



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 23, 2008 – 6:00 P.M.

LOCATION: CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 300 FOREST AVENUE

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting commenced at 6:00pm.

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:

Tricia Wotan, Associate Planner

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes from the September 8, 2008, ARB Site Review and Regular Meeting were reviewed by the Board.

→ **On a motion by Billstom/Spradling, the Board voted 6-0 to approve the September 8, 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 ITEMS WITHDRAWN OR TABLED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

→ **On a motion by Northrop/Hinshaw, the Board voted to continue the following two projects to the next regularly scheduled ARB hearing on October 14, 2008.**

a. Project Address: 231 Central Avenue (HRI)

Architectural Approval Application No. 3670-07 for proposed addition of an attached one-car garage with guest quarters above, 175 square-foot addition to the second floor of the historic home, removal of exterior walls between the house and carport to allow for an addition of a driveway to a garage. The existing structure is listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory.

Applicant: Ted Larson, architect

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Staff requested a continuance of this project to the next ARB hearing on October 14, 2008, due to the need for further information to be defined for and provided to the Board prior to any decision to be rendered.

b. Project Address: 1136 Balboa Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3784-08 for proposed second-story addition and remodel to an existing single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Robert Mein, architect

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

The applicant requested a continuance to the next ARB hearing on October 14, 2008.

13. CONSENT AGENDA

Boardmembers requested to move project address 149 15th Street to the Consent Agenda.

WITH THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE ABOVE REQUEST, BOARD MEMBER BECOM STEPPED DOWN FROM THE BOARD. BECOM IS THE DESIGNER FOR PROJECT ADDRESS 149 15th STREET.

→ On a motion by Northrop/Billstrom, the Board voted 5-0 to move Regular Agenda Project Address 149 15th Street to the Consent Agenda.

a. Project Address: 149 15th Street

Architectural Approval Application No. 3728-07 for proposed remodel and second-story addition to an existing single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Jeffrey Becom, designer, for the Randesi family

CEQA Status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

→ On a motion by Hinshaw/Billstrom, the Board voted 5-0 to grant final architectural approval to the Consent Agenda. Architectural approval is based on the standard findings and conditions for approval of an architectural approval application.

BOARD MEMBER BECOM RETURNED TO THE BOARD.

14. REGULAR AGENDA

a. Project Address: 129 Forest Avenue (HRI)

Architectural Approval Application No. 3825-08 for proposed roof material change and window replacement to an existing single-family dwelling listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory

Applicant: Michael Gomes, contractor, for Emily Cabral

CEQA status: Class 31 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Board Member Billstrom stated she reviewed the Municipal Code and believed that all improvements, even like-for-like replacement work on historic structures, must be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board. Wotan clarified that exact, like-for-like replacement/restoration projects for historic structures are not currently reviewed by the ARB, that in fact, the Chief Planner reviews these and makes such determinations. Board Member

Billstrom requested that staff agendize a discussion about like-for-like replacements for historic structures. Wotan stated she will inform the Chief Planner of this request for a future meeting.

Michael Gomes, contractor, presented the project to and answered questions from the Board. No further public comment was received.

→ On a motion by Hinshaw/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.

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

b. Project Address: 691 Laurel Avenue (HRI)

Amendment to Architectural Approval Application No. 3721-07 for proposed design change to an approved remodel and addition to an existing single-family dwelling listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory.

Applicant: Steve Nannini, owner

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

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

→ On a motion by Billstrom/Spradling, the Board voted 4-1 (with 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.

BOARD MEMBER HINSHAW RETURNED TO THE BOARD.

c. Project Address: 155 Seventeen Mile Drive

Architectural Approval Application No. 3826-08 for proposed window changes to an existing single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Bob Borosky, contractor, for Donohue family

CEQA Status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

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

→ On a motion by Hinshaw/Northrop, the Board voted 5-1 (with Billstrom 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: 957 Syida Drive

Architectural Approval Application No. 3809-08 for proposed design changes to a previously approved demolition and reconstruction of a single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Alan Young, owner

CEQA Status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Alan Young presented the project to and answered questions from the Board.

Wotan stated a public comment letter in support of this project was received from Barbara Utter, a resident of Pacific Grove. The Board received copies of the letter. No further public comment was received.

→ On a motion by Billstrom/Howe, the Board voted 6-0 to refer to the project back to the applicant for further study and continue this project hearing to the next regularly scheduled ARB hearing on October 14, 2008.

e. Project Address: 310 8th Street and 314 8th Street

Architectural Approval Application No. 3780-08 for proposed exterior alterations to an existing multi-family dwelling.

Applicant: Todd Porteous, project manager, for Arman Kooroshfar

CEQA Status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Todd Porteous, project manager, presented the project to and answered questions from the Board. No further public comment was received.

→ On a motion by Howe/Becom, the Board voted 6-0 to refer the project back to the applicant for further study and design plan adjustments, and to continue the project hearing to the next regularly scheduled ARB hearing on October 14, 2008.

BOARD MEMBER SPRADLING STEPPED DOWN PRIOR TO THE HEARING FOR 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. Item continued from the August 12, 2008, and September 8, 2008, ARB hearings.

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.

No applicant was present to represent this project and no public comment was received for the project.

→ On a motion by Howe/Becom, the Board voted 5-0 to continue this project to the next regularly scheduled hearing on October 14, 2008.

BOARD MEMBER SPRADLING RETURNED TO THE BOARD.

g. Project Address: 956 Sea Palm Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3709-07 for proposed remodel and first- and second-story additions to an existing, one-story single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Gerry Case, architect

CEQA Status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action on the architectural approval application, as well as include the recommended mitigation measures of the Archaeological Mitigation Report as special conditions of approval, if approval is so desired for this project.

Gerry Case, architect, presented the project to and answered questions from the Board. Case clarified that the finished ceiling of the shed shall be less than 6.5 feet in height by adding another layer of sheet rock to the ceiling and that the shed door shall be redesigned to swing outward to allow access to the interior of the shed. No further public comment was received.

Board Member Spradling commented for the record that the floor area loophole utilized on this project [adding sheet rock to ceiling to lower its finished height to allow more floor area to be added to the structure elsewhere] should be changed and/or removed from the Municipal Code.

Board Member Billstrom stated all Archaeological Mitigations Measures noted in the August 20, 2007, expert report by Archaeological Consulting,

Doane and Breschini, must be included as conditions of any approval rendered for this project.

→ On a motion by Billstrom/Becom, the Board voted 6-0 to grant **final architectural approval subject to all special conditions and Archaeological Mitigation Measures stated in the August 20, 2007, Preliminary Archaeological Reconnaissance report by Archaeological Consulting (Doane and Breschini) for project address 956 Sea Palm Avenue. In addition to the special conditions and mitigations measures required for this project, the final architectural approval is based on the standard findings and conditions for approval of an architectural approval application.**

BOARD MEMBER HINSHAW STEPPED DOWN AND LEFT THE BOARD FOR THE EVENING.

h. Project Address: 620 Ocean View Boulevard (Bath House at Lovers Point Park)

Architectural Approval Application No. 3726-07 for a proposed addition and remodel to an existing public building with restaurant and visitor serving/public recreation uses.

Applicant: David Prew, designer, on behalf of Enea Properties LLC

CEQA Status: Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared; Public Review Period is September 12, 2008, to October 13, 2008)

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Recommended action: Discuss and review the architectural approval application, as well as include the recommended mitigation measures of the Archaeological Mitigation Report as special conditions of approval, if approval is so desired for this project.

David Prew, designer, presented the project to and answered questions from the Board. No further public comment was received.

No action was taken by the Board.

The Board provided the following initial feedback based on the proposed project information provided for this hearing:

Chair Howe: Great project; Has a concern about the roof and suggested adding a dormer; Difficult to distinguish on the plans the cantilevered sections; Would like to see the trim board maintained on the proposed triangular window/gable components; Is in favor of the ADA stair lift, as some designs for these can be less intrusive than currently designed.

Vice Chair Spradling: Exciting project; The triangular glass elements do not conform to the rest of the building; This project has achieved the goal of

adding more seating; Believes the new design will not appear larger than it does now and thinks it will be a beautiful structure.

Board Member Billstrom: Great project and great to have shops on lower level; Interested in learning the ADA Committee's preference for ADA design; Would prefer an enclosed elevator; More interesting element needs to be added to break-up large roof; Has an issue with the windows; Need to work on the gables – they should look like the original with a hint of New England style; Don't want to lose the light provided by the triangular windows, but a different design may be needed for those.

Board Member Becom: Great job on basic layout; Great job with the addition and good changes made; Believes ADA lifts can be disguised better; Consider changing triangular glass elements – a problem with the design there, and the design should be more in keeping with the early 1900's design; Suggest adding trim as Chair Howe mentioned; Gables are needed on the large, expansive roof elevation.

Board Member Northrop: Project is hopeful for Pacific Grove.

15. REPORTS OF BOARDMEMBERS

None.

16. REPORTS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Wotan requested to add to the earlier discussion regarding like-for-like work on historic structures. Wotan noted such work is reviewed by the Chief Planner for its conformance with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Resources. Board Member Becom noted concerns exist with regard to replacement since, in some instances, restoration of the original materials can be performed instead. Wotan stated she will take this information to the Chief Planner.

17. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

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.

DRAFT