



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, JANUARY 13, 2009 – 6:00 P.M.

LOCATION: CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 300 FOREST AVENUE

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Board members present:

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

Board Members absent:

- Jeffrey Edmonds

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by Billstrom, seconded by Northrop, the ARB voted 5-0-1 to approve the minutes from the December 23, 2008, Site Review and Regular Meeting. (Spradling abstained because she was not in attendance at the December 23, 3008 meeting)

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

Senior Planner Vaughn noted that 431 Pine Avenue received subcommittee approval (Becom/Hinshaw) on January 7, 2009.

10. ADMINISTRATIVE ARCHITECTURAL APPROVALS

None.

11. ITEMS WITHDRAWN OR TABLED

None.

12. REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE

Senior Planner Vaughn requested a continuance for Item 14E, 512 8th Street, to the January 27, 2009 meeting to allow the applicant time to erect story poles and netting.

On a motion by Howe, seconded by Becom, the ARB voted 6-0 to continue Item 14E to the January 27, 2009 meeting.

13. CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Howe suggested moving Item 13A to the Regular Agenda, and also moving Item 14F to the Consent Agenda. Member Billstrom suggested moving Item 14A to the Consent Agenda as well. Member Hinshaw agreed with moving Item 13A to the Regular Agenda and moving Items 14A and 14F to the Consent Agenda. Chair Howe wanted to keep Item 14A on the Regular Agenda.

On a motion by Becom, seconded by Billstrom, the ARB voted 6-0 to move Item 13A (147 14th Street) to the Regular Agenda, move Item 14F (1169 Presidio Boulevard) to the Consent Agenda, and to approve the Consent Agenda.

a. Project Address: 1169 Presidio Boulevard

Architectural Approval Application No. 3797-08 for review of carport details for a project approved by the ARB on October 28, 2008. This item was continued from December 9, 2008 to allow the applicant time to revise the carport plans.

Applicant: Ted Larson, on behalf of Dave Gross

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn

This item (previously Item 14F) was moved to and approved on the Consent Calendar.

14. REGULAR AGENDA

BOARD MEMBER BECOM STEPPED DOWN PRIOR TO THE NEXT ITEM.

a. Project Address: 147 14th Street

Applicant: Jeanne Byrne, Architect, on behalf of Roy Ridgway

Final Review of landscaping, exterior lighting and colors as required per ARB final approval of Architectural Approval No. 3524-05 on February 14, 2006

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

This item (previously Item 13A) was moved from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda and heard as the first item.

Senior Planner Hardgrave made a brief project introduction.

Applicant Jeanne Byrne presented several exhibits depicting the exterior lighting locations and proposed landscaping plans.

Asking for, and seeing no members of the public to speak to the item, the Chair closed the public hearing.

The Board discussed the project. Member Billstrom asked about the glass to be used in the exterior light fixtures. The applicant showed a photo of the proposed fixtures. Member Billstrom expressed that the fixtures and the landscaping looked fine.

On a motion by Billstrom, seconded by Spradling, the ARB voted 5-0 to approve the project as presented and per Guideline #38.

BOARD MEMBER BECOM RETURNED TO THE BOARD.

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

Architectural Approval Application No. 3844-08 to allow a design change for a proposed addition to the rear of a single-family dwelling that is listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory. Project received previous Architectural Approval for a rear addition (AA 3560-06) on April 16, 2006, and received approval for Historic Preservation Permit No. 08-0237 allowing a reduced rear yard setback of 8 feet on November 13, 2008.

Applicant: Jesse Williams and Peter Moppert, for Laidlaw Williams

CEQA status: Class 31 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn

Applicant was not present. Chair Howe moved the item to the end of the Regular Agenda.

This item was heard at the end of the Regular Agenda.

Applicant Peter Moppert presented the project.

Asking for, and seeing no members of the public to speak to the item, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Chair Howe suggested reworking the roof to be more balanced and to comply with Guidelines #31 and 28. Member Billstrom agreed.

On a motion by Howe, seconded by Becom, the ARB voted 6-0 to approve the design change, with the condition that the applicant change the hip roof end to a gable roof end, and add a gable vent element. (Chair Howe provided a sketch of the suggested changes.)

c. Project Address: 238 Spruce Avenue (HRI)

Historic Relocation Permit Application No. 08-62, Architectural Approval Application No. 3745-08 and Tree Permit No. 08-0470 to allow the on-site relocation of a single-family dwelling, a new 2-story addition to the existing dwelling, and the pruning of existing oak trees on-site. The existing structure is listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory. The existing historic structure is proposed to be moved approximately 20 feet forward on the site, necessitating the pruning of the existing oak trees. Per Code Section 23.76.100, a structure proposed for relocation may be permitted following the same procedural guidelines described in Section 23.76.090, Demolitions, and the filing of an application for relocation. The Historic Resources Committee has reviewed the application, as per Code Section 23.76.090(b)(2), and has forwarded the application to the Architectural Review Board for action.

Applicant: Ed Bredthauer, on behalf of Charlie and Nancy Alvarez

CEQA status: Class 31 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn

Senior Planner Vaughn introduced the project and described the order of the three permits: Historic Relocation Permit, Tree Permit, and Architectural Approval. Senior Planner Vaughn offered Guidelines #1, 2, 5, 6, 13, 21, 24, 28, 31 and 32 as appropriate guidelines by which to review the project.

Applicant Ed Bredthauer presented the project, noting that the original application occurred one year ago. Mr. Bredthauer discussed the various alternatives that were considered, explained how the project complies with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Resources, and that the relocation of the existing house would remedy an existing side yard non-conformity. Mr. Bredthauer discussed the dismantling and reassembly of the existing brick fireplace and assured the Board that the existing bricks would be reused to the extent feasible, depending on their condition.

Asking for, and seeing no members of the public to speak to the item, the Chair closed the public hearing.

The Board discussed the project. Member Hinshaw felt that the massing of the new addition would affect the historic structure, and stated that he didn't find the argument regarding massing, as written in the Phase 2 Historic Assessment, to be persuasive. Member Hinshaw advised that additions to historic homes should be inconspicuous, and should be compatible in scale and massing (citing Secretary Standards). Member Hinshaw stated that the addition is oversized for the original house. Vice Chair Spradling agreed with Member Hinshaw's comments, and noted that the project doesn't comply with Guidelines #1, 5 and 24. Member Northrop agreed, and also noted that the project doesn't comply with Guideline #28. Member Northrop stated that having space around a house is important. Chair Howe disagreed with previous comments. Chair Howe felt that the project complied with Guideline #1 because it is flanked on both sides by 2-story homes. Member Becom agreed with Chair Howe. Member Becom noted that in the perspective exhibit prepared by the applicant, the addition to the rear is fairly inconspicuous. Member Becom expressed a concern with the flat wall adjacent to the neighbor. Member Billstrom stated that she agreed with everybody. Member Billstrom was also concerned with the blank wall next to the neighbor, concerned with massing, and suggested reducing the plate height on the second story if possible. Member Billstrom stated that she was fine with moving the historic home forward, but didn't feel the project otherwise complies with Guidelines #5, 24 and 28.

Applicant Ed Bredthauer addressed the board members concerns, stating that the blank wall was in response to the neighbor's request for privacy, and that the second story plate height had already been reduced to 7'4" and even more so in some of the upstairs rooms. Mr. Bredthauer reiterated the Secretary's Standards and that the most inconspicuous place to erect the addition is in the backyard – where it is currently proposed. Mr. Bredthauer discussed the number of 2-story homes in the neighborhood including the homes on either side of the proposed project

On a motion by Becom, seconded by Hinshaw, the ARB voted 6-0 to approve the Historic Relocation Permit.

On a motion by Howe, seconded by Northrop, the ARB voted 6-0 to approve the Tree Permit.

On a motion by Billstrom, seconded by Northrop, the ARB voted 6-0 to continue the Architectural Approval to January 27, 2009 to allow the applicant time to research whether the second story plate height could be further reduced, and so that Board Member Edmonds would be available.

d. Project Address: 306 7th Street (HRI)

Historic Preservation Permit Application No. 08-0239 and Architectural Approval Application No. 3833-08 to allow renovations, a 118 square foot addition, and new front entry ramp and landing to an existing single-family

dwelling. The existing structure is listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory and has non-conforming setbacks.

Applicant: Hunter Eldridge, on behalf of Max and Jean Bell

CEQA Status: Class 31 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn

Applicant Hunter Eldridge presented the project, described the existing non-conformities and the need for the Historic Preservation Permit, and outlined the findings of the Phase 2 Historic Assessment. Chair Howe asked staff about the required off-street parking. Senior Planner Vaughn cited Code Section 23.68.050 and that, due to the small size of the proposed addition, the applicant was not required to bring the site into conformity with the parking requirements.

Asking for, and seeing no members of the public to speak to the item, the Chair closed the public hearing.

The Board discussed the project. Member Billstrom would like more information as to whether the original porch was enclosed. Member Becom feels the porch crowds the fireplace and distracts from the original house, and that the original windows are too far deteriorated to be saved. Member Becom suggested that the porch be removed and rebuilt as an open porch. Member Northrop noted that the house is very small, and that removal of the porch would take away square footage. Member Northrop would like to see the porch moved away from the chimney, but stated she would not require the applicant to go back to the original porch style. Member Hinshaw stated that he likes the project and that the owners are rehabilitating the house. Member Hinshaw also stated that applicant need not worry about trying to save the original windows because of the deteriorated state, likes the new proposed Marvin wood windows, and agreed with Member Northrop about the redesign of the porch. Chair Howe agreed. There was general agreement that the enclosed porch should be moved away from the chimney and the windows may be replaced with the proposed Marvin wood windows due to the deteriorated state of the existing windows.

On a motion by Hinshaw, seconded by Becom, the ARB voted 6-0 to approve the Historic Preservation Permit with the staff recommended and standard conditions.

On a motion by Hinshaw, seconded by Billstrom, the ARB voted 6-0 to grant Concept Approval of the Architectural Approval Application per Guidelines #28, 31 and 39, subject to the redesign of the front porch as follows: the enclosed porch to be moved away from the chimney and the windows replaced with the proposed Marvin wood windows due to the deteriorated state of the existing windows.

e. Project Address: 1040 Benito Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3834-08 and Tree Permit Application No. 2008367 for a proposed new 2-story single-family dwelling and removal of 3 trees on a vacant lot.

Applicant: Roy Larson, owner
CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption
Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn

Applicant Roy Larson presented the project, and discussed how it differs from the previously approved plans.

Chair Howe and Board Member Hinshaw asked several questions regarding the proposed materials. All members reviewed a set of the previously approved plans.

Asking for, and seeing no members of the public to speak to the item, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Chair Howe stated that he liked the previous plans better than the current submittal. Chair Howe stated that he is leery of “dura-temp” siding, and feels that the panels appear too thin. Member Hinshaw stated that he thought the siding would be redwood, and that the new plans look “institutional”. Member Billstrom stated that she likes the contemporary style, but feels that the project is inappropriate for the lot because the other homes in the neighborhood are lower, single-story style homes. Member Billstrom stated that she would not support the Tree Permit at this time.

Chief Planner Burgess discussed the previous concept approval and that it is still valid. Senior Planner Vaughn noted that there is no time limit between concept approval and final approval.

Applicant Roy Larson addressed the Board’s comments on materials and stated that he chose the “dura-temp” siding for maintenance reasons, and that it is difficult to clean pine needles from the spaces between individual redwood boards. Mr. Larson stated that he would be willing to go back to the previous plans.

Chair Howe noted that the previous plans proposed redwood siding. Member Becom agreed with the applicant regarding maintenance issues.

Chief Planner Burgess asked the applicant if he would like to withdraw the current application and return to the previously approved plans.

Applicant Roy Larson formally withdrew Architectural Approval Application No. 3834-08. Mr. Larson stated that he will move forward with the previously approved concept plans and modify them by removing the spacing between the redwood boards on the exterior siding.

On a motion by Billstrom, seconded by Becom, the ARB voted 6-0 to continue the Tree Permit to a date uncertain.

Senior Planner Vaughn stated that she would listen to the ARB tape of the previous concept approval for 1040 Benito Avenue and would contact the applicant to go over any suggestions or conditions that were made at that time.

f. Project Address: 512 8th Street

Architectural Approval Application No. 3845-08 for a proposed new 2-story single-family dwelling on a vacant lot.

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

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn

This item (previously Item 14E) was continued to January 27, 2009.

15. REPORTS OF BOARDMEMBERS

Member Billstrom asked Chief Planner Burgess about the “farming out of planning services”. Chief Planner Burgess clarified that the only contracting that is under consideration is for Building Division services. Ms. Burgess discussed the current Building Division staffing arrangement, and described three alternative proposals that are under consideration. A public meeting will be held in a couple of weeks to gather public input on these proposals.

16. REPORTS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Chief Planner Burgess discussed the status of the Historic Preservation Ordinance update.

17. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.