



## 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, MAY 11, 2010 – 6:00 P.M.

Location: CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 300 FOREST AVENUE

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

**2. Roll Call**

Architectural Review Board (ARB) members present:

Robin Aeschliman  
Jeff Becom, Vice-Chair  
Jeff Edmonds, Chair  
Ken Hinshaw  
Juan Rosas  
Vitaly Volmensky  
1 vacancy

**3. Approval of Minutes**

**On a motion by Becom, seconded by Volmensky, the Board voted 6-0 to approve the minutes from the April 27, 2010 ARB Site Review and Regular meetings.**

**4. Public Comments**

Senior Planner Vaughn noted that the family of Bob Davis has planned a memorial reception scheduled for May 29, 2010 to be held at the Point Pinos Grill at the PG Municipal Golf Course Clubhouse. The reception will be from 5:00 to 7:00 pm and the public is invited to attend.

## 5. Written Correspondence

Senior Planner Vaughn noted that correspondence from Board Members Becom and Hinshaw regarding window materials had been handed out at the site review meeting and copies were available for the public.

## 6. Items to be Continued or Withdrawn

None.

## 7. Consent Agenda

Board Member Hinshaw pulled Item 7a, project address 689 Ocean View Boulevard, from the Consent Agenda and onto the Regular Agenda.

## 8. Regular Agenda

### A. Project Address: 689 Ocean View Boulevard (HRI) (previously Item 7a)

Architectural Approval Application (AA) No. 3947-10 (FINAL): Proposed window changes to a previously approved project for a residential structure that is listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory. Modifications include window size adjustments, addition of three skylights, and deletion of three windows.

Applicant: Peter Davis, on behalf of Spencer Stillman

CEQA Status: Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted July 14, 2009

Recommended Architectural Review Guidelines: 6, 7

Staff Reference: Assistant Planner, Jill Miller

Assistant Planner Miller introduced the project.

Peter Davis, applicant, described the project and answered questions from the Board.

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

**On a motion by Rosas, seconded by Edmonds, the board voted 4-2 (Becom and Hinshaw dissenting) to grant Final Architectural Approval to the project as presented, pursuant to Guidelines 24, 32, 33, 34, and 37.**

### B. Project Address: 325 Central Avenue (previously Item 8a)

Architectural Approval Application (AA) No. 3898-09 (FINAL): Proposed 619 sq. ft. second-story meeting room addition to an existing religious facility, and exterior ADA wheelchair lift.

Applicant: Allen Robinson, Architect, on behalf of Central Presbyterian Church

CEQA Status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff Reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn, AICP

Senior Planner Vaughn introduced the project, noting that the Sign Permit issued in 1983 does not pertain to the crosses on the building, rather to the freestanding sign located along the Central Avenue frontage. City legal staff determined that the proposed cross on the 8<sup>th</sup> Street elevation is within the purview of the ARB not as a sign, but rather as an architectural element. She noted applicable Federal Laws to consider during project review. The proposed ADA lift will allow the first floor of the building to be accessible. Also the project is not historic, and should not be reviewed as such.

Allen Robinson, Architect, described the project and answered questions from the Board. He noted the revised plans eliminated the need for a variance with regard to height, and although the project is not historic, it was designed as though it was. The addition was designed to be compatible with the architecture of the existing structure and the community overall. The proposed cross on the roof ridgeline is to make the 8<sup>th</sup> Street side of the structure look like an entrance. He noted that the massing of the addition is situated to the rear of the structure and the proposed gable roof design allows for inspirational space inside the church as well as allowing room for a tall stained glass window in each end. He also noted that the revised design had satisfied all but one concerned neighbor. He showed pictures of the view from the balcony at 147 8<sup>th</sup> Street, the opposing neighbor, and noted that Pacific Grove does not have a view sharing ordinance.

Applicant attorney Christine Kemp stated that the project meets CEQA, as a modest 619 square foot addition is well under the threshold for the specified Categorical Exemption, and that the lowered roof shows reasonable effort to address concerns of neighbors. She asked for the Board's support of the project.

The public comment period was opened.

Pam Silkwood, attorney for neighbor at 147 8<sup>th</sup> Street, stated that CEQA exemptions don't apply to historic structures and this building is over 80 years old, and federal RLUIPA laws require that substantial burden must be proven. She stated that her client will pursue a CEQA violation if project design is not revised. Ms. Silkwood asked that the project be continued.

Senior Planner Vaughn reiterated that the applicant had followed proper procedure to exempt the church from the local historic preservation ordinance; that exemption had been accepted by the city, and therefore structure is not historic.

Ron Brown, architect, for the neighbor, suggested several alternative designs, including a basement addition, a first floor only addition, and a hip roof design in order to preserve views from 147 8<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Brown suggested that the photos shown are not accurate as to how the project will impact ocean views from 147 8<sup>th</sup> Street.

The public comment period was closed.

In rebuttal, applicant Allen Robinson noted a basement option was problematic as it would always be wet, compromises the stability of the existing structure and is very costly.

Applicant attorney Christine Kemp also rebutted that the City Council did see the alternative designs provided by Mr. Brown and unanimously voted on the plans as submitted. The Council upheld the variance approval, by a unanimous vote, based on a finding of substantial burden, and that there was no compelling state interest to deny the project. She stated that one person's alleged view impact is not a compelling state interest. The church project was revised and the height variance was not required for the project.

Board Member Hinshaw noted that while the alternative designs presented by Mr. Brown are interesting, the applicant's design is excellent in that it enhances the existing structure and looks like it belongs. He stated that he was fully in favor of approving the project as presented.

Board Member Becom stated that the proposal upholds original intent and design of the structure. He stated that the proposed project is appropriate and compliments the existing building. The proposed cross gable roof design looks like it could have been an original part of the structure. He supported the second cross, but would like to see a change of material, perhaps wood; plastic is out of character with Pacific Grove as a whole and not in keeping with the materials of the structure. Although not a part of the modest addition, he would like to see the vinyl windows replaced with wood.

Board Member Volmensky agreed that the design is integrated and cohesive and didn't understand why the project was being opposed. He asked questions regarding ADA accessibility, which were answered by staff.

Board Member Rosas stated that the project was well thought out and noted the compromises that were made prior to reaching the ARB.

Board Member Aeschliman noted that the proposed addition blends with the neighboring structures, that the proposed roofline was compatible with other structures in the neighborhood, and that the applicant had redesigned the project for the benefit of the neighbors. She went on to state that the proposed project doesn't compromise neighboring views, that it is in scale with other properties in the neighborhood and that the addition compliments the existing building. She also noted concern with the vinyl windows currently in place on the church and urged the applicant to replace those with wood windows. She also stated that she'd like to see the crosses on the roof ridge be of a material in keeping with the existing building, and not plastic.

Chair Edmonds stated that it was an excellent design and that the gable ends fit the project. He noted that the addition is to the rear of the building which lessens the impact from the street. He agreed that the existing vinyl windows should be

replaced. He noted that Guideline No. 9 states that attempts should be made to preserve some portion of the neighbors views, stressing the words “some portion”, and that had been met by the applicant.

**On a motion by Rosas, seconded by Becom, the Board voted 6-0 to grant Final Architectural Approval to the project, with subcommittee (Rosas, Becom) approval of the following:**

- 1. The crosses on the roof ridgeline be of a material other than plastic.**
- 2. The existing vinyl windows be replaced with wood windows.**

**While the Architectural Review Guidelines are not applicable to this project, approval was granted based on the concepts contained with Architectural Review Guidelines No. 24, 25, 34, 35 and 38.**

**9. Acceptance of Minutes from Other Bodies**

None.

**10. Reports of ARB Subcommittees**

None.

**11. Reports of ARB Members**

Board Members Becom and Hinshaw discussed their window replacement handouts and the need for revised window guidelines citing examples from the City of Carmel and various articles on the topic. The Board debated the merits of vinyl, clad-wood, and wood windows.

Councilman Bill Kampe briefly discussed the ongoing work of the Council Ad Hoc Subcommittee, and noted that absolute clarity, consistency and predictability are benefits to applicants.

**12. Reports from Staff**

Senior Planner Vaughn noted that draft revised window guidelines were expected to be presented to the Board in June for input and recommendations.

**13. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:36 p.m.