Council Chamber
Few Memorial Hall of Records
Monterey, California

Architectural Review Committee Annotated Agenda

Regular Meeting
May 7, 2008

AFTERNOON ONLY
4:00 PM – 7:00 PM

Architectural Review Committee

Terry Latasa, Chair
Peter Arellano, Vice Chair
Paul E. Davis
Eugene Hayden
Boris Jacoubowsky
Glenn Johnson
William Whipple

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Latasa called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present: Arellano, Davis, Hayden, Jacoubowsky, Johnson, Latasa, Whipple

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Senior Planner Forrest Ebbs, Recording Secretary Jaci Abadilla

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

April 16, 2008

ACTION: Approved the Annotated Agenda of April 16, 2008 with clarification to item 1. 3-0-4(Abstain Arellano, Davis, Hayden, Whipple).

REVIEW OF CONSENT ITEMS

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. 1164 Third Street; ARC Application 08-063; Applicant Anthony Zavitsanos; Owner Herma Smith Curtis; R-3-6 Zoning District; Exempt from CEQA Requirements.

Concept Design Review for a New Detached Garage with a Second-Story Apartment at a Multi-Family Site with an Existing Single-Family Dwelling.

ACTION: Continued the application for Concept Design Review with the following direction to the applicant. 7-0-0.

1. The applicant shall look into tree replacement.
2. The applicant shall introduce a greater detail in Craftsman-style.
3. The proposed project shall have a greater modulation between the two buildings.
4. The applicant shall resolve the Building Code issue regarding building separation.
5. The applicant shall add the layout of adjacent buildings to the site plan.
6. Preliminary Design Review will return to ARC for review.

Staff Presentation/Committee Member Questions:
Senior Planner Ebbs presented the staff report and answered Committee Members' questions.

Applicant:
Anthony Zavitsanos and Herma Smith Curtis were present. Mr. Zavitsanos answered questions concerning the chimney, decks, retaining wall, plate heights, tree replacement, setbacks and the separation between the two buildings.

Public Comments:
Laura Cote, 1165 Third Street, stated that she opposes the project because the property has always been used for a single-family dwelling and not multi-family. The proposal doesn't conform to the Oak Grove Neighborhood Policy, it infringes on the neighbor's privacy, it overshadows the existing house, blocks sunlight and is too boxy.

Chiyoko Ono, 1178 Third Street, asked if the Pine trees were going to be replaced.

Committee Member Comments:
Committee Member Jacoubowsky moved to continue the application for Concept Design Review with direction to the applicant. Committee Member Johnson seconded the motion.

MOTION:
On a motion by Committee Member Jacoubowsky, seconded by Committee Member Johnson, the application for Concept Design Review was continued with direction to the applicant. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES:	7	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	Arellano, Davis, Hayden, Jacoubowsky, Johnson, Latasa, Whipple
NOES:	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	None
ABSENT:	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	None

2. 529 Pine Street; ARC Application 08-028; Applicant John Petrushkin; Owner Scott and Arleen Hardenstein; R-1-5 Zoning District; Exempt from CEQA Requirements.

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

ACTION: Approved the application for Concept Design Review with Conditions of Approval and adopted Finding for Decision. 7-0-0.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Preliminary Design Review will be brought back to ARC.
2. The applicant shall provide more detail regarding the lift.
3. The applicant shall provide an example of the wall finish.
4. The applicant shall clarify the proposal for the two rear accessory structures.
5. The proposed grading, drainage and retaining wall will be clarified.

Finding for Decision:

1. The project is consistent with the zoning standards contained in Municipal Code Section 38-23 (R-1 Residential Single-Family District), the Guidelines for Single-Family Dwellings, the New Monterey Area Plan, the View Impact Policy, the general direction of the Architectural Review Committee, and the overall character of the neighborhood.

Staff Presentation/Committee Member Questions:
Senior Planner Ebbs presented the staff report and answered Committee Members' questions.

Applicant:
John Petrushkin was present and answered questions regarding AAC block, second floor framing, the elevator, the proposed first floor height, artificial grass on the deck, corten staining, the proposal for the rear structures and grass pavers.

Public Comments:
Sharon Dwight, New Monterey Neighborhood Association, stated she supported the project for its use of green building procedures, the use of AAC block, the mass and roof style and the use of light. She stated that she still had issues with the third story deck, the story-pole staking, grading and drainage, tree retention, the elevator, the impact the proposal had on the neighbors and the two rear structures.

Committee Member Comments:
Committee Member Davis moved to approve the application for Concept Design Review with Conditions of Approval and adopt Finding for Decision. Committee Member Johnson seconded the motion.

MOTION:
On a motion by Committee Member Davis, seconded by Committee Member Johnson, the application for Concept Design Review was approved with Conditions of Approval and Finding for Decision adopted. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES:	7	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	Arellano, Davis, Hayden, Jacoubowsky, Johnson, Latasa, Whipple
NOES:	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	None
ABSENT:	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	None

3. Consideration of a Proposal to Require a Structural Engineer's Report for Certain Applications to the Architectural Review Committee.

ACTION: Require the Engineer Report as a submittal requirement whenever a second-story addition is proposed over the existing residence on a lot with existing non-conformities that will be retained. Committee Member Whipple seconded the motion. 7-0-0.

Staff Presentation/Committee Member Questions:
Senior Planner Ebbs presented the staff report and answered Committee Members' questions.

Public Comments:
Sharon Dwight supported the idea of the report but stated there could be a problem with getting the Engineer's response in a timely manner.

Committee Member Comments:
After a discussion regarding cost, non-conformities, the liability of the Engineer, a disclaimer releasing the City of Monterey, and adding a standard Condition of Approval, Committee Member Hayden moved to require the Engineer Report as a submittal requirement whenever a second-story addition is proposed over the existing residence on a lot with existing non-conformities that will be retained. Committee Member Whipple seconded the motion.

MOTION:
On a motion by Committee Member Hayden, seconded by Committee Member Whipple, the Committee required the Engineer Report as a submittal requirement whenever a second-story addition is proposed over the existing residence on a lot with existing non-conformities that will be retained. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES:	7	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	Arellano, Davis, Hayden, Jacoubowsky, Johnson, Latasa, Whipple
NOES:	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	None
ABSENT:	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	None

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. Senior Planner Ebbs announced that the house at 498 Wave was demolished and a new proposal will be returning to ARC for review.

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.

1. Committee Member Johnson asked why ARC did not review the new path of history signs.
2. Chair Latasa stated that he would write a letter to the chair of the Historic Preservation Commission asking for a continuance so that ARC could review the proposal.
3. Committee Member Hayden stated that he would notify the Planning Division if he is unable to attend a meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:00 P.M.

ARC Chairperson	ARC Planner
Date	Date