



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, NOVEMBER 13, 2008 – 6:00 P.M.

LOCATION: CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 300 FOREST AVENUE

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting commenced at 6:05 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Architectural Review Board (ARB) Members present:

Darlene Billstrom
Ken Hinshaw
Doug Howe, Chair
Maryanne Larson Spradling, Vice Chair
Wilda Northrop

ARB Members absent:

Jeff Becom

Staff in attendance:

Tricia Wotan, Associate Planner
Sarah Hardgrave, Senior Planner
Karen Vaughn, Senior Planner

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes from the October 28, 2008, ARB Site Review and Regular Meeting were reviewed by the Board.

- **On a motion by Billstrom/Northrop, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the October 28, 2008, ARB site review and regular meeting minutes with the revision of the minutes for project address 1169 Presidio Boulevard to reflect the ARB approval of the tree permit application with the condition that tree number 1 be retained (not removed).**

4. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None.

5. COMMUNICATIONS

None.

6. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

None.

7. CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS

None.

8. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

Wotan reported that the Planning Commission denied the appeal of project address 1007 Hillside Avenue and upheld the ARB decisions with the addition of further tree protections to the project.

9. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Chair Howe read the following subcommittee approvals into the record:

- a. **1349 Pico Avenue** – Beam detail was approved.
- b. **122 9th Street** – Window details were approved.

10. ADMINISTRATIVE ARCHITECTURAL APPROVALS

None.

11. ITEMS WITHDRAWN OR TABLED

None.

12. REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE

None.

13. CONSENT AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER HINSHAW STEPPED DOWN PRIOR TO DISCUSSIONS FOR THE CONSENT AGENDA DUE TO OWNING PROPERTY WITHIN 500 FEET OF THE PROPOSED ITEM TO BE PLACED ON THIS AGENDA.

The Board requested to move project address 691 Laurel Avenue to the Consent Agenda. The Chair asked the public if anyone wished to speak on the item. No public comment was requested.

→ **On a motion by Northrop/Spradling, the Board voted 4-0 to move project address 691 Laurel Avenue to the Consent Agenda.**

- a. **Project Address: 691 Laurel Avenue (HRI)**

Amendment to Architectural Approval Application No. 3836-08 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.

→ **On a motion by Northrop/Spradling, the Board voted 4-0 to grant final approval to the Consent Agenda as noted above.**

BOARD MEMBER HINSHAW RETURNED TO THE BOARD.

14. REGULAR AGENDA

a. Project Address: 224 5th Street (HRI)

Historic Preservation Permit Application No. 08-0237 to grant a reduced rear yard setback for a proposed addition to an existing non-conforming single-family dwelling. The existing structure is a single-family dwelling that is listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory and has non-conforming setbacks and parking. Per Code Section 23.68.050(d)(2), a single-family dwelling having non-conforming setbacks must request and obtain approval of a use permit in order to construct a first floor addition, while maintaining yards no less than existing yards. Per Code Section 23.20.070(c), new construction within the R-2 district must maintain a required minimum rear setback of 10 feet. Per Code Section 23.76.060, certain exceptions to zoning requirements, including setbacks and parking, may be requested through a Historic Preservation Permit from the Architectural Review Board in lieu of a use permit or variance approval.

Applicant: Jesse Williams, Peter Moppert
CEQA Status: Class 31 Categorical Exemption
Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn
Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Senior Planner Vaughn presented a staff report.

Jesse Williams presented his project to and answered questions from the Board. Contractor Peter Moppert spoke about the project, as well. No further public comment was received.

→ **On a motion by Billstrom/Northrop, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Historic Preservation Permit as recommended by staff, with an 8-foot rear setback, with all findings and conditions noted in the staff report.**

b. Project Address: 520 12th Street (HRI)

Architectural Approval Application No. 3802-08 and Tree Permit No. 421-1326 for proposed remodel and additions to an existing single-family dwelling, including the addition of a bay window, dormers, a wood deck, and a one car garage. The removal of two (2) trees is also proposed. The existing structure is

a single-family dwelling that is listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory.

Applicant: James N. Smith, Architect, for Montalvo family

CEQA status: Class 31 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Senior Planner Hardgrave corrected the record in regard to the tree permit application number.

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

→ On a motion by Hinshaw/Billstrom, the Board voted 5-0 to grant final approval to the architectural approval application and tree permit application, and this approval includes all materials submitted tonight at hearing, including the gutter and window details.

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

c. Project Address: 115 10th Street (HRI)

Design changes to a previously approved remodel and addition project for an existing single-family dwelling listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory

Applicant: Teri Takikawa, architect for Robert Bianchi

CEQA Status: Class 31 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Teri Takikawa, designer, corrected the record to state that he is a designer and not an architect. Takikawa proceeded to present the project to and answer questions from the Board. No further public comment was received.

→ On a motion by Billstrom/Hinshaw, the Board voted 4-0 to grant final architectural approval to the proposed design changes to the windows, doors, and deck, and with the condition that the new doors are in-swing French doors. Architectural approval is based on the standard findings and conditions for approval of an architectural approval application.

BOARD MEMBER NORTROP RETURNED TO THE BOARD.

d. Project Address: 620 Ocean View Boulevard (Old 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 take appropriate action.

Hardgrave presented a staff report about the project as a whole. Hardgrave also presented the phased landscaping plans to the Board and answered questions from the Board on this portion of the project.

Dave Prew presented the building design to and answered questions from the Board.

→ **On a motion by Hinshaw/Billstrom, the Board voted 5-0 to grant final architectural approval to the building design and the phased landscaping plan with the following subcommittee (Hinshaw and Billstrom) review items to be submitted and reviewed within the next 30 days or the project must return to the ARB for review:**

- **An awning detail of how the awning will be attached over the entrance stairs, particularly in regards to the existing post;**
- **Removal of the awning over the ADA lift;**
- **Revisions to the railings for the ADA ramp to the lift;**
- **Details on the entrance door into the lift at the bottom and at the landing, including the framing and casing of the door and how it will open;**
- **An elevation and further details on the patio wall, stairs, and railings around the patio. I hope you can provide a simulation of this area similar to the one provided for the new walkway in front of the volleyball court;**
- **A detail/sample of the guardrail proposed on the stone wall in front of the building. They want something simpler than the artistic railing shown on the materials board for Phase 1; and,**
- **A dimensioned site plan with additional details about the new paving areas and elevations of the ADA ramp.**

Architectural approval is based on the standard findings and conditions for approval of an architectural approval application.

e. Project Address: 919 Cedar Street

Architectural Approval Application No. 3807-08 for proposed demolition of existing single-family dwelling and construction of a new single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Jeanne C. Byrne, FAIA, on behalf of Ben Shelkowski

CEQA Status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

Jeanne Byrne 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 5-0 to grant final architectural approval. Architectural approval is based on the standard findings and conditions for approval of an architectural approval application.**

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

f. Project Address: 1771 Sunset Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3733-07 for a proposed demolition of the existing single-family dwelling and the construction of a new single-family dwelling.

Applicant: Eric Miller Architects, on behalf of Randal and Deborah White

CEQA status: Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted by the ARB 10/28/08.

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action on the final proposed design project.

Eric Miller presented the project to and answered questions from the Board.

Maryanne Spradling inquired about harvesting of the design from the property. No further public comment was received.

Eric Miller stated they will be following the biological mitigation measures outlined in the biological report for the project.

Spradling noted that sedge is a native plant than can and should be retained in the area.

No further public comment was received.

→ **On a motion by Howe/Hinshaw, the Board voted 4-0 to grant final architectural approval. Architectural approval is based on the standard findings and conditions for approval of an architectural approval application.**

BOARD MEMBER SPRADLING RETURNED TO THE BOARD.

g. 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. This item was continued from the September 23, October 14, and October 28, 2008 ARB hearings.

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

- **On a motion by Billstrom/Hinshaw, the Board voted 5-0 to refer the project back to the applicant for further study of a gable extension, removal of the building façade stone, garbage enclosure doors, transom window design, cap on the stone wall, and placing the same siding/material on at least three sides of the structure.**

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

h. Project Address: 325 Central Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3820-08 for proposed skylights on an existing church. This item was continued from the October 14 and October 28, 2008 ARB hearings.

Applicant: Michael Brophy, on behalf of Young Koh

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Associate Planner, Tricia Wotan

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

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

- **On a motion by Hinshaw/Billstrom, the Board voted 4-0 to grant final architectural approval conditioned upon the utilization of four (4) skylights on the west (most visible) elevation, with three (3) skylights centered over the windows below, and the fourth skylight behind the tower, and all skylights shall be equally spaced apart and equally dimensioned upward from the edge of the roof eave. Architectural approval is based on the standard findings and conditions for approval of an architectural approval application.**

BOARD MEMBER NORTHROP RETURNED TO THE BOARD.

15. REPORTS OF BOARDMEMBERS

Chair Howe shared a few words about the Historic Preservation workshops he attended in San Francisco recently on the topics of “Historic Integrity” and the “Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties”.

Board member Billstrom presented an idea that staff present Administrative Architectural Approvals to the ARB at Site Review. Billstrom is concerned that the ARB is not reviewing these items.

16. REPORTS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

None.

17. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 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.