the front stairways and providing additional details on the stair and rail elements.**

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 presented the project and responded to questions from the Board.

The Board decided to review and consider items 14g – j together.

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 presented the project and responded to questions from the Board.

The Board decided to review and consider items 14g – j together.

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 presented the project and responded to questions from the Board.

The Board decided to review and consider items 14g – j together.

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 presented the project and responded to questions from the Board.

The Board decided to review and consider items 14g – j together.

→ **On a motion by Howe/Northrop, the Board voted 5-1 (with Billstrom voting no) to grant final architectural approval to Agenda Items 14g-j, subject to subcommittee review of minor revisions to the detail for the boxed eave at gable roof ends, removal of the fake hinges on the garage doors, and retaining the rafter tails (subcommittee members are Howe and Hinshaw). Architectural approval is based on the standard findings and conditions for approval of an architectural approval application.**

15. REPORTS OF BOARDMEMBERS

Board member Billstrom reported on the Planning Commission's review and consideration of amendments to the Historic Preservation Ordinance, including the creating of a Historic Architectural Review Board (HARB) in lieu of currently separate ARB and HRC hearing bodies.

Board member Hinshaw reported that the City of Pacific Grove is sponsoring a workshop on Heritage Tourism by the Association of Monterey Area Preservationists (AMAP) on September 19, 2008 at 1pm.

16. REPORTS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

None.

17. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:37pm.

Note: Materials for this agenda, and copies of previous meeting agendas and minutes for the Architectural Review Board, are available for review at the Community Development Department, 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove. Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Architectural Review Board after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection at the Community Development Department, 2nd Floor of City Hall, during normal business hours (8 a.m. – 2 p.m.) and can be requested for review at the Business Desk, 1st Floor of City Hall, from 2 p.m. – 5 p.m. Materials can also be requested of staff during the Architectural Review Board hearing.

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.

STANDARD FINDING FOR APPROVAL OF A SIGN PERMIT APPLICATION

The proposed sign effectively conveys the business type and identity to the public and possesses pleasing elements of design that protects and enhances the architectural character and harmony of the community, buildings, and neighborhood in which it is located.

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.