

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING

December 27, 2005
City Council Chambers
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove
4:00 p.m.

Tape: 05-23

Boardmembers Present: Darlene Billstrom
Ken Hinshaw
Doug Howe, Chair
Maryanne L. Spradling
Dennis Tarmina, Vice Chair

Absent: David Prew

Vacancies: 1

Staff: Rideout

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion Billstrom-Tarmina, the Board voted 5-0, to approve the minutes of the December 13, 2005 Architectural Review Board meeting.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

None.

3. COMMUNICATIONS

None.

4. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

None.

5. CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS

Staff reported.

6. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

Staff reported

7. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

None

8. ITEMS WITHDRAWN

None.

9. REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE

a. Project Address: 950 Walnut Street

Architectural Approval Application No. 3495-05 for a proposed second-story addition and exterior alterations to a one-story single-family dwelling. (Applicant: George and Neivein Gergawy) (Continued from 10/11/05)

b. Project Address: 1124 Balboa Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3473-05 for a proposed new single-family dwelling. (Applicant: Teri Takikawa) (Continued from 12/13/05)

c. Project Address: 211 9th Street

Architectural Approval Application No. 3238-03 (Final) for proposed first and second-story additions to a single-family dwelling that is included on the City's Historic Resources Inventory. (Applicant: David Prew) (Continued from 12/13/05)

On a motion by Billstrom-Spradling, the Board voted 5-0 to continue Items 9a-c to the January 10, 2006 meeting, at the request of the applicants.

BOARDMEMBER HOWE STEPPED DOWN PRIOR TO THE VOTE ON THE FOLLOWING ITEM DUE TO A CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

d. Project Address: 210 Willow Street

Architectural Approval Application No. 3526-05 (Concept) for a proposed remodel and exterior alterations including a change in roof pitch to an existing dwelling that is part of a two-unit dwelling group. (Applicant: Doug Howe)

The Board voted 4-0 to continue 210 Willow Street to the January 10, 2006, meeting.

BOARDMEMBER. HOWE RETURNED TO HIS SEAT

10. CONSENT AGENDA

Boardmember Tarmina requested that 275 Spruce Avenue be moved to the regular agenda.

Project Address: *275 Spruce Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3456-05 (Final) for a proposed remodel and additions, including a second-story addition, to a one-story single-family dwelling that is included on the City's Historic Resources Inventory. (Applicant: Eric Miller Architects)

Boardmember Hinshaw requested that 836 Carmel Avenue be moved to the regular agenda.

Project Address: 836 Carmel Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3393-04 (Final) for proposed construction of an 890 square foot accessory building on the Cal-Am reservoir site. (Applicant: Bestor Engineers, Inc.)

a. Project Address: 1245 Forest Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3486-05 (Final) for proposed construction of a new detached accessory building that includes a garage, greenhouse, and a storage room. (Applicant: International Design Group)

On a motion by Hinshaw-Tarmina, the Board voted 5-0 to grant final approval of the remaining item on the consent agenda based on the standard finding for approval of an architectural approval application.

11. REGULAR AGENDA

a. Project Address: *275 Spruce Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3456-05 (Final) for a proposed remodel and additions, including a second-story addition, to a one-story single-family dwelling that is included on the City's Historic Resources Inventory. (Applicant: Eric Miller Architects)

Tom Schellenberg, property owner, answered questions from the Boardmembers.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Robert Galvan, 271 Spruce Avenue, spoke in support of the project.

There being no additional speakers, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Hinshaw stated that his concerns from the Board's initial consideration of the project, regarding inappropriate roof shapes and engulfment of the historic residence, remained unaddressed. He stated that the dormer and gable roof shapes detract from the character-defining hip roof of the existing residence.

Howe noted that more details were needed for final approval and the submitted architectural details are not consistent with the exterior features and materials called out on the elevations.

On a motion by Howe-Tarmina, the Board voted 4-1, with Hinshaw voting no, to continue the item to the January 10, 2006, meeting to allow the applicant to develop correct and complete architectural drawings.

b. Project Address: 836 Carmel Avenue

Architectural Approval Application No. 3393-04 (Final) for proposed construction of an 890 square foot accessory building on the Cal-Am reservoir site. (Applicant: Bestor Engineers, Inc.)

Pat Ward, representing the applicant, answered questions from the Board.

On a motion by Tarmina-Hinshaw, the Board voted 5-0 to grant final approval based on the standard finding for approval of an architectural approval application.

c. Project Address: 1213 Shafter Avenue

Amend Architectural Approval No. 3430-05 for proposed exterior alterations to a single-family dwelling. (Applicant: Charles Coleman) (Continued from 10/25/05)

Charles Coleman, property owner, presented the project revisions.

All of the Boardmembers agreed that a subcommittee should review the handrail, stone trim and corner details.

Billstrom also requested subcommittee approval of the side elevation.

On a motion by Hinshaw-Billstrom, the Board voted 5-0, to grant final approval subject to subcommittee approval of the handrail, stone trim and corner details, and the west side elevation. Approval is based upon the standard finding for

approval of an architectural approval application.

Subcommittee: Tarmina and Hinshaw

12. REPORTS OF BOARDMEMBERS

13. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

**SALLY RIDEOUT
ACTING SECRETARY**

*Building identified on the Pacific Grove Historic Resources Inventory.

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.