



CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, California 93950

AGENDA REPORT

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL
FROM: Community Development Director Jon Biggs
MEETING DATE: July 19, 2006
SUBJECT: Meeting Minutes of July 11, 2006 Architectural Review Board
Regular Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive.

DISCUSSION:

Attached are the minutes of the July 11, 2006 regular meeting of the Architectural Review Board.

Decisions rendered by the Architectural Review Board may be called up by the City Council at this time.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

ATTACHMENTS:

Minutes of the July 11, 2006 regular meeting of the Architectural Review Board.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jon Biggs
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

REVIEWED BY:

James J. Colangelo

Digitally signed: I have reviewed this document .

James J. Colangelo
CITY MANAGER

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING

July 11, 2006
City Council Chambers
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove
4:00 p.m.

Tape: 06-13

Boardmembers Present: Jeff Becom
Darlene Billstrom (entered the meeting during Item 8)
Scott Hall
Ken Hinshaw,
Maryanne L. Spradling
Dennis Tarmina, Chair

Absent: Doug Howe, Vice Chair

Staff: Garcia and Rideout

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by Hall Spradling, the Board voted 6-0, to approve the minutes of the June 27, 2006 Architectural Review Board meeting with the following correction.

Item 11e. Project Address: 1601 Sunset Drive

Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring Program and Architectural Approval Application No. 3539-06 for proposed one-story additions to a one-story single-family dwelling that is located in an environmentally sensitive area of the coastal zone. (Applicant: Al Saroyan)

Spradling stated her disagreement with the review process- not disclosing a deed restriction.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None.

3. COMMUNICATIONS

None.

4. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

None.

5. CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS

Staff reported.

6. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

Staff reported

7. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

None

8. ITEMS WITHDRAWN

11a. Project Address: 837 Ocean View Boulevard

Architectural Approval Application No. 3518-05 to demolish an existing two-story, single-family residence with an attached garage, and construct a new two-story single-family residence with an attached garage. The property is located in an archaeologically sensitive area. (Applicant: Eddie Hurt, Architect)

9. REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE

10a. Project Address: 420 Evergreen Road

Architectural Approval Application No. 3573-06 (Concept) for a proposed remodel and addition to a single-family residence and construction of a new detached garage. (Applicant: Anthony Giammanco)

On a motion by Hall - Becom, the Board voted 6-0, to continue 420 Evergreen to the July 25, 2006 Architectural Review Board meeting.

10. CONSENT AGENDA

On a motion by Hall - Billstrom, the Board voted 5-0 to grant final approval for the following item on the consent agenda based on the standard finding for approval of an sign permit application.

b. Project Address: 588 Lighthouse Avenue

Sign Permit Application No. 06-1026 for proposed request to allow an increase in the number of permitted primary signs on an existing building. (Applicant: Charles S. Long)

11. REGULAR AGENDA

a. Project Address: 311 6th Street

Architectural Approval Application No. 3535-05 (Final) for proposed first and second-story additions to a one-story single-family dwelling. (Applicant: Rick Steres, Architect) (Continued from 06/27/06)

Rick Steres, architect, presented the project and answered questions from the Board members.

Correspondence received:

Carol Lawton, 310 6th Street, in support.

Billstrom suggested a hip roof instead of the gable roof element.

Becom agreed but remained concerned with the proportions of the shutters and siding materials.

Hinshaw agreed that a hip roof on the second floor addresses his concerns regarding proportion and massing.

Spradling noted that the proposed shutters carry an existing theme throughout the remodeled building.

On a motion by Billstrom-Becom, the Board voted 6-0 to grant final approval based on the standard finding for approval of an architectural approval application and subject to eliminating the new shutters, adding board and batten siding in the north gable end and changing the second-story gable to a hip roof

b. Project Address: 994 Syida Drive

Amend Final Architectural Approval No. 3181-03 for proposed exterior alterations for one and two-story additions to a one-story single-family dwelling. (Applicant: Matthew and Tonya Bosworth) (Continued from 06/13/06 and 06/27/06)

Tim Ledesma, contractor, presented the revised window changes.

Billstrom remained concerned with the window configuration.

Several Boardmembers stated that the applicant responded their initial concerns.

On a motion by Spradling-Hinshaw, the Board voted 5-1, with Billstrom voting no, to grant final approval based on the standard finding for approval of an architectural approval application.

c. Project Address: 889 Bayview Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3578-06 for a proposed addition to the second-story of a two-story single-family dwelling. (Applicant: Bill Mefford) (Continued from 06/13/06)

Bill Mefford, architect, presented the project.

All the Boardmembers agreed that the proposed materials are appropriate and consistent with the existing dwelling but were concerned with the mass of the extended roofline and front wall.

On a motion by Billstrom-Hinshaw, the Board voted 6-0 to refer the application back to the applicant to re-study the roofline and front wall and continue the item to the July 25, 2006, Architectural Review Board meeting.

BOARDMEMBER HALL STEPPED DOWN PRIOR TO THE NEXT ITEM DUE TO OWNING PROPERTY WITHIN 500 FEET OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY.

d. Project Address: 420 10th Street

Amend Final Architectural Approval No. 3406-04 for proposed exterior alterations for a remodel and construction of first and second-story additions to a single-family dwelling. (Applicant: Across the Pond Construction (Robert Darly)

All the Boardmembers agreed that the revised front porch overhang improves the front entry.

Several Boardmembers were concerned with that the arched window is inconsistent with the design.

On a motion by Billstrom, the Board voted 5-1, with Spradling voting no, to grant final approval based on the standard finding for approval of an architectural approval application subject to using a rectangular window instead of the arched window.

BOARDMEMBER HALL RETURNED TO HIS SEAT.

BOARDMEMBER BECOM STEPPED DOWN PRIOR TO THE NEXT ITEM DUE TO OWNING PROPERTY WITHIN 500 FEET OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY.

e. Project Address: 122 14th Street

Architectural Approval Application No. 3569-06 for a proposed new two-story single-family dwelling with an attached garage. (Applicant: Richard Van't Rood)

Richard Van't Rood, property owner, presented the proposed project.

Correspondence received:

Betty Aickelin, 114 14th Street
Sally Aberg, 115 14th Street

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Betty Aicklund, 114 14th Street, spoke in opposition, stating that the proposed placement and mass of the new dwelling should be consistent with conditions of a similar project that had been approved by the Coastal Commission in the past.

Sally Aberg, 115 14th Street, spoke in opposition. Citing Architectural Review Guidelines #s 5, 24, and 26, she stated that although the proposed materials and details of the proposed dwelling are appropriate for the neighborhood, the scale of the building should be consistent with the maximum required coverage and floor area of a previously approved project on the site.

Rachel Dehennis, 119, 14th Street, requested that a streetscape be prepared to clarify the impact of the project in the neighborhood.

Elizabeth Martin, 101 14th Street, (represented by Sally Aberg), spoke in opposition to the mass and scale.

There being no more speakers, the Chair closed the public hearing.

All of the Boardmembers agreed that a revised site plan including adjacent existing and proposed development and a streetscape rendering would help to clarify the relationship of the proposed project to the neighborhood.

Spradling was concerned that the proposed mass and scale of the new dwelling does not honor neighbor issues nor conditions imposed by the Coastal Commission on the past project proposal for the site.

Billstrom stated that, regardless of any previous projects proposed for the site, the Board is looking at a new structure being added to a block that consists of modest homes, including two relatively new two-story buildings. She said that

the scale of the project could be reduced but appreciated that the garage is subservient to the dwelling. She also stated that the design fits with the neighborhood but the massing concerns should and can be addressed.

Tarmina agreed with Billstrom's comments regarding the garage. Stating that the proposed project is not imposing, he questioned the appropriateness of holding the current project to conditions applied to a different project. He agreed that a streetscape, including the approved triplex under construction next door, should help to demonstrate the proposed mass and scale of the project.

On a motion by Spradling - Billstrom, the Board voted 6-0 to refer the project back to the applicant to prepare a streetscape rendering and restudy the concerns of the Board and continue the item to the July 25, 2006 Architectural Review Board meeting.

BOARDMEMBER BECOM RETURNED TO HIS SEAT.

12. REPORTS OF BOARDMEMBERS

None.

13. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

**SALLY RIDEOUT
ACTING SECRETARY**

*Building identified on the Pacific Grove Historic Resources Inventory.

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.

FINDING FOR THE 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 protect and enhance the architectural character an harmony of the community, building, 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.