



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, FEBRUARY 24, 2009 – **6:00 P.M.**

LOCATION: CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 300 FOREST AVENUE

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

Architectural Review Board (ARB) Members present:

Jeff Becom
Jeff Edmonds, Vice-Chair
Ken Hinshaw
Doug Howe, Chair
Wilda Northrop

Architectural Review Board (ARB) Members absent:

None

Staff present:

Karen Vaughn
Valerie Tallerico
Sarah Hardgrave

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by Northrop, seconded by Hinshaw, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the minutes from the February 10, 2009, ARB Site Review and Regular Meetings as presented.

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

Subcommittee approval (Howe, Becom) was received for the following project:

- a. Walnut Avenue. Architectural Approval No. 3839-08 received subcommittee approval for a proposed 2-story single-family dwelling on a vacant lot.

10. ADMINISTRATIVE ARCHITECTURAL APPROVALS

An Administrative Hearing was held on Friday February 13, 2009. Administrative approval was received for the following project:

- a. 152 14th Street. Administrative Architectural Approval No. 08-189 to allow proposed backyard improvements including a new retaining wall, fire pit, trash enclosure, and countertop at BBQ area. Ground cover will consist of decomposed granite and decorative plantings. The proposed improvements are not visible from the public right-of-way.

11. ITEMS WITHDRAWN OR TABLED

None

12. REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE

- a. **Project Address: 1110 Patterson**
Architectural Approval Application No. 3641-07 for a remodel and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling.
Applicant: Silvio Canudo, on behalf of Lindsay Sullivan
CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption
Staff reference: Associate Planner, Valerie Tallerico

Staff requested that Agenda Item 14g be continued to the March 10, 2009 meeting in order to have the story poles and netting for the project erected.

b. Project Address: 1141 Presidio Boulevard

Architectural Approval Application No. 3831-08 for demolition of an existing single family dwelling and reconstruction of a proposed new two-story single family dwelling.

Applicant: Sergio Vaca, on behalf of David and Gina Armas

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

On a motion by Howe, seconded Edmonds, the Board voted 5-0 to continue Agenda Items 12a and 12b to the March 10, 2009 regular meeting.

13. CONSENT AGENDA

On a motion by Hinshaw, seconded by Becom, the Board voted 5-0 to move Agenda Item 14h to the Consent Agenda.

a. Project Address: 152 Pacific Avenue

Minor Architectural Approval Application No. 3856-09 to allow the installation of an exterior furnace door on the side elevation of an existing single-family dwelling located within the Coastal Zone.

Applicant: William Brown, on behalf of Dave Groll

CEQA Status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

b. Project Address: 640 Gibson Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3850-09 for design changes to a previously approved single family dwelling including: enlarging front window, adding stone planter at entry steps, omitting roof hips on the east elevation, and adding a viewing window at the north elevation. (CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption).

Applicant: Robert Gunn

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Recommended Architectural Review Guidelines: 33, 34 and 36

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

On a motion by Howe, seconded by Hinshaw, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Consent Agenda.

14. REGULAR AGENDA

Chair Howe stepped down prior to the following item.

a. Project Address: 512 8th Street

Architectural Approval Application No. 3845-08 (Final) for a proposed new 2-story single-family dwelling on a vacant lot of record. Concept Architectural Approval was granted on January 27, 2009.

Applicant: Baldwin Living Trust, Richard Baldwin and Margaret Baldwin, Trustees

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Recommended Architectural Review Guidelines: 1, 2, 6, 24, 27, 32, 35, 36, 37 and 38.

Senior Planner Karen Vaughn presented the project. Applicant Rick Baldwin, applicant, spoke to the project and identified changes made since the ARB's review at the previous meeting including adding windows to the rear and first floor.

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

Board member Hinshaw stated that the changes made were just right and Board members Edmonds, Becom, and Northrop agreed.

On a motion by Hinshaw, seconded by Edmonds, the Board voted 5-0 to grant Final Architectural Approval pursuant to Architectural Review Guidelines: 1, 2, 6, 24, 27, 32, 35, 36, 37 and 38.

b. Project Address: 945 Cedar Street

Architectural Approval Application No. 3838-08 for a new single family dwelling on a vacant lot of record.

Applicant: Susan Bailey, on behalf of Elva Perkins

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Recommended Architectural Review Guidelines: 1, 2, 6, 21, 24, 25, 27, 32, 36, 37 and 38.

Associate Planner Valerie Tallerico presented the project, which was continued from the January 27, 2009 regular ARB meeting.

Susan Bailey, applicant, presented the project and identified changes made since the previous ARB review, including lowering of the roof by three feet, relocation of the second story element, hip roofs, a ninety-eight foot reduction in site coverage, reducing the plate heights on the first floor, and moving the building closer to Cedar Street to reduce the impacts on the tree on the Congress Avenue side of the lot. The applicant also provided a graphic of second story structures already located in the neighborhood to address the ARB's concern about the second floor of the structure.

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

Senior Planner Sarah Hardgrave distributed a letter from neighbor, Pat Toprakizhar, and responded to the written correspondence by clarifying that no water allocation had been assigned to the subject property and that staff had verified with the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District that no water permits had been issued.

The Board discussed the project and expressed general support, with some discussion about the exterior materials and finish details that should be considered in the applicant's submittal for Final Architectural Approval.

Board member Hinshaw stated that the efforts made to minimize the size of the house were done well and helped to minimize the impact of the residence.

Board member Edmonds stated that the scaling down helped to create a great looking project.

Board member Becom stated he was comfortable with the scale and had no problem with the second floor but felt the finish of the house needs more finesse suggested exterior siding.

Board member Northrop agreed with previous statements from the board and felt the project should have a different finish than stucco.

Chair Howe stated he liked the project and thought a stucco finish was alright.

On a motion by Hinshaw, seconded by Edmonds, the Board voted 5-0 to grant Conceptual Architectural Approval subject to finishes and details in accordance with Architectural Review Guideline #36.

c. Project Address: 1018 Lincoln Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3840-08 for new single family dwelling on a vacant lot of record. Concept Architectural Approval was granted on January 27, 2009.

Applicant: Robert Walker, on behalf of Peter and Susan Loewy

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Recommended Architectural Review Guidelines: 1, 2, 6, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 36, 37 and 38

Senior Planner Sarah Hardgrave presented the project, as well as Agenda Items 14d-f. She noted that while the Board must take separate action on each proposed new single family dwelling, their prior review had also considered the site as a whole. She also noted that the Public Works Department had reviewed the design plans and determined that curbs, gutters and sidewalks would be required. She also provided the ARB with a copy of the traffic impact report that had been prepared at the time of the General Plan Amendment changing the land use designation from Neighborhood Commercial to Low Density Residential. The report had been requested by the City Council at their last meeting, when they received the January 27, 2009 ARB minutes.

Robert Walker, applicant, presented the project and identified the changes to the rear elevation based on the ARB's previous comments.

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

The ARB discussed the project, expressing general support.

On a motion by Howe, seconded by Hinshaw, the Board voted 4-1 (Becom dissenting) to grant Final Architectural Approval.

d. Project Address: 1016 Lincoln Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3841-08 for a new single family dwelling on a vacant lot of record.

Applicant: Robert Walker, on behalf of Peter and Susan Loewy

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Recommended Architectural Review Guidelines: 1, 2, 5, 6, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 36, 37 and 38

Robert Walker, applicant, presented the project and identified project changes based on the ARB's previous comments, including elimination of the deck and increasing the backyard area by sixteen feet and increasing the garage setback..

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

The ARB discussed the project. Chair Howe inquired whether the applicant had considered putting a roof element over the rear door. The other Board members concurred with this comment and expressed general support for the project in particular the enlarged backyard.

On a motion by Becom, seconded by Hinshaw, the Board voted 5-0 to grant Final Architectural Approval with the condition that a small shed roof element be added to protect the backdoor from the elements.

e. Project Address: 1108 Presidio Boulevard

Architectural Approval Application No. 3842-08 for a new single family dwelling on a vacant lot of record.

Applicant: Robert Walker, on behalf of Peter and Susan Loewy

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Recommended Architectural Review Guidelines: 1, 2, 6, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37 and 38

Robert Walker, applicant, presented the project and identified project changes based on the ARB's previous comments, including increasing the backyard area from seventeen feet to twenty four feet, relocation of the second story element, change in the roof pitch, addition of a chimney cap detail, and removing the arched door feature.

Chair Howe inquired about the first floor roof overhang and building planes on the north elevation. Board member Becom inquired about the plate heights; the applicant responded they are proposed at eight feet. Becom also commented about the window proportions on the front elevation and that the side light next to the front door appears out of keeping with the Spanish design style. Board member Edmonds asked about the chimney design.

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

The ARB discussed the project. Chair Howe stated that he appreciated the changes made to the building massing, and that he was concerned with the organization of the windows on the north elevation.

Board member Northrop provided a photograph example of a Spanish style house, particularly in regards to the window details. She suggested the north and south elevations should be revised in line with this example. Board member Northrop also inquired about lowering the window on the front façade. The applicant Robert Walker informed the board that this was not possible because the window is in the kitchen.

Board member Edmonds commented that the fireplace chimney seemed out of scale with the rest of the house. He concurred with Chair Howe's previous comment about extending the first floor roof element on the north elevation.

Board member Hinshaw commented that the front elevation could be improved with a more interesting front window and removal of the sidelight. He also suggested that the window proportions and locations should be rethought on the north elevation as well as a craftsman window style, that the chimney should be fatter on the bottom, and that a carriage style garage door should be considered.

Board member Becom commented that the window size, shape, and placement seem random and that a logical window placement would make the appearance more appealing. Board member Becom suggested removing the arched window on the north elevation and restudying the window placement on the north elevation.

Chair Howe stated he would advocate for eliminating the arch on the stair window on the north elevation and creating a better rhythm for the window size and placement.

On a motion by Becom, seconded by Hinshaw, the Board voted 5-0 to refer the project back to the applicant for further study of the north elevation, to square the window at the stair, extend the first floor roof element, increasing the base of the chimney, reconsideration of the window placement on the north elevation, on the front elevation to consider a carriage style garage door, elimination of the front door sidelight, and a more prominent window design.

f. Project Address: 1110 Presidio Boulevard

Architectural Approval Application No. 3843-08 for a new single family dwelling on a vacant lot of record.

Applicant: Robert Walker, on behalf of Peter and Susan Loewy

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Recommended Architectural Review Guidelines: 1, 2, 6, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 36, 37 and 38

Robert Walker, applicant, presented the project and identified project changes based on the ARB's previous comments, including changing the east elevation roof to a hipped roof, lowering the height of the structure by one foot, moving the window on the east elevation for increase privacy, and use of board and batt . The Board inquired about the exterior siding material and construction of board and bat siding.

The public comment period was opened.

Heidi Becklenberg, neighbor, spoke to the project. She expressed appreciation for the design changes made to this project as well as the other three lots, and stated that she wished the overall building height could be lowered further. She noted that the proposed project has fifteen foot vaulted ceilings.

No further public comment was received.

The applicant responded on the question of the exterior siding, stating that plywood could be used for the board and bat, and that it could be constructed to disguise the seams.

The ARB discussed the project. Board member Northrop asked the applicant how he would describe the style of the house. The applicant responded it was in the barn vernacular on the modern side. Board member Northrop stated that because of this lot being on the corner and in a more prominent location, the design of the house would be fitting if it was something more unique from the other houses.

Board member Becom concurred, and noted the mix of gable and hip roofs creating a very high roof line and suggested use of hip roofs to reduce the scale of the house. He expressed appreciation for the design changes made with the hip roofs resulting in less overall bulk, and stated that the plywood board and bats would work as the exterior siding.

Board member Edmonds inquired about the roof element over the garage, and noted that it could be lowered.

Board member Hinshaw concurred that the roof still needs more work. He suggested moving the window on the front of the house out of the corner and locating it to create better balance. He also stated that when the ARB next sees the project that the applicant brings new ideas for how to design a unique residence.

Chair Howe stated he thought the roof should better reflect the step down in the rear of the lot, and expressed concern with the north elevation.

On a motion by Howe, seconded by Northrop, the Board voted 5-0 to refer the project back to the applicant for further study of the north elevation, the board and bat siding, and the roof elements.

g. Project Address: 1141 Presidio Boulevard

Architectural Approval Application No. 3831-08 for demolition of an existing single family dwelling and reconstruction of a proposed new two-story single family dwelling.

See Agenda Item 12b, continuing this project to the March 10, 2009 ARB regular meeting.

h. Project Address: 640 Gibson Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3850-09 for design changes to a previously approved single family dwelling including: enlarging front window, adding stone planter at entry steps, omitting roof hips on the east elevation, and adding a viewing window at the north elevation. Applicant: Robert Gunn
CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Project was moved to the Consent Agenda, see Agenda Item 13b.

15. REPORTS OF BOARDMEMBERS

Boardmembers may ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement or make a brief report on his or her activities. In addition, the Board members may provide a referral to staff or other resources for factual information, request staff to report back to the body at a subsequent meeting concerning a City matter or direct staff to place a request to agendize a matter of business on a future agenda (G.C. 54954.2).

16. REPORTS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Reference: Chief Planner, Lynn Burgess

17. ADJOURNMENT

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.