



Council Chamber  
Few Memorial Hall of Records  
Monterey, California

**Architectural Review Committee  
Minutes**  
**SPECIAL JOINT MEETING  
with  
Historic Preservation Commission**

**July 27, 2005**

**7:00 PM**

**Architectural Review  
Committee**

*Glenn Johnson, Chair  
Peter Arellano, Vice Chair  
Virginia Fry  
Eugene Hayden  
Terry Latasa  
Luis Osorio  
William Whipple*

*Architectural Review Committee (ARC) review is to encourage and promote good development that is related to the setting and established character of the surrounding area or neighborhood.*

**CALL TO ORDER:** 7:00 PM  
**ARC MEMBERS PRESENT:** P. Arellano, V. Fry, E. Hayden, G. Johnson, T. Latasa, L. Osorio, W. Whipple  
**HPC MEMBERS PRESENT:** S. Calabrese, J. Castagna, B. Jacoubowsky, V. McLain, J. O'Brien, R. Petty  
**HPC MEMBERS ABSENT:** M. Lucido, M. DeVoe  
**STAFF:** C. Rerig, K. Cole, C. Anderson, B. Wojtkowski, K. Allen

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

The Public may speak at this time on any Architectural Review Committee matter not on the agenda. Comments should be limited to a maximum of three (3) minutes.

Richard Ruccello said that open spaces are important to our historic City. He asked that the Committee and Commission urge City Council to adopt a policy for a special open space designation that would preserve precious pieces of land and would prevent building structures on them without a vote of the people.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**450 Madison Street (Public Service Center); Use Permit, Rezone and General Plan Amendment 02-067 (Applicant/Owner- City of Monterey); R-3-6 Zoning District; (Environmental Impact Report)**

Public Hearing for the Architectural Review Committee and Historic Preservation Commission to review the architectural design and historic implications of the City of Monterey Public Service Center for recommendation to the Planning Commission.

The project proposes construction of two, two-story buildings with a single basement underneath the proposed south building. The new building will house 84 employees after construction. Overall, employee population in the Monterey Civic Center complex will be 198 persons.

The overall application is to amend the City General Plan from Residential – Medium Density (8-30 dwelling units per acre) to Public/Semi-Public Use, Rezone from R-3-6 (Medium Density Multi-Family Residential) to C-O (Office and Professional) to allow government office use. The project requires approval of a Use Permit for the building size and height over 25'.

Currently, the Monterey Civic Center complex consists of a collection of buildings, City-owned residences, and temporary modular offices. The project site is located in a National Historic Landmark District. At the heart of the complex is Colton Hall (1847-1849), Few Memorial Hall (1934), Underwood-Brown adobe

(1843), and the Vasquez adobe (1840). In recent years, as City government has grown, a scattering of nearby cottages and temporary offices have been added to the complex to accommodate public service needs. As a result, City services are disconnected and nearly all departments and occupants are in need of additional space, collaborative meeting areas, public service areas, and public access points.

The project will result in the removal of several smaller buildings currently located behind the main Civic Center complex and eleven trees.

The project will result in the closure of Dutra Street between Madison Street and King Street. Based on the proposed parking plan, parking will be available on site for 188 City employees and visitor parking will remain at 50 spaces. Twenty-two City vehicles will be moved offsite to the East Custom House Garage so employee and visitor parking can be provided.

Story pole staking outlining the project's size was installed on Friday, July 15, 2005.

**ACTION: Historic Preservation Commission recommended that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council reduce the program requirements thereby reducing the size (mass) of the building(s) but that the proposed site is the appropriate site for a Public Service Center. 6-0-1 (Absent - Lucido)**

**ACTION: Architectural Review Committee recommended that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council deny the project as proposed with the following Findings for Decision. 4-3 (Noes-Arellano, Osorio, Whipple)-0:**

**Findings for Decision:**

- 1) That the proposed bulk, mass, height, and footprint of the proposed buildings impose a significant negative visual impact on the existing historic buildings and site; that the mostly two-story buildings impose a visually negative impact on existing historic context and buildings by not respecting the human and historic scale and spatial relationships which define this site; and that these impacts cannot be mitigated simply by window trim, paint or planting modifications.
- 2) That the proposed project imposes a significant negative visual impact on the neighborhood by failing to transition to a pedestrian or residential scale, effectively walling off the historic buildings and excessively eliminating open space.
- 3) That public testimony has underscored a concern with excessive bulk and compromise of historic open space and that the project is inconsistent with the Old Town Neighborhood Plan.
- 4) That a significantly smaller project could utilize more single story elements and better respect the scale of this most historic site and avoid the visual compromise and parking issues which so concern the neighborhood; and ultimately better serve the public.
- 5) That the City should reconsider the proposed "one-stop service center" concept and seriously develop plans for an alternative site for the space required by City employees to serve the public.

**Staff Presentation**

Kim Cole presented the staff report and answered ARC Members and HPC Commissioners questions. Ms. Cole clarified that Dutra Street will not be closed on the new plans that were submitted by the applicant.

**Architectural Historian Presentation**

Mr. Jay Turnbull, President of Page and Turnbull, Inc., presented information regarding the historical significance of the property and the areas surrounding it and answered ARC Members and HPC Commissioners questions.

## Comments from Applicant/Project Architect Presentation

Carl Anderson, as applicant for the City, gave a presentation on the project and its history and answered ARC Members and HPC Commissioners questions. Les Melburg, of Nichols, Melburg & Rosetto, and Dan Fletcher, of Fletcher + Hardoin, the project designers, gave a presentation and answered ARC Members and HPC Commissioners questions.

### Public Comment

Molly Erickson, resident of Monterey, asked that the ARC Members and HPC Commissioners treat this applicant as they would any applicant, private or public, with no special treatment. She said this project is not consistent with the Old Town Neighborhood Plan. She handed out a survey of Old Town area residents that was done a while ago which indicated that the residents did not want the Public Service Center. She said the City has never surveyed the Old Town neighborhood to find out if they were in support of the center. She also stated her concern that the budget for this project is taking money away from the Neighborhood Improvement Programs. She said the basement is not the appropriate place for City archives and computer equipment due to the drainage problems of this area. She urged the ARC Members and HPC Commissioners to deny the project and asked that any future considerations of the project be brought back to the ARC and HPC, and to include a 3-D model of the project.

Richard Ruccello said there is little information on how the new building relates to Colton Hall and the jail, which are the most important elements of the project due to their historical significance. He said the new building dominates and diminishes the importance of Colton Hall and historic jail. He asked that the ARC and HPC assess the project as though proposal is by a private developer. He concluded by saying that the City is trying to make the project fit into a site that is not working, much like putting a square peg into a round hole.

Larry Conte, President of the Villa Del Monte Neighborhood Association and a member of the Monterey Alliance of Neighborhoods, said he is here to support the local residents to make sure their voice is heard. He asked the ARC and HPC to make sure that the project does not go forward without due process regarding all the details.

Boyd De Larios, President of Los Californianos, asked that this project be rejected in favor of Option #5. He questioned the information on the City's web site and asked for better views that show a comparison of the project to Colton Hall and the jail, but said he is comforted that Dutra Street will remain open. He said what was done in the 1950's should not be used as a precedent for today as that was not a good time for preservation. He said the essential nature of the Spanish buildings in the City are not seen in the design, and compatibility in terms of the size is not there. He said that many people throughout the State and around the country care about Monterey because it is a unique place and the beginning of a period of California history, and asked the City to not impinge on Colton Hall and the Vasquez Adobe with a modern complex.

Nancy Selfridge, Monterey Vista Neighborhood Association President, said this project is a prime example of mansionization and its effects on the neighborhood, and that it is the wrong location for this project. She said Colton Hall is a treasure for all of California, and Monterey has the responsibility to protect it. She asked the ARC and HPC to please direct the City staff to look at alternative locations.

Neal Hotelling, board member of the Alliance of Monterey Area Preservationists, and concerned citizen about the history of the entire peninsula, said that an evolving civic center within a National registered district that supports further evolution as historically appropriate is the ultimate in double-speak. He said Few Memorial Hall is not included in the landmark designation because it was not a contributor. He said the Old Monterey Landmark District is designed to support the Spanish colonial era of Monterey, and that the new project is in-fill around historic buildings that would create a negative impact to interpreting history, would impact the quality of the district, and potentially destroy its significance. He said Ryan Ranch or Garden Road would be more appropriate sites for a project of this size. He also asked if this project really needs to be in one place and suggested mid-sized buildings that would allow some consolidation, but not

total consolidation, and would not impact the historic nature of the City. If Monterey loses or destroys the contiguity of the historic area we have lost what Monterey represents.

Judi Lehman said she does not support the location or the size of the project. She mentioned how important Monterey's history is to tourism and that to preserve the historic integrity the City has to act as stewards to preserve what we have. She said to restore the small unique designs that are compatible with the neighborhood, the City should build two or three small units with underground parking and storage if necessary. She said that future projects reviewed for this area should provide a view cone of the view from up the hill, as there is a major impact on what the houses above will see. She said the project is imitating what is existing, has a prison-like appearance, and is not pedestrian friendly. She suggested more pedestrian arcades on the south building along Van Buren, more roof topographies, and to possibly move the north building along Van Buren, with the parking lot and open park space by the historic buildings. She said there is no reason in this computer age for all the offices to be grouped together and that she enjoys going to the various offices around the City to conduct business. She also raised concerns about the security and safety issues of having all City employees in one place.

James Bryant, President of Alliance of Monterey Area Preservationists, said that although the project was reduced by 25%, only 15% of that is above ground and that an increase in only sixteen employees is astounding for the size and cost of the building. He said the National Park Service and others have the opinion that the survey should be updated. He said the staff report says the project won't adversely impact the Historic District or the neighborhood, but the National Park Service raised the concern that there is not adequate information, including 3-dimensional models, to judge the impact of the project on the Historic District. He asked where are the models and computer simulations that show the context of the historic buildings with the proposed buildings and also asked for Pacific Street elevations. He asked that as stewards of one of the largest and most important collections of historic buildings in California, and on behalf of all of America and visitors, to please find another location.

Frances Grate has worked for the Monterey Historic Parks for over forty years, and questioned the request to take the project on faith that it will turn out all right. She cited the San Carlos Hotel project as an example of how that premise does not work.

Nancy Peden, a tenant of 526 Dutra Street, said it has been an enchanting place to live, in part due to its historical significance. She questioned the impact of construction at this time on historical tourism and the economy. She said this is the wrong time and the wrong place for a project on this major property. She asked that the ARC and HPC look at Option #5.

Bettina Hotelling said she is actively involved in the historic preservation of the area and is concerned about the placement of the center. She asked the City to consider removing the housing designation of the property across the street, move small housing units to this location and place the large service center where the housing project is currently designated to go.

Richard Peden, a fifth generation Californian, said that although the value of City services is important and space is needed, the protection of historic tourism is more important and reflects the true value of what the City has. He asked that the ARC and HPC take all the time they can to evaluate the project and said every detail is needed to evaluate what the project will look like for the future and in context with the neighborhood.

Vincent Torrente said he grew up in the neighborhood and is concerned with the parking issues. He also raised concerns with the loss of views from the homes that his family owns in the Old Town area.

#### ARC Members and HPC Commissioners Discussion on Historic Preservation

Commissioner Jacoubowsky said that a project that is compatible with the historic buildings could be put on this site, so the project cannot be rejected out of hand without further consideration of the possibilities. He said this project as submitted could not be put on this site, without significant impact to the site and the historic resources in the area.

Chair Johnson said that this site had historical civic use over time and so is appropriate for a civic center now, but that because of the bulk and mass, the current project is oversized. He said if the project was scaled down so that it doesn't have an impact, it may be to a point where it may not be feasible to have it on this site anymore.

Commissioner McLain said this architectural firm did a very good job with the changes they made in listening and responding to the previous submittals. She said looking at this from an Historic Preservation point of view, she cannot approve this project. She said that the letters people wrote and the public comments were from those impacted, people in the neighborhood, and also some out of state, as well as Californians who feel this is an important place. Ms. McLain said she heard over and over again the concern over mass and size and the fact that this is a very important site, that of a National Historic Landmark. She said she has had to change her views for the following reasons. She said if the City is going to build one big building it needs to be put in a place that is not trying to also protect history. She said it is important to accommodate the National Trust and the National Park System. She questioned who should be making the decisions on how to reduce bulk and mass sited by staff in the staff report. She closed by mentioning a reference in the draft EIR to using an alternate site and said she has to agree with that opinion.

Commissioner Castagna said we need to create more space for City employees, as the offices currently are cramped, inefficient and demoralizing to employees. He said ideally the civic center should be located somewhere else, but if that is not an option, something needs to be done here. He said an alternate plan of having several small buildings would not work as it would take too many small buildings to accommodate all the City employees and that nibbling away at the building with minor alterations is not going to change the basic issue. He asked for a 3-D rendering and for the City to obtain the final opinion of the National Trust before the project proceeds to the Planning Commission. He said he is not opposed to it, but he would need more information before giving his final approval.

Commissioner Calabrese said she completely agrees with Commissioner Castagna's assessment of the situation.

Member Hayden said Commissioner Jacobowsky made a very valid point and that there is adequate information. He said if there is a basic reservation about this project, the ARC and HPC owe it to the City to make definitive comments to save time in the process.

Commissioner O'Brien said she is in favor of the placement of the civic center, but not the mass. She said she needs more detail to resolve some of the conflicts she has heard from public comment. She said Dutra Street historically separates the historic segment from the newer buildings but it is important to have some architectural distinction to easily define the new from the old, very important buildings.

Member Latasa said the project has an unfortunate, adverse impact on the historic district, especially the north building. He said something could be done on the site, especially on the south building area, but the north building is too massive, and it results in too great a visual impact and encroachment on Colton Hall and the jail.

Commissioner Petty said his ideal wish would be for the City offices to be in a central location, and that it would be great for them to be within the historical district near the buildings that are historic, but not in a structure that appears to be so large and massive and too much like an imitation of the historic buildings. He agrees with Commissioner O'Brien that the new buildings need to appear more distinctive from the historic buildings. He said he needs more clarification regarding the Conditions of Approval in the staff report and recommendation before he can make a decision.

Commissioner Jacobowsky said in addition to the historic concerns, he is concerned with the impact on Madison and Van Buren Streets. He said the scale and height of the proposed buildings are too massive in terms of overall width, depth and everything else mentioned, and that they overwhelm the structures across the street. He said taking into consideration everything being discussed at the meeting would require a great change in the program to accommodate the new buildings on this site. He said he did not know the solution, but to scale down the building something would have to give.

Member Fry said she agrees with the cultural history of conducting business in the historic civic center but the current design does not fit into that vision. She said that the City should be prepared to make sacrifices in order to place the new structures on a National Historical Landmark site. She said a way to achieve this would be to scale down the office spaces and the circulation areas. She suggested a change by cutting the north building in half and moving it to make three buildings instead of two. She said she opposes moving the City offices to Ryan Ranch or Garden Road unless the City cannot compromise bulk and mass, and scale. She said if the City cannot compromise the mass, they should move to another location.

Commissioner Castagna said one benefit of the new building would be to allow the ground floor of Colton Hall to be vacated by the City and developed into a historic museum.

Member Osorio said that due to the historic preservation aspect, this is an incredibly difficult project. He said it is critical to consider what the contribution of the project is to the National Landmark and how we are interpreting history here. He said the City has chosen an appropriate site and is using architecture to preserve the historical aspect. He asked to give direction for more detailed plans, before a recommendation is made to Planning Commission.

Member Arellano said usually there is a distinction between old and new, but in this case mimicking the existing historic buildings is important because they are located in such a small and sensitive historic area. He said the bulk and mass of the project needs to be addressed but stressed that it is very important that a central civic center should remain located in the downtown area.

#### ARC Members and HPC Commissioners Discussion on Architectural Review

Member Hayden congratulated the City for leaving the story poles up for the extended time. However, he said there is more building than what is reflected by the story poles. He said the architectural firm has been asked to deliver on an impossible premise by being expected to design a building to accommodate more employees than the site can handle. He said some government offices should be located here, but not all of them. He said that the proposed building is just too big, and visually and spatially compromises the most important historic resource in Monterey and the state of California.

Member Latasa said he agrees with Member Hayden, that the basic massing impacts on the historic landmark site are obvious, and that the massing for the project is too large for this site and historic resource. He said he agrees the architects did a great job with the program they were given, but the project is just too big for the site. He said the north building is way too big with too much impact on the historic resources and that both buildings need to be modified to reduce the massing, especially the north building. He said if the City Council went along with the ARC and HPC recommendations, it would mean a substantial re-massing of the project.

Member Whipple said he sees the project as two buildings. He said the south building is essentially appropriate, that it is sufficiently remote from the historic resources and shielded by the huge cypress trees, so it needs to be judged more on its relationship to the neighborhood. He said that the north building is not appropriate, as it is probably 50% too big and too close to the historic resources. He concluded by saying he agrees in part, but not as drastically as some of the other opinions offered, that the project is too big, though not as too big as some of the other people have described it.

Member Johnson said he agrees that the project impacts the historical resources in a negative way, but that he is also concerned with looking at the neighborhood compatibility and in context with the whole complex. He said one of the interesting things about the existing complex is that there are all different shapes and sizes of buildings. He said the two new buildings are almost identical in mass and shape. He said he would like to see the two buildings broken up into smaller, medium, and larger elements to fit into context with what already exists on the site.

Member Osorio said he feels the siting, including the location and number of buildings, is appropriate. He said the massing is causing the heartburn here, especially the massing on Madison and Van Buren Streets. He said looking at the recommendations of staff there is a need to look at further modulation. He said

Architectural Review Committee

Minutes

July 27, 2005

maybe different setbacks for the second story portions, with perhaps a transitional one story portion of the building on both Van Buren and Madison, would help to reduce the massing and also to make it more pedestrian friendly, which is another of the issues raised. He said the ARC and HPC have to be careful in telling the City what they need space wise. He said the big question is how much further down can the project realistically get to. He said they need to look at the project again before a recommendation is made to the Planning Commission. He asked how far can the architectural detailing be separated from the massing as the architectural design is being used to compliment the existing national landmark and that is the crucial point here. He said he cannot make a decision on the bulk and mass without more information on the architectural detailing which is ultimately what is going to make the building good or bad.

Member Fry said she agrees essentially with everything that has been said. She said she would like to see the site looked at more as a campus with two ways to reduce the appearance of excessive bulk and mass, one by reducing the square footage by whatever means and the other by expanding the project site, including into the parking area on Van Buren behind the Vasquez Adobe. She suggested breaking up the north building into two segments by moving one segment to the north parking site, with a result of a greater overall parking area, modulation of Van Buren, and a few other things.

Commissioner Petty asked if there is a way to increase the amount of building on the ground level and remove some of the second story of either or both of the buildings, by shrinking the circulation areas and using up some of the area set aside for landscaping. He suggested moving square footage down to ground level instead of having it on a second story, not necessarily reducing the overall square footage, and keeping the project at this site.

Commissioner Castagna said although probably impractical, he suggested moving the north building to the other side of Madison, across the street.

Member Whipple said that there would have to be compromises made to use this site. He suggested dropping the front half [east] of the north building, creating a quasi-basement at the first floor, making it a story and a third tall, thereby resolving a significant number of the bulk and mass issues closer to Colton Hall. He said it would be appropriate for office space, as there is a history in older parts of Monterey of buildings with a half basement on the ground level, with the next floor at half grade. He said this is just another way of looking at what can be done on the site, as well as Member Fry's idea, which he also liked.

Member Johnson said the dilemma is at what point does the mass become compatible with the historic resources and with the rest of the buildings in the area. He said he is still struggling with where to go with the project and how to proceed to give solid direction.

Member Hayden said that traditionally if the committee can, they make minor changes to the project, but if the dilemma is so big as in this case, then the ARC and HPC need to make recommendations on the building and project as it has been submitted.

#### Final Discussion

Mr. Wojtkowski reminded ARC Members and HPC Commissioners that they could look at the other alternatives as provided in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or they could consider the two buildings separately.

Ms. Cole presented the plans for Alternative #2 and #3 provided in the EIR.

Commissioner Castagna said he was intrigued by Alternative #2 because it is a smaller building and is confined to the south side of the cypress trees and made a motion to recommend Alternative #2, eliminating the north building.

Commissioner Calabrese seconded the motion.

Commissioner Jacoubowsky said the problem with all the proposals is the perception of a big footprint and that looking at the site plan and the width of the existing buildings compared with the proposed buildings, the

new buildings appear as a huge block on the site. He said the proposed floor to ceiling dimension of each floor is 10 feet and although that might be ideal for office space, lowering the ceiling height could be one of the ways to find creative solutions to overcome the perception of a huge block of stuff on the site. He said because the project sits on an historic site, it is not just another office building that can go anywhere and the City will have to accept ways to be more creative that will overcome the perception of a huge block of stuff on the site. He said he believes this will require some reduction of the program requirements or the project will have to be moved to another site. He ended by saying this alternative is not a building that will enhance the historic district it is in.

Commissioner Petty said he agrees with Commissioner Jacobowsky that the width is as important as height, and that since Alternative #2 would be one much bigger building he doesn't support it. He said it would be better to create more one-story building and chop off some of the two story elements.

The motion failed 2 (Calabrese, Castagna) – 4 (Noes – Jacobowsky, McLain, Petty, O'Brien) – 1 (Absent – Lucido).

Commissioner McLain said she feels the Commission is not ready to make a motion and that she needs more discussion. She said she would like to see different drawings reflecting the idea of smaller size and mass of the buildings, and would like more choices.

Commissioner Jacobowsky said the architects have been given a program requirement that equates to a situation where the architects could not come up with something that would satisfy everyone in the room right now.

Commissioner McLain made a motion to recommend that the City Council explore alternative locations for the placement of a new service center because large buildings on the north of Madison Street would have too great an impact on the Historic Landmark District. She asked the City to look at what is behind the Fire and Police Stations. She questioned the need for expanding the Fire and Police Stations, as the City population does not seem to be growing at a rate that requires additional growth for these departments.

Commissioner Castagna seconded the motion. He said the he wants go on record that the Commission would prefer a different site even if it is not possible.

Commissioner Petty said that even though he might prefer a different site, he wants the Public Service Center to work at this site. He said his preference is not to go back to square one, but to figure out a way to rework the project so that it does not have the impact on the historical buildings that this proposal does.

Commissioner Jacobowsky said he goes along with what Commissioner Petty said and he would like the City Council and staff to restudy the program requirements to make it possible to build a smaller project on this site to accommodate the majority of needs that need to be met.

Mr. Wojtkowski suggested the HPC Commission consider each building separately to give better direction to the Planning Commission and the City Council.

The motion failed 2 (Castagna, McLain) – 4 (Noes - Calabrese, Jacobowsky, Petty, O'Brien) – 1 (Absent – Lucido).

Commissioner Jacobowsky made a motion to recommend that the project be re-studied by staff and the City Council with the possibility of reducing the program requirements so the building can be located on the site with less mass than is currently being proposed.

Commissioner Petty seconded the motion. He said he would not want to limit the staff and their consultants to reducing the program requirements as the only way to reduce the mass of the buildings. He said he would also like them to be able to explore other ways to reduce the mass of the buildings such as spreading more out on the ground level instead of having two stories.

**HPC MOTION:**

On a motion by Commissioner Jacoubowsky, seconded by Commissioner Petty, the Historic Preservation Commission recommended that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council reduce the program requirements thereby reducing the size (mass) of the building(s) but that the proposed site is the appropriate site for a Public Service Center. The motion passed by the following vote:

**AYES: 6 HPC COMMISSIONERS Calabrese, Castagna, Jacoubowsky, McLain, Petty, O'Brien**  
**NOES: 0 HPC COMMISSIONERS: None.**  
**ABSENT: 1 HPC COMMISSIONERS: M. Lucido**

Commissioner McLain requested that staff make sure that any new information on the project be sent to the National Park Service and the National Trust, as well as the State Park and Recreation Department, in time for them to comment.

Member Fry made a motion recommending that the current proposal be re-evaluated to reduce the mass, increase the number of buildings to three, and possibly expand the site to achieve a more campus-like appearance. There was no second.

Member Hayden made a motion to recommend to the Planning Commission that they deny the project as proposed with five Findings for Decision.

Member Johnson seconded the motion.

Member Fry asked what kind of guidance was given in the motion.

Member Hayden said that he is asking for a further reduction in the square footage that would accommodate a third of what is in the proposed project.

Member Osorio said he does not agree with the motion.

Member Hayden said the core of the Monterey historical site should not be compromised by putting a large oversized building on the site. He said not all the City offices need to be here if it compromises the historic resources.

Member Whipple said he does not support the motion because he feels it is not the appropriate course at this time.

Member Fry said she does not support a motion that requires a 30% reduction and that she would like a motion that more matches the HPC motion.

Member Latasa said that the one-stop shopping concept results in oversize buildings.

Member Arellano said the project is too large for the site.

**ARC MOTION:**

On a motion by Member Hayden, seconded by Member Johnson, the Architectural Review Committee recommended that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council deny the project as proposed with the following Findings for Decision:

Findings for Decision:

- 1) That the proposed bulk, mass, height, and footprint of the proposed buildings impose a significant negative visual impact on the existing historic buildings and site; that the mostly two-story buildings impose a visually negative impact on existing historic context and buildings by

- not respecting the human and historic scale and spatial relationships which define this site; and that these impacts cannot be mitigated simply by window trim, paint or planting modifications.
- 2) That the proposed project imposes a significant negative visual impact on the neighborhood by failing to transition to a pedestrian or residential scale, effectively walling off the historic buildings and excessively eliminating open space.
  - 3) That public testimony has underscored a concern with excessive bulk and compromise of historic open space and that the project is inconsistent with the Old Town Neighborhood Plan.
  - 4) That a significantly smaller project could utilize more single story elements and better respect the scale of this most historic site and avoid the visual compromise and parking issues which so concern the neighborhood; and ultimately better serve the public.
  - 5) That the City should reconsider the proposed "one-stop service center" concept and seriously develop plans for an alternative site for the space required by City employees to serve the public.

The motion passed by the following vote:

**AYES: 4 ARC MEMBERS: Fry, Hayden, Johnson, Latasa**  
**NOES: 3 ARC MEMBERS: Arellano, Osorio, Whipple**  
**ABSENT: None.**

**ADJOURNMENT: 11:20 PM**

**APPEALS: ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE DECISIONS MAY BE APPEALED TO PLANNING COMMISSION WITHIN TEN (10) DAYS FROM THE DATE OF THE DECISION ON FORMS AVAILABLE IN THE PLANNING DIVISION DURING BUSINESS HOURS. WHEN THE TENTH DAY FALLS ON A WEEKEND OR A HOLIDAY, THE APPEAL DEADLINE DATE IS THE NEXT WORKING DAY FOLLOWING THE HOLIDAY OR WEEKEND. THE APPEAL FILING FEE IS \$50.00.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
 ARC Planner

\_\_\_\_\_  
 ARC Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
 HPC Planner

\_\_\_\_\_  
 HPC Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

CITY OF MONTEREY'S 24-HOUR SUGGESTION HOTLINES: Voicemail: 646-3799 FAX: 646-3793  
 Email: [suggest@ci.monterey.ca.us](mailto:suggest@ci.monterey.ca.us) WebPage: <http://www.monterey.org>

The City of Monterey is committed to include the disabled in all of its services, programs, and activities. Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (831) 646-3721. Please speak to the City Clerk prior to the meeting if you require a hearing amplification device. For more agenda information, call 646-3885.

