



Council Chamber  
Few Memorial Hall of Records  
Monterey, California

# Minutes Planning Commission

Regular Meeting  
February 28, 2006

4:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.  
7:00 p.m. – 11:00 p.m.

## Planning Commission

Toynette Bryant, Chair  
Leon Garden, Vice-Chair  
Paul W. Davis  
Willard McCrone  
Henry Ruhnke  
David Stocker  
Ralph Widmar

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bryant called the meeting to order at 4:00 P.M.

### ROLL CALL

**Commissioners Present:** Bryant, Davis, Garden, McCrone, Ruhnke, Stocker

**Commissioners Absent:** Widmar

**Staff Present:** Community Development Director Bill Wojtkowski, Senior Planner Rick Marvin, Senior Planner Chip Rerig, Recording Secretary Terry Lebda

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 14, 2006

**ACTION:** Approved as amended. 6-0-1 (Absent-Widmar).

MOTION:

On a motion by Commissioner Garden, seconded by Commissioner McCrone, the minutes of February 14, 2006 were approved as amended. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES:	6	COMMISSIONERS:	Bryant, Davis, Garden, McCrone, Ruhnke, Stocker
NOES:	0	COMMISSIONERS:	None
ABSENT:	1	COMMISSIONERS:	Widmar

### PUBLIC COMMENTS

PUBLIC COMMENTS allows the public to speak for a maximum of three minutes on any subject, which is not on the agenda. Any person or group desiring to bring an item to the attention of the Planning Commission may do so by addressing the Commission during Public Comments or by addressing a letter of explanation to: Community Development Director, City Hall, Monterey CA 93940. The appropriate staff person will contact the sender concerning the details.

None.

## REVIEW OF AFTERNOON AGENDA AND CONSENT ITEMS

REVIEW OF AGENDA AND CONSENT ITEMS are to review those items recommended for approval on consent, or recommended to be continued, tabled or withdrawn, etc. CONSENT ITEMS consists of those items which are routine and for which a staff recommendation has been prepared. A member of the public or a Commissioner may request that an item recommended for approval on consent be heard on the regular agenda for further discussion.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

PUBLIC HEARINGS are held to receive public comment on certain items pending Planning Commission action. You are welcome to offer your comments after being recognized by the Chair. The Chair may limit the time allocated to each speaker.

**1. 798 Wave Street (Palace Flop House); Application 06-018 to Re-Open Parking Adjustment 03-500; Applicant/Owner Jack Stracuzzi; C-2 Zoning District; Exempt from CEQA Requirements.**

Permit request for a two-year extension of an eight-space Parking Adjustment that was approved to allow construction of a 3,828 square foot two-story commercial building.

**ACTION: On consent approved Parking Adjustment Extension as submitted. 5-1 (Noes-Garden)-1 (Absent-Widmar).**

Commissioner Garden commented that this is an example of when the City needs to stop issuing parking adjustments until it is clear what policy is in place to establish when they are to be issued.

MOTION:

On a motion by Commissioner Ruhnke, seconded by Commissioner Stocker, it was moved to approve the Parking Adjustment Extension as submitted. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES:	5	COMMISSIONERS:	Bryant, Davis, McCrone, Ruhnke, Stocker
NOES:	1	COMMISSIONERS:	Garden
ABSENT:	1	COMMISSIONERS:	Widmar

**2. 702 Pine Street; Appeal 06-027 of Architectural Review Application 05-449; Appellant Albert and Frances Werr; Applicant/Owner Andrew and Roberta Legg; R-1-5 Zoning District; Exempt from CEQA Requirements.**

Appeal of Architectural Review Committee decision approving concept design for second story addition to an existing two-story single-family dwelling.

**ACTION: Denied the appeal and upheld the decision of the Architectural Review Committee. 4-2 (Noes-Stocker, Bryant) –1 (Absent-Widmar).**

Staff Presentation/Commissioners Questions:

Chip Rerig presented the staff report and answered Commissioners' questions.

Appellant:

Albert Werr showed photographs of the story pole staking that blocks the ocean view. He said the reason for the appeal is that the Architectural Review Committee did not follow guidelines. He said that the attic space is for storing Christmas decorations, but there is approximately 1,270 feet of storage space, which is larger than most houses in the area.

Applicant:

Andrew Legg said that they submitted plans to the Architectural Review Committee and as designed, the additions met the guidelines. He said that the ARC reviewed the plans and suggested changes, which were submitted and reviewed at the January 18 meeting. He said the roof and dormer revisions substantially reduced view impacts and satisfied guidelines, and that the pitch of the roof is reasonable and compatible with the area. He submitted his presentation for the record.

Public Comments:

Sally Salmon said that she is pleased that they are doing this project because it will improve the looks of the house. She said her concerns are in two words balance and equitable. She said the 180-degree view on the backside of the house is unbalanced and she has a concern that the understory of the garage adds massing.

Dr. Robert Wemheuer, New Monterey Neighborhood Association, said that they oppose the appeal of the ARC decision. He said that the applicant has already changed plans significantly to apply with ARC recommendations and they meet the concept of view sharing in the New Monterey Area Plan.

Steve Wilson said that he supports the addition and opposes the appeal because of the topography of the area. He said that their design will be an upgrade to the neighborhood.

Jim Tuller, Project Designer, answered Commissioner Stocker's question explaining the design of the attic space and that they stepped the roof to provide visual interest. He said the inside of the house is small with not much storage space and that he does not know where the terminology 'Christmas storage' started.

Mr. Werr said that 'Christmas storage' was stated by Mr. Legg. He said that this is a very high house and no reason for it.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Ruhnke said that this is always difficult with hillsides and ocean views. He said that this meets the intent of the City's View Sharing Policy. He said he remembers this project from the past and it has come a long way to improve the appearance of the home and even if they push the attic down, it will not change the view. Regarding the design and massing, he said this is not an inexpensive design and can be a beautiful home if detailed correctly. He said that the Architectural Review Committee evaluated and considered the design and came to a conclusion that it is acceptable. He said there is no indication of mismanagement in their decision and he moved to deny the appeal.

Commissioner McCrone seconded the motion. He said that at first he was troubled by the storage space as it seemed to be artificial or add unnecessary height to the addition, but that he is satisfied with the description from the designer. He said that from the three houses visited, it appeared that this was a good example of view sharing. He said the photo was taken from the first floor and could have some impact, but from their upper level there is no impact.

Commissioner Garden said that he supports the motion to deny the appeal because there are no findings that the ARC erred. He said there is little impact from the raising of the roof as described. He said it is an ongoing issue because driving up Prescott it looks like a three-story house, but it is a one-story living space and does not meet the guidelines of a 3-story home.

Commissioner Stocker said that he disagrees and will vote against the motion. He said that the attic adds bulk and mass and blocks views. He said they bumped the roof to add architectural interest and it intrudes the views from two houses, and adding storage area that blocks views is wrong. He said that it is effectively a third story and it could have been designed without increasing the mass.

Commissioner Davis said that he agrees with Commissioner Ruhnke and that the Architectural Review

Committee did a good job. He said that the applicant was directed to change their design and they did as recommended. He said that you can't satisfy all the neighbors and that the process went as planned.

Chair Bryant said that her concern is the appearance up from Prescott Avenue. She said if the pitch of the roof is lowered, that would have the same appearance and improve the house, but allow a slight more bit of view from the neighbors' homes uphill. She said there is a step affect when someone has an addition and the uphill view is compromised, then uphill there are more additions. She said we can't legislate that, but when View Sharing Policy was set up for City, people needed to realize it is a shared view. She said balance is in the eye of the beholder. She said she agrees that the design will improve the house and will be an asset to the neighborhood.

**MOTION:**

On a motion by Commissioner Ruhnke, seconded by Commissioner McCrone, it was moved to deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Architectural Review Committee. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES:	4	COMMISSIONERS:	Davis, Garden, McCrone, Ruhnke
NOES:	2	COMMISSIONERS:	Bryant, Stocker
ABSENT:	1	COMMISSIONERS:	Widmar

**3. 460 San Bernabe Drive; Appeal 06-030 of Architectural Review Application 05-456; Appellant Harleen Sandhu; Applicant Susan Bailey (Any Habitat); Owner Russell Levin; R-1-12 Zoning Code; Exempt from CEQA Requirements.**

Appeal of Architectural Review Committee decision approving concept design for a two-story addition to an existing single-family dwelling.

**ACTION: Appeal withdrawn by applicant.**

**COMMISSION COMMENTS**

Commissioners may ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement or make a brief report on his or her activities. In addition, the Commission 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 place a request to agendaize a matter of business on a future agenda (G.C. 54954.2).

**4. Response to Commissioners' Comments at February 14, 2006 meeting.**

**ACTION: Report received.**

**New Comments:**

- Commissioner Ruhnke said that there is a proliferation of business signs popping up on Garden Court and he understands that staff is looking into that. He suggested that the signs be combined such as on 10<sup>th</sup> street.
- Mr. Wojtkowski reviewed the responses to the February 14 Commissioners' comments. Regarding the Valero Service Station, he indicated that the City will prepare a request for proposals to redevelop the site. He also reported that the City has hired Bellinger, Foster and Steinmetz Landscape Architectures to design the Hartnell Gulch walkway connecting the Library, the State property behind Cooper Molera, and over to the Stevenson House. Mr. Marvin said that Del Rey Oaks contacted Monterey's Planning staff and said that they reviewed the Tarp's truck and determined it is not in violation of their ordinances.

## **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

The Community Development Director's report supplies information on activities or announcements. He may also ask for clarification or direction regarding scheduling of Commission meetings and study sessions.

### **5. Director's Report**

#### **ACTION: Report received.**

- In answer to Commissioners' questions regarding the Catellus property, Mr. Wojtkowski said that there has been presented a strong voice from advocates wanting both the Adventures-By-The-Sea and the Monterey Bay Kayaks buildings removed from the site. He said that the City Council direction is to remove the kayak building and expand the Adventures-By-The-Sea building to combine both uses into that building. He also indicated that the Open Space Committee will separately be looking at uses in waterfront open space areas. In answer to a question, he said that the Coastal Commission has two categories for Coastal space—Coastal Dependent and Coastal Related—and that the Monterey Bay Kayaks are coastal dependent and Adventures-By-The-Sea is coastal related.
- Mr. Wojtkowski said that a Public Service Center meeting will be held this Thursday evening by the Historic Preservation Commission and will be heard by the Planning Commission tentatively in late April.
- Commissioner McCrone said that he will not be able to attend the March 14<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting.
- Mr. Wojtkowski informed the Commissioners that the previously heard cell antenna project has been appealed to the City Council and the appellants are questioning the FCC review of health issues and the City's role with review of these installations.
- Mr. Wojtkowski said that the Lighthouse Avenue is moving towards the possibility of two lanes with an additional middle lane for left turns and deliveries. He said that this matter will be referred to the Planning Commission in the future.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**The Planning Commission Meeting will be adjourned to the Waterfront Community Room located adjacent to the Maritime Museum and Custom House Plaza for dinner and will reconvene at 7:00 p.m. for the Annual Retreat.**

**Recess 5:05 p.m.  
Reconvene 7:00 p.m.  
WATERFRONT COMMUNITY ROOM**

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Bryant called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

## **ROLL CALL**

**Commissioners Present:** Bryant, Davis, Garden, McCrone, Ruhnke, Stocker

**Commissioners Absent:** Widmar

**Staff Present:** Community Development Director Bill Wojtkowski, Senior Planner Rick Marvin, City Engineer Tom Reeves, Recording Secretary Terry Lebda

## 6. PLANNING COMMISSION RETREAT – ITEMS OF MUTUAL CONCERN

**ACTION: No action taken. Discussed: 1) current Planning Division processes; 2) appropriateness of current parking standards; 3) Open Space uses; 4) possible City priorities for Fiscal Year 2007-2008; and 5) if there is a need to revise the City Subdivision Ordinance.**

The Planning Commission and staff discussed the following items:

### Process

- Planning Commission recommendations to City Council should be strongly stated and clearly presented in the reports; however, staff needs to give City Council their best opinion whether they agree with the Commission or not.
- The Commission would like to see the Zone Check Sheet back in the staff reports.
- Staff should review the number of photographs presented in staff reports. In many cases, a few photographs will be adequate.
- The Commissioners asked that staff carefully considers the reasons for appeals and be sure that they are addressing the decision and the bases of the decision.
- Plans no longer need to be posted at the meeting; however, full size sets of plans should be readily available to review if necessary.

### Parking Standards

- It was asked for a more thorough explanation of the rationale behind required parking standards and suggested that we move towards more general standards that might result in less area devoted for parking.
- The traffic and parking problems will not be resolved unless there are incentives for transit.
- Parking in commercial areas should be reviewed first, and then residential areas can be looked at.
- In new residential homes the demand is for two car garages.
- The parking standard is a tool that can be used to establish fee for transportation management.
- Consider elimination of parking credits and charge a tax for transit.
- The Parking Adjustment Subcommittee is getting close to resolving some of these issues and simplifying the requirements.

### Open space

- Is there any reason why the current list of allowable uses within Open Space beachfront properties should still be permitted?
- Activities at the beach will bring people to the area; therefore, there should be categories for both Open Space, such as parks, and activity spaces, such as boardwalks, restaurants, and entertainment.
- Does there need to be parking on the ocean side to serve beach users?
- Active and passive portions of Window on the Bay can be put into the Area Plan. Priority B supports these purposes.
- Should the people of the community vote for permanent Open Space?

### City Priorities for Fiscal Year 2006-2007

#### *Water*

- The Council should consider appointing a subcommittee to focus on water issues for the City. Staff does not have time to dedicate a full time person to this and a subcommittee could explore all options for increasing water supplies, large and small.

*Affordable Housing*

- By trying to force developers to provide affordable housing, are we netting more homes or losing?
- The Housing Element encourages condominium conversions and they are in development, but there is a potential of a backlash of loss of rentals if the existing tenants perceive they have no place to move to in the community.
- Developers want workforce housing in Ryan Ranch Park and Ft. Ord water could be used for this.
- To make it pencil out, projects need to go to a third floor to be able to provide workforce housing, yet Monterey will not allow more than two stories, as shown by the recent project on Lighthouse Avenue.
- The plan for Ryan Ranch Park was the best plan yet and a good use of that land.
- Could incentives be tied with parking?
- The condominium conversion developers need to be told that the City will help with down payment assistance.
- Successful projects can be partnerships such as Carl Outzen's Wave project and the Osio project. The City needs to actively look to be involved in a partnership with developers to achieve more of these projects.
- Should the City revisit Granny Units in R-1 Districts. To be successful, the Planning Commissioners would need to visit neighborhoods to understand opposition and address concerns.

*Other*

- Is it appropriate to remove Monterey Transit Center further out and redevelop the areas around Webster and Munras as an expansion of the downtown?
- The City should continue to explore expanding the Conference Center and continue to work with the State Theater for events and venues.
- The Commission should consider a meeting with the City Council to brainstorm other ideas such as preservation and incentives for Wing Chong/La Ida Café and Ed Ricketts Lab.

Subdivision Map Ordinance

- A suggested Work Program item for next fiscal year should be to amend and modify the outdated Subdivision Map Ordinance.

<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>
--------------------

**There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:15 P.M.**

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

---

Toynette Bryant, Chair

---

Bill Wojtkowski, Secretary

Respectfully Submitted, Terry Lebda  
Recording Secretary  
Planning Commission