



Architectural Review Committee Annotated Agenda

Architectural Review Committee

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

Council Chamber
Few Memorial Hall of Records
Monterey, California

Regular Meeting
March 22, 2006

4:00 PM - 6:15 PM
7:30 PM - 11:00 PM

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. To accomplish this, the ARC will review all areas of a proposal that influence outside appearance. Access, on-site circulation, grading, tree impacts, building placement, landscape areas, landscape planting, architectural style, bulk, mass, color and signs are evaluated for conformance with adopted design guidelines, tree protection standards and neighborhood compatibility. Applications may be approved as submitted, continued for further study, denied or approved subject to conditions, specified changes, additions, or deletions.

CALL TO ORDER: 4:02 PM
PRESENT: P. Arellano, V. Fry, E. Hayden, G. Johnson, T. Latasa, L. Osorio
ABSENT: W. Whipple
STAFF: C. Rerig, 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.

NONE.

APPROVAL OF ANNOTATED AGENDA:

1. Approved March 8, 2006 Annotated Agenda 6-0-1 (Absent-Whipple).

CONSENT AGENDA:

Consent Agenda consists of items which staff recommendations have been prepared. A member of the public or an Architectural Review Committee Member may request that an item be placed on the regular agenda for further discussion. If placed on the regular agenda, Consent items will be the first items discussed.

NONE.

AFTERNOON REVIEW AGENDA: REPRESENTATION NECESSARY

1. **Cannery Row Banner Program (05-419)** **Cannery Row Banner Program.**
Applicant: Eileen Angelos and Mike
Bellinger for Cannery Row Business
Association

Approved Cannery Row Banner Program 5-1(Noes-Johnson)-1(Absent-Whipple) adopting staff Findings for Decision and adding the following additional Finding for Decision:

1. The banner program is appropriate as an aid to identify the Cannery Row Conservation District.

marvelous things for the site, and that the City did the neighborhood a disservice by not allowing the previous design to go forward. She ended by saying that the architect has done a very good job of creating another design that addresses all the previous issues.

Bob Evans, representing the New Monterey Neighborhood Association, is pleased that the height came down enough to no longer require a variance. He said he also feels that the six-foot fence might be too high but that the architect can find a solution that allows a good balance between light, space, and privacy issues. He said the round opening looks more like a southwestern design but it is an acceptable design.

Michael Smith, adjacent property owner to the north, said he appreciates the work staff and the architect have done and for including him in the process of the re-design, and he also appreciates the city recognizing the privacy concerns he had. He said that the new project allows for a lot more light and removes the feeling of the new structure looming over their home and creating a canyon effect. He said that another neighbor appreciates the new design and is actually gaining some view opportunities. He questioned how the issues of drainage on the site will be addressed and also how proximity issues during construction will be addressed because of the existing slope. He concluded by saying he is now in support of the project as designed.

**4. Single-Family Dwelling (06-021)
78 Via Ventura
Applicant/Owner: Steve Mickel**

**Concept Design Review for the Construction of a
New Two-Story Single-Family Dwelling on a Vacant
Parcel.**

Approved Concept Design Review 6-0-1(Absent-Whipple) adopting staff Findings for Decision, delegating Preliminary Design Review to staff, and with the following Conditions of Approval:

1. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall obtain an arborist's report that evaluates the overall health of the trees on the site and provides recommendations on tree protection during construction.
2. If the two (2) Coast Live Oak proposed for relocation succumb during construction, the applicant shall replace each tree on a three-to-one basis on the site at a minimum size of 15 gallons. The applicant shall coordinate the relocation of the existing trees with the City Forester.
3. The applicant shall hand excavate any and all foundations, footings, and/or graded area within 15 feet of any tree on the site.

Sarah Duncan, a neighbor across the street, said the lot is not vacant as it has a garage on it. She also stated that there is currently a beautiful garden on the lot and expressed concerns about how many trees would be removed from the lot. She said she was concerned about the façade and size of a new structure because there are already two imposing, overlarge houses without trees on the street and also that a two-story structure might be too difficult to squeeze on this lot.

RECESS: 6:15 PM
Agenda items shown on the schedule after the recess will only be heard on the Evening Review. Staff Informational Reports and ARC Member's Comments may be heard at the end of the afternoon agenda if time allows before the Recess.
RECONVENE: 7:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER: 7:33 PM
PRESENT: P. Arellano, V. Fry, E. Hayden, G. Johnson, T. Latasa, L. Osorio, W. Whipple
ABSENT: T. Latasa
STAFF: C. Rerig, K. Allen, C. Anderson, F. Meurer

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.

Carl Anderson, as applicant for the City, clarified the changes made in the program and answered ARC member's questions. Les Melburg, of Nichols, Melburg & Rosetto, and Dan Fletcher, of Fletcher + Hardoin, the project designers, gave a presentation and answered ARC member's questions. Mike Bellinger, of Bellinger Foster Steinmetz, gave a brief overview of the proposed landscape plans.

Public Comment

Bruce Crist, representing the New Monterey Neighborhood Association, said that staff deserves good workspace, but there are a number of ways to address the need for workspace. He said that structural reorganization does not address how tasks are performed, and that methods for re-engineering and using cutting edge technology should be addressed. He asked the City to consider using other City owned facilities such as Archer Park. He said the New Monterey Neighborhood Association doesn't believe that it is worth the cost to have all the services in one spot rather than using other existing locations. He said the Association proposes elimination of the second story of the north building to reduce the mass, give a more campus like feel, and distract less from the Vasquez adobe. He said the Association also has great concerns about the parking situation because if there is no parking available in City parking lots, people are going to park in the neighborhood for their convenience. He concluded by stating that the New Monterey Neighborhood Association is asking for further reduction in the size of the project to reduce the impacts on the historical area and to reduce the parking impacts.

Joanne Kelly, a resident of Monterey, stated that the concept of one stop shopping started in 1986 before the advances of the 21st century. She said that with the advent of computers, City staff does not need to physically be in the same building to communicate with each other. She said that there are many other City owned properties that could be more economically used with much less impact on the historical resources and asked why that has not been studied. She asked the City to explore ways for staff to function more efficiently without being forced into an area that is too small for their needs. She concluded by saying that the historical organizations that have expressed opposition to the project should be listened to.

James Bryant, resident of Old Town, said the National Trust and the National Parks Service wrote that the City is moving in the right direction, but that neither entity has approved the project. He said that the architects have done a great job, but they are being asked to do too much with the space that is allowed. He said the Old Town Neighborhood Association is very concerned because they feel that the plan will impact the surrounding neighborhood and that is not consistent with the hard thought Old Town Area Plan. He concluded by stating that by pursuing the current project the City seeks to undercut the goals of the Old Area Plan.

Sharon Dwight, resident of Monterey, stated that the current design is a significant improvement over the previous designs, and that the model is extremely helpful. She said that to move the bulk and mass away from the historic buildings, at least one of the two-story buildings should be located across the street in the land owned by the City but allocated for senior housing. She said this solution would allow visibility of the historic buildings from Van Buren Street and that pedestrian crossing on Madison Street would not be a problem. She suggested bringing the floor plate height of Building C down to the level of Dutra Street, with a sloped transition between building B and C that would eliminate the stairs, as an alternative to the variance request to reduce visibility of Building C from Pacific Street. She stated her concerns about the mass of the new building in relationship to the existing City buildings as viewed when coming up Madison and turning onto Dutra. She asked how high the ceiling in the basement is, and could it be lower. She asked for an opening in the chalk rock wall to facilitate pedestrian access from the parking lot across the street. She asked which trees will be removed, how and where will they be replanted, and if and where hand excavation will be required. She questioned that there is no parking master plan and asked what the City standard says the parking requirements are for accommodating staff, the public and meetings. She suggested looking at an elevator the City of Santa Cruz built as an example of a good solution. She asked that the City pursue possibilities for using solar power and recapturing water for reuse. She concluded by saying that if two of the houses on the south side of Madison could be moved, the City should find ways to do so to be responsible about addressing historic resources.

Mr. Anderson addressed concerns brought up in public comment and asked if the neighborhood associations had studied the current revised plans. He addressed the variance issue for clarification and

said the location of the building was to create a better balance between the new building and the existing historical buildings. He clarified that Archer Park is a recreational center that was closed because of the budget crisis, but that it will be used again as a recreational facility. Mr. Anderson said although some think one-stop shops are passe, he still feels it is a viable concept. He said that there is great value in face to face employee contact and that in his experience, when managers and staff don't see each other on a daily basis, staff becomes continually more difficult to manage. He concluded by stating that the City re-engineers the way we do business on a daily basis.

Mr. Fletcher said the height in the basement and all floors have been reduced as much as is allowed for a commercial site.

ARC Member Comments

Member Whipple asked if the City Forester or a certified arborist could confirm that the buildings could not be lowered any more without damaging the Cypress trees and to explore possibilities for further reduction before eliminating the possibility of lowering Building C. He stated that the bulk and mass and siting are appropriate, that the elevator shaft is not that obtrusive and that he supports the project.

Member Arellano stated that he supports the project, that if it were any smaller it would defeat its purpose. He said the project has achieved a campus setting with more open space but he asked that he would like the bulk and mass of the elevator and of the corner of Building B to be addressed.

Member Osorio said the buildings now relate well to the historic setting, and to the Old Town neighborhood overall, and are architecturally well designed. He said that he feels that his issues from the last meeting have been met. He also said that the County of Monterey has consolidated many of their functions and it has been very successful with the public. He said some remaining issues can be dealt with during Preliminary Design Review but he generally supports the project.

Member Fry said she agrees with quite a bit of what Member Osorio said, that the project is well designed although still too large, but there has to be a reasonable point where the project must go forward. She said she has thought from the beginning it would be very desirable to have the civic center in one location with the possibility for lots of landscaping in a campus setting and that the project relates well to the City of Monterey and reflects old Monterey colonial architecture. She concluded by saying that she supports the project but would like to see bricks or pavers replace the asphalt on Dutra Street.

Member Hayden said the project is a great design, but he is still concerned about the impact on how it fits and relates to the most historic site in the State of California. He said that he feels further reductions are needed, and suggested exploring ways to minimize the impact of the elevator shaft, wrapping the balconies around to reduce the mass visible when coming up Madison, and said that the rear building on Madison needs to be restudied. He said the project is close to being the spectacular design that the site deserves, but he could not support it without further reduction of the building bulk and mass.

Member Johnson stated that there should be a comprehensive Master Plan that takes in account both sides of Madison Street for all Public Safety and Public Services. He said he compliments the architects, that the buildings are well modulated and opened up to the courtyards and gardens. He said he feels the project is still a little too massive for the historic district. He encouraged the City to make the project as "green" as possible as a landmark and example to other cities. He said that it is important for the City to create something that will be another historic resource 100 years from now.

AGENDA ITEMS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN INITIATED BY 11:00 PM WILL NOT BE REVIEWED. THESE ITEMS WILL BE CONTINUED TO THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING.

STAFF INFORMATIONAL REPORT (SIR):

The SIR is the Staff's report on activities or announcements and requests for clarification or direction regarding scheduling of Committee meetings or study sessions. Most reports will be presented orally at the meeting.

- 1. A topic for April 10, 2006 Mayor's Meeting was briefly discussed.

ARC MEMBER'S COMMENTS:

Committee Members may ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement or make a brief report on his or her activities. In addition, ARC 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 any City matter, or direct staff to agendaize a matter of business on a future agenda (G.C. 54954.2). This agenda item is not intended for discussion among the ARC Members. Issues that warrant discussion may be scheduled for review at a subsequent meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: 10:30 PM

TWO-YEAR TIME LIMIT: Pursuant to Section 38-201 (e) of the Monterey City Code, if within two (2) years from the date of final Architectural Review Committee approval a Building Permit has not been granted, the approval shall be null and void unless extended by the Committee.

CITY PERMITS FOR WATER ALLOCATIONS: Currently there is no water allocation available to serve residential, commercial and residential additions or remodels. Individual projects after receiving Architectural Review Committee Concept approval may request a water reservation.

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

CITY OF MONTEREY'S 24-HOUR SUGGESTION HOTLINES: Voicemail: 646-3799 FAX: 646-3793
Email: 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.

