



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, APRIL 28, 2009 – 6:00 P.M.

LOCATION: CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 300 FOREST AVENUE

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Board members present:

- Robin Aeschliman
- Jeff Becom
- Jeffrey Edmonds
- Ken Hinshaw
- Doug Howe, Chair
- Wilda Northrop

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by Northrop, seconded by Hinshaw, the ARB voted 6-0 to approve the minutes from the April 14, 2009, Regular Site Review and Regular Meeting.

4. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None

5. COMMUNICATIONS

None

6. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

None

7. CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS

None

8. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

Chief Planner Lynn Burgess discussed the Historic Preservation Ordinance and recent Planning Commission direction.

9. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

None

10. ADMINISTRATIVE ARCHITECTURAL APPROVALS

Associate Planner Valerie Tallerico informed the Board that an Administrative Hearing was held on Friday April 17, 2009. Administrative approval was received for the following project:

- a. 1157 Forest. Administrative Approval of Sign Permit No. 09-1061 to allow for two new signs for a new business. One sign on the building face and one sign panel on an existing monument sign.

11. ITEMS WITHDRAWN OR TABLED

None

12. REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE

None

13. CONSENT AGENDA

None

14. REGULAR AGENDA**a. Project Address: 620 Ocean View Boulevard (HRI)**

Design changes to windows, awnings and gable, and final approval of ADA ramp and lift access to the second floor restaurant, for 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. This item was granted final approval on November 13, 2008, and again on December 23, 2009 subject to a subcommittee review of the following details, which staff has determined should be considered by the full ARB for final approval:

1. Removal of the awning element on the front elevation, and maintaining the existing front porch roof cover;
2. Adjustment of the ADA entrance ramp curb height to allow the railings to be parallel to the ground;
3. Visual screening of the ADA lift by extending the shingle wall out from the parapet in front of the lift to the ground.
4. Use of simple, plain 2"x2" balusters rather than the existing decorative balusters;
5. Addition of knee brace brackets under the front gable feature for the visual effect of supports;

6. Revising the design of the guard rail on the rock wall on the ocean side to be parallel with the existing wall height, while keeping the minimum 42” height requirement; and
7. Revising the design of the guard rail on the rock wall on the ocean side to match the style of the other exterior railings and fence designs.

Applicant: David Prew, designer, on behalf of Enea Properties LLC
CEQA Status: Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted
Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Senior Planner Sarah Hardgrave introduced the project and explained that the project had been approved with a subcommittee but because of the design changes that had taken place she felt it was more appropriate for the whole board to review the project. She went on to explain the hardship finding made by the building official, the review of the site plan review committee and the use of the chair lift.

Applicant David Prew presented the project and explained the design changes that have taken place.

Chair Howe raised concerns with the accuracy of the drawings.

Board member Becom concurred with Chair Howe’s concerns.

Board member Hinshaw asked about the color of the lift mechanism. Applicant Prew responded that it is a tan color.

Board member Edmonds asked about the location of the ventilator shaft. Applicant Prew responded that the location may change at final construction drawings.

Senior Planner Hardgrave informed the board that in order to proceed with the Coastal Development Permit, all discretionary approvals need to be resolved. She suggested that a condition of approval be that the Board review plans prior to obtaining building permits.

Chair Howe asked about recessing the lift so that the wall is not closer to the street. Applicant Prew responded that the building official required maximum clearance from the door and that is why the lift is located as it is.

The public comment period was opened. No public comment was received.

Board member Hinshaw stated that the Board has the big picture of what is proposed and thought the suggestion by staff was reasonable.

Board member Edmonds agreed with Board member Hinshaw and thought an isometric drawing would be helpful.

Board member Northrop stated she likes the concept and would like to see 2x2 batts.

Board member Aeschliman stated she finds the project appealing.

Board member Becom stated he wants to see the project move forward and agreed with staff's suggestion.

Chair Howe expressed concern with moving forward without accurate drawings.

On a motion by Hinshaw, seconded by Edmonds, the Board voted 6-0 to grant Final approval with a provision to review the final construction plans prior to building permit issuance and appoint a subcommittee to look at the lift and vent details.

Board member Becom and Chair Howe volunteered for the subcommittee.

b. Project Address: 412 16th Street (HRI)

Historic Preservation Permit Application No. 08-0235 and Architectural Approval Application No. 3821-08 to allow renovations, a 160 square foot addition connecting the main house and the detached garage, and a second-story addition over the existing garage. The existing structure is listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory and has non-conforming setbacks and height limits. The proposed addition to the dwelling would increase the building coverage, exceeding the maximum allowed, and create a new non-conformity. The proposed second-story addition would exceed the maximum allowable height limit, creating a new non-conformity, and would also encroach into the side and rear yard setbacks, expanding an existing non-conformity. Per Code Section 23.76.060, certain exceptions to zoning requirements, including setbacks, height and coverage regulations, may be requested through a Historic Preservation Permit from the Architectural Review Board in lieu of a use permit or variance approval when such exception is necessary to permit the preservation or restoration of, or improvements to, a building listed on the historic resources inventory.

Applicant: James D. McCord, Architect on behalf of Frances Coen and Michelle Ford

CEQA status: Class 31 Categorical Exemption

Recommended Architectural Review Guidelines: Historic Buildings, Appendix I, Guidelines 1, 2, 3 and 4

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn

Senior Planner Karen Vaughn introduced the project and reviewed the existing and proposed nonconformities on the site. Senior Planner Vaughn explained Staff's recommendation for denial of the project citing concerns with the proposed height, encroachment into the side yard setbacks, and projection of the eaves closer than 3 feet from a property line. Senior Planner Vaughn also explained the condition for approval regarding the proposed lower level

window on the front façade of the historic home in order for the project to qualify for the CEQA Class 31 categorical exemption.

Applicant James McCord presented the project.

Board member Edmonds asked if the use of the rear garage as a bedroom was nonconforming. Senior Planner Vaughn clarified that the nonconforming conditions are allowed to remain and that Staff's recommendation for denial stemmed from the proposed new nonconformities only.

Board member Aeschliman questioned if dropping the plate height would cause a redesign of the roof and suggested removing the window shown on the front of the house.

The public comment period was opened. No public comment was received.

Board member Becom stated that he understands the concern with the height, but thought it was a good project and well designed. He also stated that the addition would look awkward if the second story was moved to conform to the side yard setback.

Board member Aeschliman stated that if the plate height could be conveniently lowered to lower the overall height without changing the roof slopes, it should.

Board member Northrop stated that she understands that setbacks are in place to keep houses safe, but this project is right on.

Board member Hinshaw stated he agreed with what was said by other Board Members.

Chair Howe stated that he also agreed with other members of the Board.

On a motion by Becom, seconded by Hinshaw, the Board voted 6-0 to grant approval of the Historic Preservation Permit subject to all findings and conditions as presented with the understanding that the design of the proposed project is necessary to complement the historic home.

Chair Howe stated that he felt the parapet of the connector between the house and garage needed a cap of some type.

Board member Becom questioned the pyramidal skylights visibility from the street.

On a motion by Howe, seconded by Edmonds, the Board voted 6-0 to grant Final Architectural Approval subject to all findings and conditions as presented, citing Appendix 1, Guidelines 1 thru 4 of the Architectural Review Guidelines, pending subcommittee review of the specific window

proportions (shop drawings or cut-sheets) and the simplified gable end detail.

Board member Edmonds and Chair Howe volunteered for the subcommittee.

c. Project Address: 1249 Buena Vista Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3769-08 for a proposed remodel of a single-family dwelling with new entry/stair addition and deck.

Applicant: Jeffrey Kilpatrick, architect for Robert Lis

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Recommended Architectural Review Guidelines: 33, 34, and 36

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Valerie Tallerico

Associate Planner Valerie Tallerico introduced the project.

Applicant Jeff Kilpatrick presented the project and explained the reasoning for the proposed design changes.

Chair Howe questioned why some of the windows and decorative elements had been removed. Owner Robert Lis responded that the window changes were made because of structural issues.

The public comment period was opened. No public comment was received.

Board member Edmonds stated that the changes should be approved.

Board member Northrop agreed with member Edmonds, but noted that the scale of the plans made them hard to read.

Board member Aeschliman stated she had no problems with the design.

Board member Becom stated he thought the decorative elements should be put back on the building.

Board member Hinshaw stated he liked the grouping of windows and decorative element.

On a motion by Hinshaw, seconded by Northrop, the Board voted 6-0 to grant Final Approval of the project.

d. Project Address: Chestnut Street (street address not currently assigned)

Architectural Approval Application No. 3861-09 and Tree Permit No. 090053 for a proposed 2-story single-family dwelling on a vacant lot of record

Applicant: Michael Chandler, on behalf of Larry Scholink

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Recommended Architectural Review Guidelines: 1, 2, 4, 6, 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38.

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn

Senior Planner Karen Vaughn introduced the project. She noted the two oak trees on-site, and that the City Arborist had visited the site and prepared a memorandum including general conditions. The memorandum had been handed out at the site review meeting, and additional copies were available for the public.

Applicant Michael Chandler presented the project and explained that the house was designed with the two existing oak trees in mind. He noted that that an arborist report was prepared and the City Arborist conducted a site review, and that both arborists agreed that the proposed house and garage would not be harmful to the health of the trees.

The public comment period was opened. No public comment was received.

Board member Northrop stated that this house is similar to the house of the adjacent property. She stated she likes the appearance of a single car garage. Additionally she stated that the stone should be eliminated and the whole house shingled.

Chair Howe stated he likes the design except for the roof over the second floor element on the left and the material change occurring on an outside corner.

Board member Edmonds stated that he agreed with Chair Howe about the roof.

Board member Hinshaw stated that the connection between the garage and house should be recessed behind the face of the garage, not in front of it, and that the rear elevation does not match the interest of the front and that the entire house should be shingled.

Board member Becom agreed that the link should be recessed, the number of materials reduced to one or two types, and the stone should be eliminated. He agreed with Chair Howe about the roof element. He also said the house should have more traditionally styled windows throughout.

Board member Aeschliman agreed that fewer materials should be used and that the stone should be eliminated. She also suggested that the rear roof line should be changed to be steeper by possibly lowering the plate height in the rear. She also expressed concern about the proximity of the garage to the tree and suggested the garage be moved back into the rear setback or made smaller to allow more distance from the tree.

On a motion by Howe, seconded by Northrop, a motion was made to grant concept approval with the following changes: lower the roof line of the second floor on the left side of the structure, eliminate the stone, and avoid material changes on outside corners, as well as include all conditions provided by the City Arborist. The motion failed on a 3-3 vote, with Hinshaw, Becom, and Aeschliman dissenting.

On a motion by Becom, seconded by Hinshaw, the Board voted to refer the project back to the applicant for further study of the rear façade, drop the roof ridge on left side, change the design of the side windows, move the half-bath elsewhere in order to recess the connector between the house and garage, reduce the number of exterior materials, and either eliminate the cedar shakes on the second story or wrap them around the side. The following guidelines were also cited: 1, 2, 4, 6, 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38. The project was also continued to the May 12, 2009 meeting. The motion passed on a 4-2 vote, with Howe and Edmonds dissenting.

15. REPORTS OF BOARDMEMBERS

None

16. REPORTS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Chief Planner Lynn Burgess informed the Board about the AMAP seminar at Asilomar on May 15th. She also noted the upcoming Ethics training scheduled for Monday, May 4, 2009 from 10:00-12:00 noon in the Police Training Room.

17. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:14 pm.