



Council Chamber
 Few Memorial Hall of Records
 Monterey, California

Architectural Review Committee Annotated Agenda

Regular Meeting
 May 6, 2009

AFTERNOON ONLY
 4:00 PM – 7:00 PM

Committee Members:

Paul E. Davis, Chair
 Terry Latasa, Vice Chair
 Peter Arellano
 Dan Finklea
 Boris Jacobowsky
 Glenn Johnson
 Scott McKenzie

JOINT SESSION WITH THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION (HPC)

Commissioners: Virginia McLain, Chair, Todd Porteous, Vice Chair, John Castagna, Maria Lucido, Jean O'Brien, Carol O'Neil, Bob Petty, Dennis Hodgin (*Non-voting*), Ann Swett (*Non-voting*)

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present: Arellano, Davis, Finklea, Jacobowsky, Johnson, Latasa (arrived at 4:02 PM), McKenzie

Commissioners Present: Castagna, Hodgin, Lucido, McLain, O'Neil, Petty, Porteous, Swett

Committee Members Absent: None

Commissioners Absent: O'Brien

Staff Present: Senior Planner Forrest Ebbs, Senior Associate Planner Christy Hopper, City Traffic Engineer Rich Deal, Deputy Fire Marshal David Reade, 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 AGENDAS

February 4, 2009 – **Historic Preservation Commission Only**

ACTION: Approved the Annotated Agenda of February 4, 2009 as submitted.
 4-0-2(Abstain Lucido, Petty)-1(Absent O'Brien).

February 12, 2009 – **Historic Preservation Commission Only**

ACTION: Approved the Annotated Agenda of February 12, 2009 as submitted. 4-0-2(Abstain Lucido, Porteous)-1(Absent O'Brien).

April 1, 2009 – **Architectural Review Committee Only**

ACTION: Approved the Annotated Agenda of April 1, 2009 as submitted. 6-0-1(Abstain McKenzie)-0.

Committee Member Comments:

Committee Member Jacoubowsky moved to approve the Annotated Agenda of April 1, 2009 as submitted. Vice Chair Latasa seconded the motion.

MOTION:

On a motion by Committee Member Jacoubowsky, seconded by Vice Chair Latasa, the Annotated Agenda of April 1, 2009 was approved as submitted. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: 6	COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Arellano, Davis, Finklea, Jacoubowsky, Johnson, Latasa
NOES: 0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS: None
ABSTAIN: 1	COMMITTEE MEMBERS: McKenzie
ABSENT: 0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS: None

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.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

Public Meetings are held to receive public comment on certain items pending Architectural Review action. You are welcome to offer your comments after being recognized by the Chair. The Chair may limit the time allocated to each speaker. Project representative is required.

Item 2 was moved to the beginning of the Public Meetings due to the additional City staff being present.

1. 600 Martin Street; Historic Application 09-076; Applicant / Owner Tom Carr; R-1-15-H2 Zoning District; Exempt from CEQA Requirements. Historic Preservation Commission Only.

Historic Permit for the removal and reconstruction of a masonry chimney.

ACTION: Approved the Historic Permit with Conditions of Approval and adopted Findings for Decision. 6-0-1(Absent O'Brien).

Condition of Approval:

1. The applicant shall fully document the existing chimney prior to its demolition. Specifically, the applicant shall take photographs from every angle and from near and far. Copies of the photographs, on true photo paper, shall be provided to the Planning, Engineering and Environmental Compliance Division. In addition, measurements shall be taken of all planes and elements of the chimney and a drawing with these dimensions shall be submitted along with the photographs.
2. The applicant shall submit a sample of the intended brick veneer to the Planning, Engineering and Environmental Compliance Division prior to application for a Building Permit. The brick veneer shall be of a similar color, size and finish as the existing bricks, but should not contain intentionally loose grout lines or other conjectural features.

3. The applicant shall revise the plan such that the new chimney is 13' tall, or the exact same height as the existing chimney. Presently, the plan indicates a desired height of 9'6".
4. The spark arrestor shall be a standard, non-decorative element and shall be painted matte black.
5. A Building Permit is required.

Staff Presentation/Commissioner Questions:

Senior Planner Ebbs presented the staff report and answered Commissioners' questions.

Applicant:

Tom Carr was present and explained the project. He answered questions regarding the crown of the roof and roof line.

Public Comments:

None.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Castagna moved to approve the Historic Permit with Conditions of Approval and adopt the Findings for Decision. Commissioner Lucido seconded the motion.

MOTION:

On a motion by Commissioner Castagna, seconded by Commissioner Lucido, the Commission moved to approve the Historic Permit with Conditions of Approval and adopt Findings for Decision. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES:	6	COMMISSIONERS:	Castagna, Lucido, McLain, O'Neil, Petty, Porteous
NOES:	0	COMMISSIONERS:	None
ABSENT:	1	COMMISSIONERS:	O'Brien

2. 443 Wave Street (Holiday Inn Express); ARC Application 09-009; Applicant James D. McCord; Owner Holiday Inn Express, Cannery Row L.L.C; VAF Zoning District; Exempt from CEQA Requirements.

Advisory review of a proposed porte cochere and glass entry wall.

ACTION: The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) recommended approval of the application to the Planning Commission and adopted Finding for Decision. 6-0-1(Absent O'Brien).

Finding for Decision:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, meets the Cannery Row Conservation District Design Guidelines, and will not affect the integrity of the adjacent historic resource.

ACTION: The Architectural Review Committee (ARC) recommended denial of the application to the Planning Commission and adopted Findings for Decision. 6-1(Noes Finklea)-0.

Findings for Decision:

1. The porte-cochere fails to meet emergency equipment access requirements.
2. The proposed project fails to meet the ADA requirements (i.e. accessible path of travel from handicapped parking spaces) and parking requirements for the site.

Staff Presentation/Committee Member/Commissioner Questions:

Senior Associate Planner Hopper presented the staff report and answered Committee Members' and Commissioner's questions. Deputy Fire Marshal David Reade answered questions regarding the height and length of the porte-cochere. Traffic Engineer Rich Deal spoke with regards to the number of parking spaces, back up space for vehicles and answered questions regarding street parking.

Applicant:

James McCord was present. He explained the project with regards to the recommendations in the staff report and answered questions regarding the ADA requirements and the skylight.

Public Comments:

None.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Petty moved to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Commission and adopt Finding for Decision based on the proposed project will not affect the adjacent historic resource. Commissioner O'Neil seconded the motion.

MOTION:

On a motion by Commissioner Petty, seconded by Commissioner O'Neil, the Commission moved to recommend approval of the application to the Planning Commission and adopt Finding for Decision based on the proposed project will not affect the adjacent historic resource. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES:	6	COMMISSIONERS:	Castagna, Lucido, McLain, O'Neil, Petty, Porteous
NOES:	0	COMMISSIONERS:	None
ABSENT:	1	COMMISSIONERS:	O'Brien

Committee Member Comments:

After a discussion regarding the height and design of the porte-cochere, Committee Member Johnson moved to continue the application for redesign with direction to the applicant:

- The porte-cochere should be redesigned to lessen the mass of the structure and still meet emergency equipment access requirements.
- The site plan should be redesigned to meet ADA requirements (i.e. accessible path of travel from handicapped parking spaces) and ensure that the parking requirements for the site are satisfied.

Committee Member Johnson withdrew his motion.

Committee Member Johnson moved to recommend denial of the application to the Planning Commission and adopt Findings for Decision based on the emergency equipment access, ADA and parking requirements. Committee Member Arellano seconded the motion.

MOTION:

On a motion by Committee Member Johnson, seconded by Committee Member Arellano, the Committee moved to recommend denial of the application to the Planning Commission and adopt Findings for Decision based on the emergency equipment access and ADA requirements. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES:	6	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	Arellano, Davis, Jacobowsky, Johnson, Latasa, McKenzie
NOES:	1	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	Finklea
ABSENT:	0	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	None

Senior Planner Ebbs reminded the Historic Preservation Commission about the NHL Conference being held on May 14th and the Historic Preservation "Green" Conference on May 15th.

The Architectural Review Committee and Historic Preservation Commission Joint Session adjourned. The Architectural Review Committee regularly scheduled meeting convened.

3. **443 Wave Street (Holiday Inn Express); ARC Application 09-054; Applicant James D. McCord; Owner Holiday Inn Express, Cannery Row L.L.C; VAF Zoning District; Exempt from CEQA Requirements.**

Review of four (4) replacement signs; minor alterations to a new freestanding sign structure, new building lighting and new security gate.

ACTION: Approved the application with the Conditions of Approval and adopted Findings for Decision. 5-2(Noes Johnson, McKenzie)-0.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The proposed hanging pole sign at the Foam Street frontage is approved and shall be double sided.
2. The proposed wall sign at the Foam Street frontage shall be removed from the project plans.
3. Preliminary Design Review may be delegated to staff for review and approval.
4. The applicant shall submit details for all signs including accurate colors and may use a high-density foam material.
5. The applicant shall remove the up-lights from the project plans and resubmit lighting plans that conform to the Cannery Row Conservation District Guidelines and ARC Resolution 92-07: ARC Exterior Lighting Design Guidelines, Commercial, Industrial and Institutional Development.
6. The applicant shall submit elevation drawings and specifications for the proposed Foam Street security gate for review and approval by staff.
7. The applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit for the monument sign structure.

Staff Presentation/Committee Member Questions:

Senior Associate Planner Hopper presented the staff report and answered Committee Members' questions.

Applicant:

James McCord was present. He explained the project and answered questions regarding the pole sign, the AAA sign, mounted building signs, and the security gate.

Public Comments:

None.

Committee Member Comments:

After a discussion regarding the Foam Street pole sign, Vice Chair Latasa moved to approve the application with the Conditions of Approval and adopt Findings for Decision. Committee Member Johnson seconded the motion.

MOTION:

On a motion by Vice Chair Latasa, seconded by Committee Member Johnson, the Committee moved to approve the application with the Conditions of Approval and adopt Findings for Decision. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: 5 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Arellano, Davis, Finklea, Jacobowsky, Latasa
NOES: 2 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Johnson, McKenzie
ABSENT: 0 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: None

4. **585 and 625 Cannery Row; ARC Application 08-352; Applicant/Owner Tene Shake / Shake Enterprises; CR Zoning District; Exempt from CEQA Requirements.**

Preliminary Design Review for new exterior paint.

ACTION: Denied the application for Preliminary Design Review and adopted Findings for Decision. 7-0-0.

Findings for Decision:

1. The proposed color scheme is inconsistent with the Cannery Row Conservation District Design Program. The Design Policy for new construction (p. 33) states that, "New buildings shall respect the traditional character of the area." The proposed paint scheme is not in character with the traditional building character of Cannery Row, which uses subtle, utilitarian and neutral paint schemes. The proposed colors are very bold, rich and saturated and do not relate to the industrial tradition of Cannery Row. Further, Policy 6.11 (p. 59) states that, "New materials may also be considered. If used, they should appear similar in character to those used during the period of focus", and Policy 6.12 states that, "A simple material finish is encouraged for a large expanse of wall plane". The proposed colors are not similar in character to those used during the Cannery-era and the richness of the colors do not constitute a simple material finish.
2. The proposed color scheme is inconsistent with Architectural Review Committee (ARC) Resolution No. 92-10, Exterior Color Design Guidelines, which states, "bright, intense, highly saturated colors which exaggerate attention to the architecture are discouraged", "building color in built-up areas, characterized by a dominance of buildings, should be compatible and blend with surrounding buildings. The color should not be a "sign" or imply that a building is trying to attract attention." The color scheme is very bright, very intense and uses highly saturated colors. Further, the buildings are each fully three stories in height with fairly flush front elevations. The uniquely large bulk of these buildings are further exaggerated by these bold colors. Other buildings of this mass, including the Monterey Bay Aquarium, the Intercontinental Hotel, the Edgewater Cannery Building, and the City Parking Garage all utilize simple, neutral and soft tones. As such, the building cannot be considered to be compatible with surrounding buildings of this size. The use of bold colors on smaller buildings achieves a different effect. The colors, including the stripes and checkerboard patterns, are also associated with a current fad and can be considered to be fashionable, as discouraged by Resolution No. 92-10.
3. The proposed colors are incompatible with the established architectural character and traditions of Cannery Row and serve to garner attention. The buildings are already exceptionally massive and the use of these bold colors calls undue attention to them. Similarly, the application of contrasting checkerboard and stripe patterns to the building and the bridge, will visually clutter the neighborhood and the right-of-way.

Staff Presentation/Committee Member Questions:

Senior Planner Ebbs presented the staff report.

Applicant:

Not Present.

Public Comments:

None.

Committee Member Comments:

Committee Member Jacoubowsky moved to deny the application for Preliminary Design Review and adopt Findings for Decision. Committee Member Johnson seconded the motion.

MOTION:

On a motion by Committee Member Jacoubowsky, seconded by Committee Member Johnson, the Committee moved to deny the application for Preliminary Design Review and adopt Findings for Decision. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: 7 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Arellano, Davis, Finklea, Jacoubowsky, Johnson, Latasa, McKenzie
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.

None.

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 announced that he would be resigning from the Architectural Review Committee effective the end of June.
2. Vice Chair Latasa asked the date of the next Architectural Review Committee meeting.
3. Committee Member Finklea questioned the Initial Study for 2 Upper Ragsdale that he received in the mail.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:45 P.M.

ARC Chairperson

ARC Planner

Date

Date

HPC Chairperson

HPC Planner

Date

Date