



Council Chamber
Few Memorial Hall of Records
Monterey, California

Architectural Review Committee Annotated Agenda

Regular Meeting
November 8, 2006

AFTERNOON ONLY
4:00 PM - 6:30 PM

Architectural Review Committee

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

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: 4:16 PM
PRESENT: Arellano, Fry (4:20 PM), Hayden, Johnson, Latasa, Whipple (4:21 PM)
ABSENT: None
STAFF: Chip Rerig, Forrest Ebbs, Kim 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.

Bruce Crist, a resident of New Monterey, said that in July he applied for membership to the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) and asked for clarification regarding the status of the appointment of a seventh ARC member.

APPROVAL OF ANNOTATED AGENDA:

1. Moved approval of the Annotated Agenda to the end of the meeting. Approved November 1, 2006 Annotated Agenda 4-0-2(Abstain-Latasa, Whipple) with minor corrections to Item 3 and Condition #1 of Item 7.

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.

REVIEW AGENDA:

REPRESENTATION NECESSARY

1. **New Monterey Business Association
Banner Program Amendment
Applicant: Rick Johnson for New Monterey
Business Association** **Proposal to Amend the Banner Program to Permit
a Limited Amount of Corporate Sponsorship.**

Continued 4-0-2(Absent-Fry, Whipple) per the applicant's request.

Architectural Review Committee
Annotated Agenda
November 8, 2006

2. **Living Hope Church (06-333)**
1375 Josselyn Canyon Road
Applicant: Daryl Hawkins AIA, JHW
Architects Inc.
Owner: Living Hope Church of the
Nazarene

**Concept and Preliminary Design Review for
Exterior Alterations and Additions to an Existing
Religious Use.**

Approved Concept and Preliminary Design Review 6-0-0 adopting staff Finding for Decision.

3. **Single-Family Dwelling (06-112)**
725 Lily Street
Applicant: Anthony Zavitsanos
Owner: Terry & Angela Neill

**Concept Design Review for the Demolition of an
Existing One-Story Single-Family Dwelling and
Construction of a Two-Story Single-Family
Dwelling. Continued from August 2, 2006 meeting.**

Mr. Rerig recused himself, with Mr. Ebbs serving as Planning Division representative.

Denied Concept Design Review 5-1(Noes-Arellano)-0 adopting the following Finding for Decision:

1. The proposed design is too massive for the site and is inconsistent with other properties in the immediate area. The proposed structure appears excessively massive due to the box-like shape of the building, the disproportionate second-story massing, and the additional volume created from the second-story covered decks. These conditions are created by the lack of negative relief or recess in the second-story building mass, the duplicative fenestration on the first- and second-story front elevations, the uninterrupted first-story wall adjacent to the shared driveway, the projecting bay windows in the south side setback, and are further exacerbated by the elevation of the building site relative to the sidewalk and adjacent properties. The proposed structure is also inconsistent with Monterey City Code Section 38-23.E.4, *Substandard Residential Lots – Aesthetic Design*, because it is “box-like”, with no physical relief or recess in the second story: the basic form of the building is a two-story rectangular solid with nearly identical first- and second-story footprints.

Barbara Carlson, owner of the adjacent property, stated her concerns regarding the placement of the project in relationship to her house and to the driveway that is shared by both properties, and questioned if a car would be able to access the carport without going on her property. She said that the photo simulation presented does not express the reality of the location of the project in relationship to the driveway and other buildings.

Elizabeth Peters, co-owner of the adjacent property, said her one-story house will be dwarfed by the proposed project and that the project is not compatible with the flavor and visual appeal of the neighborhood. She asked that a compromise be made by scaling back the second story house and added her concerns about the impact on the shared driveway arrangement.

Maureen Littlejohn, a resident of the area, said the project utilizes the space well, represents progress, and will beautify the neighborhood.

Amro Hamdoin, a neighboring property owner, said this project is very different than the other second story buildings on the street which clearly do have modulation, and that although other streets have predominately stucco houses, the vast majority of the houses on this street are single-story, wood sided houses. He stated his concerns about the size of the project in relationship to the small lot. He said that no effort has been made to address the concerns of the neighbors or the recommendations of the ARC, and asked the ARC to use the precedents that have been set in recent second story projects in the area.

Bob Evans, President of the New Monterey Neighborhood Association, clarified that the Association has not taken a position on this project. He said this is a neighborhood of one-story houses, and asked what will happen when all the houses on the block evolve and if this project will still fit in when all the lots are exchanged for two-story houses. He said the ARC has to look at the future as well as the current condition.

**AGENDA ITEMS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN INITIATED BY 6:30 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. There will be a joint meeting with the Planning Commission and the new City Council in January 2007 to discuss Mixed-Use Guidelines.

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 agendize 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: 5:30 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 \$100.00.

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.

