



## **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 10, 2009 – 6:00 P.M.

LOCATION: CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 300 FOREST AVENUE

#### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.

#### **2. ROLL CALL**

ARB members present:

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

#### **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**On a motion by Hinshaw, seconded by Howe, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the January 27, 2009 regular site review and regular meeting minutes.**

#### **4. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

None

#### **5. COMMUNICATIONS**

None

#### **6. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

None

## 7. CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS

Senior Planner Vaughn reported that the City Council had called-up 622 17<sup>th</sup> Street, which had received a “technical denial” from the Historic Resources Committee on January 14, 2009 due to a lack of quorum. The City Council will hear the project at their March 4, 2009 meeting, and will review the findings of the Phase 1 Historic Assessment and make a determination as to whether or not the property should be placed on the City’s Historic Resources Inventory. The project will return to the Architectural Review Board for project review after the City Council’s determination and action.

## 8. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

None

## 9. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Senior Planner Vaughn reported that project address 310-314 8<sup>th</sup> Street received subcommittee approval for Architectural Approval No. 3780-08.

## 10. ADMINISTRATIVE ARCHITECTURAL APPROVALS

Senior Planner Vaughn reported that project address 2740 Ransford Avenue received administrative approval for Administrative Architectural Approval No. 08-188 on Monday February 2, 2009. The approval was for the replacement of rusted metal railings along the steps and deck on the rear of a multi-family residential structure.

## 11. ITEMS WITHDRAWN OR TABLED

None

## 12. REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE

Staff requested that Item 12a, project address 1110 Patterson, be placed as the last item on the Regular Agenda.

## 13. CONSENT AGENDA

### a. 2826 Forest Hill Boulevard

Minor Architectural Approval Application No. 3854-09 to replace clay tile roofing with composite shingle roofing material.

Applicant: Wolfy’s Roofing, on behalf of Joanne Ewing

CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn

Recommended action: Discuss and take appropriate action.

**On a motion by Hinshaw, seconded by Becom, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the item listed on the Consent Agenda.**

**14. REGULAR AGENDA**

- a. Election of Officers: Appoint 2009 Architectural Review Board Chair and Vice-Chair**

**On a motion by Hinshaw, seconded by Northrop, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the election of Doug Howe as Chair, and Jeff Edmonds as Vice-Chair of the Architectural Review Board.**

- b. Project Address: 306 7<sup>th</sup> Street (HRI)**

Architectural Approval Application No. 3833-08 (Final) 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. Historic Preservation Permit Application No. 08-0239 was approved on January 13, 2009. Concept Architectural Approval was also granted on January 13, 2009 subject to moving the front porch away from the chimney and allowing the applicant to replace the historic porch windows that have deteriorated beyond repair.

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

CEQA Status: Class 31 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn

Senior Planner Vaughn introduced the project, and noted that the Concept Approval received on January 13, 2009 was based on Architectural Review Guidelines Nos. 28, 31 and 39.

Hunter Eldridge, applicant, presented the project and responded to questions from the Board. Mr. Eldridge noted that he had redesigned the front porch in order to move it away from the chimney, per the Board's previous suggestions.

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

Board Member Becom stated that he likes the project, but suggested moving the front door away from the corner and centering it in the entryway.

Chair Howe agreed that the front door should be moved away from the corner, and added that the window on the right side of the porch should also be moved away from the corner.

Board Member Edmonds also agreed that the front door should be moved and centered in the entryway.

Board Member Northrop stated that she likes the project. She suggested moving the wall separating the dining room from the entryway in order to allow more space for the entry.

Board Member Hinshaw stated that this is a great project.

The applicant asked the Board if the two original windows on the left side of the house can be replaced due to their deteriorated state. Board Member Hinshaw stated that he didn't see any original windows in the house that needed to be saved; that they were all deteriorated beyond repair. The new windows will need to maintain the same size, shape and location of the original windows.

**On a motion by Hinshaw, seconded by Becom, the Board voted 5-0 to grant Final Architectural Approval, pursuant to Historic Guideline #3 (Appendix I), with the condition that the front door be moved away from the corner and that the window on the right side of the porch also be moved away from the corner.**

**c. Project Address: Walnut Avenue**

Architectural Approval Application No. 3839-08 and Tree Permit No. 2008478 for a proposed 2-story single-family dwelling on a vacant lot of record. Placement of the structure will require the pruning of two oak trees on the site.  
Applicant: Michael Chandler, on behalf of Larry Scholink  
CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption  
Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn

Senior Planner Vaughn introduced the project, and recommended Architectural Review Guidelines Nos. 1, 2, 6, 21, 22, 24, 27, 32, 35, 36, 37 and 38 for review. Also noted for the record that the City Arborist had reviewed the updated project and issued a revised memorandum and conditions.

Michael Chandler, applicant, presented the project and responded to questions from the Board. The Board Members asked a number of questions regarding the proposed materials for the project. Mr. Chandler noted the owner's willingness to be flexible regarding the design and the materials.

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

Board Member Hinshaw stated that he appreciated the flexibility of the owner and applicant. He noted the changes that were made to the design and stated that the project was greatly improved. He acknowledged the various alternatives offered by the applicant, but felt that those details were not as important as the main mass of the structure. He stated that any of the alternatives would be acceptable.

Board Member Northrop noted her preference that only two main material types be used: plaster and board & batten. She noted that she did not care for the proposed stone.

Chair Howe stated that he likes the stone. He noted that changes in materials should occur at inside corners. He suggested several changes, including moving the left upstairs dormer to the right, adding a roof element over the rear sliding door, and lowering the roof over the stairs in the rear to avoid the tree branches.

Board Member Becom noted the substantial redesign of the project and agreed with the suggestions made by Chair Howe. He stated that the upstairs dormer locations were fine where they were.

Board Member Edmonds also noted the drastic changes to the design. He stated that the large center dormer would allow more light into the home, and agreed that the rear elevation needed to be broken up a bit. He also suggested lowering the roof over the stairs in the rear to allow more room for the tree branches. He also noted that he preferred only two material types and suggested the use of stone and board & batten.

Chair Howe stated that he preferred the proposed wood shake roof rather than composite shingles, but would not require it.

Board Member Hinshaw noted that the finish on the chimney should be stone. He also noted that he preferred wood windows, but would not require them.

Board Members discussed options to make the north side elevation more attractive. Members agreed that a roof element with knee brace on the north side elevation would help to break up the board & batten side treatment.

Senior Planner Vaughn noted that the structure is proposed to be located at the 6 foot side setback line. Any roof elements or projections could not extend any further than 3 feet; projections may not be within 3 feet of a side yard setback.

Board Member Northrop noted that the rails around the windows on the garage doors should be wider, and the muntins should be narrower.

**On a motion by Howe, seconded by Becom, the Board voted 5-0 to grant Final Architectural Approval, pursuant to Architectural Review Guidelines Nos. 1, 2, 6, 21, 22, 24, 27, 32, 35, 36, 37 and 38, subject to subcommittee (Howe/Becom) review and approval of the following conditions:**

- 1. Lower the roof over the stairs in the rear by at least 18 inches to avoid tree branches.**
- 2. Replace the proposed plaster on the front elevation with stone, and carry it full height to the eave.**
- 3. Install clad wood windows.**
- 4. Use stone finish on chimney.**
- 5. Add a roof element over the door on the north side and rear elevations.**
- 6. Change in materials shall occur at inside corners.**
- 7. Use wood material for roofing as an option, but not required.**

CHAIR HOWE STEPPED DOWN PRIOR TO THE NEXT ITEM DUE TO THE PROXIMITY OF HIS RESIDENCE TO THE PROJECT. VICE CHAIR EDMONDS ACTED AS THE CHAIR FOR THIS ITEM.

**d. Project Address: 512 8<sup>th</sup> 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

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn

Senior Planner Vaughn introduced the project, and recommended Architectural Review Guidelines Nos. 1, 2, 6, 24, 27, 32, 35, 36, 37 and 38.

Richard Baldwin, applicant, presented the project and responded to questions from the Board. Mr. Baldwin noted that he had redesigned the project per the Board Member's previous suggestions, including reducing the height, changing attached 2-car garage to detached 1-car garage, placing garage at grade, and changes to windows and garage door.

Public comment:

Richard Di Lorenzo, neighbor, voiced concerns about the overall height of the proposed structure. He asked that the applicant try to reduce the height, if possible, and suggested placing the dwelling on a slab rather than a raised crawl space.

Mr. Baldwin addressed Mr. Di Lorenzo's concerns, noting that he did not max out the building potential of the lot and that the house is situated along the front setback line which allows a larger back yard. Mr. Baldwin stated that he preferred having a crawl space vs. a slab foundation due to moisture and heating issues.

Board Member Hinshaw noted that the applicant has worked hard to meet the ARB's suggestions. He stated that he appreciates the story and a half design and that the applicant didn't attempt to max out the lot.

Board Member Northrop stated that it is a great project, noting that the detached garage is a positive design change.

Board Member Becom also stated that this is a good project. He suggested the addition of a second story window on the right side elevation, and a shed roof element over both the right side door and rear door. He also asked the applicant if it was possible to lower the second story.

Mr. Baldwin stated that it would be quite an additional expense to go back to the architect and engineer to lower the roof, and that it would provide only minimal benefit.

Mr. Di Lorenzo stated that he did not realize this project was as far along as it is, and that he appreciated the fact the Mr. Baldwin allowed a larger back yard, minimal rear windows and did not fully maximize the lot. He stated that he would be fine with the roof height as proposed

Board Member Becom suggested the addition of an upstairs window under the gable on the right side elevation, a shed roof over the right side door, and a window over the upstairs bathtub to balance out the other upstairs window on the rear elevation. He also suggested the addition of windows in the upstairs closets to add interest to the rear elevation.

Board Member Edmonds stated that the ridge could be lowered in back, but would not require it. He agreed with the suggested addition of an upstairs window on the right side elevation and 3 additional upstairs windows on the rear elevation. He also agreed with the addition of a shed roof over both the right side and rear doors.

**On a motion by Hinshaw, seconded by Becom, the Board voted 4-0 to refer the project back to the applicant for further study and consideration, and to continue the item to the February 24, 2009 meeting.**

CHAIR HOWE RETURNED TO HIS SEAT.

**e. Project Address: 818 17 Mile Drive**

Design Change Architectural Approval Application No. 3848-08 to relocate a proposed detached garage. Final Architectural Approval No. 3666-07 was granted final approval on August 28, 2007.

Applicant: Susan Bailey, on behalf of Pat and Katie Craig

CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical Exemption

Staff reference: Senior Planner, Karen Vaughn

Senior Planner Vaughn introduced the project, described the proposed design change and noted that the proposed garage location complies with the required setbacks. Ms. Vaughn suggested Architectural Review Guidelines Nos. 4, 13 and 14 for review.

Susan Bailey, applicant, presented the project and responded to questions from the Board. The Board asked what the reasons were for the design change. Ms. Bailey stated that the property owner also owns the adjoining lot and didn't want the garage doors facing the lot. Ms. Bailey also stated that both garage bays would be accessible, but that the vehicle may have to do a 2 or 3 point turn.

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

Board Member Becom stated that he does not have an issue with the proposed garage configuration. He was concerned with the functionality of the garage and getting in and out of the parking bays.

Board Member Edmonds stated that the proposed location would be a visual improvement.

Board Members Northrop and Hinshaw agreed.

**On a motion by Becom, seconded by Northrop, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Design Change, pursuant to Architectural Review Guidelines Nos. 4, 13 and 14.**

**f. 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: Senior Planner, Sarah Hardgrave

Associate Planner Valerie Tallerico introduced the project and recommended Architectural Review Guidelines Nos. 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 24, 27, 28, 33, and 34 for review.

Brian Sullivan, applicant, presented the project and responded to questions from the Board.

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

Chair Howe stated his preference to have the roof reflect the walls below. He stated that the added gables didn't look right; the second story gable was located over a blank wall, and the garage gable appeared smaller than the garage door.

Board Member Northrop agreed with Chair Howe, adding that the gable elements don't match the contemporary design of the house. She suggested adding clerestory windows upstairs. She cited Architectural Review Guidelines No. 13 and stated that the new elements should reflect the style of the house.

Board Member Hinshaw stated that he was fine with the roofline. He agreed with prior comments about the proposed gable elements.

Chair Howe stated that the belly band trim should continue around all sides of the structure. He also noted that the belly band seemed too low, and that the windows appeared too high. He questioned whether the plans were drawn to scale, as the windows were depicted very high.

Board Member Becom stated his preference for a shed roof over the front door and front second story windows, rather than the gable elements.

Board Member Hinshaw stated that the main concern was the view from the street and that the gables looked odd. He suggested the project be referred back to the applicant with clear direction from the Board.

Chair Howe sketched an alternative roofline and presented it to the Board and public. He stated that it was a simple design and should not be very expensive to design or build. The Board Members agreed with Chair Howe's roof design.

Board Member Edmonds stated that all elevations are important and that the applicant should do their best to make all sides of the structure visually appealing.

**On a motion by Becom, seconded by Edmonds, the Board voted 5-0 to refer the project back to the applicant for further study and consideration, and to continue the item to the February 24, 2009 meeting.**

**15. REPORTS OF BOARDMEMBERS**

None

**16. REPORTS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

Chief Planner Lynn Burgess discussed the Old Bath House project, noting that the Chief Building Official had reviewed the plans and had suggested several changes pertaining to ADA accessibility. Ms. Burgess noted that the stair lift was not a viable option because the building is a commercial structure. State building codes require an elevator be the preferred option, unless a hardship waiver is approved. Ms. Burgess stated that staff will bring the project back to the full Board for review.

Ms. Burgess also discussed various staffing options for the Building Division of the Community Development Department. She noted that a public meeting will be held on Wednesday February 11, 2009, 6:00 pm, at the Community Center to allow for citizen input.

**17. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 pm.